

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 11 July, 1985.

Time — 2:00

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Wednesday, July 10, 1985 at 8:00 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

- No. 14 - An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les garderies d'enfants.
- No. 19 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); Loi modifiant le code de la route (2).
- No. 37 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques.
- No. 40 - The Workplace Innovation Centre Act; Loi sur le Centre d'innovation des lieux de travail.
- No. 55 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la réglementation des alcools.
- No. 58 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les hypothèques.
- No. 60 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1985); Loi de 1985 modifiant le droit statuaire.
- No. 72 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants.
- No. 73 - An Act to amend The Special Survey Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les arpentages spéciaux.
- No. 74 - The Equal Rights Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le droit statuaire afin de favoriser l'égalité des droits.
- No. 78 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les divertissements.
- No. 82 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les biens réels.
- No. 85 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act (2); Loi modifiant la loi sur l'assurance-maladie.

No. 94 - An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société d'habitation et de rénovation.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

- No. 28 - The Manitoba Habitat Heritage Act; Loi sur la protection du patrimoine écologique du Manitoba.
- No. 36 - The Mortgage Dealers Act; Loi sur les courtiers d'hypothèques.
- No. 47 - The Infants' Estates Act; Loi sur les biens des mineurs.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société du Barreau.
- No. 59 - The Statute Law Amendment (Family Law) Act; Loi modifiant le droit statuaire concernant le droit de la famille.
- No. 62 - The Charter Compliance Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin d'assurer le respect de la Charte.
- No. 67 - An Act to amend The Registry Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'enregistrement foncier.
- No. 70 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la société du crédit agricole.
- No. 81 - An Act to amend The Co-operatives Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les co-opératives.
- No. 84 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Finance Board Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Commission des finances des écoles publiques.
- No. 86 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la protection du consommateur.
- No. 90 - An Act to amend The Ecological Reserves Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les réserves écologiques.
- No. 98 - An Act to Validate an Expropriation Under The Expropriation Act; Loi validant une expropriation effectuée en vertu de la loi sur l'expropriation.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for River East, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

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

I would like to table with the House proposed changes, draft amendments, to The Credit Union and Caisse Populaire Act.

I would like to make a statement in tabling this report.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have his statement in writing?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, it has been circulated to all the desks. I have discussed this briefly with the opposition critic and we have, I believe, agreed to proceeding in this way. I'd like to make just a very few brief comments if I can in tabling this.

Mr. Speaker, credit unions and caisses populaires represent a valuable and important sector in Manitoba's financial community. There are 103 credit unions and 29 caisses populaires that provide financial services to approximately 330,000 members throughout the province. They strengthen the financial fabric of cities, towns and communities through democratically controlled financial institutions.

Those members have collectively deposited over \$1.75 billion in their own credit unions and caisses populaires. Their confidence in that financial system, which has served Manitoba well for generations, is increasing. Last year, the credit union system grew by 13 percent and the caisse populaire system grew by 11 percent. That growth is illustrative of the faith that hundreds of thousands of Manitobans and their families share in these co-operative financial institutions.

That confidence and their faith has proven to be well placed. Credit unions, caisses populaires and the system in which they operate, have provided reliable financial services and helped to strengthen our provincial fiscal community. Thousands of volunteers in leadership roles and staff operate an efficient and effective fiscal system. They protect the investment of the membership through dedication to their responsibilities and commitment to co-operative principles.

Those directors and officers of those credit unions and caisses populaires, the central organizations and the stabilization funds, all operate within a legislative and regulatory framework. That legislation is designed to meet several general objectives.

Firstly, it sets out the definitions of the individual components of the system which, when taken together, provide a comprehensive picture of the entire system and the legislated relationships of its different parts.

Further to those basic definitions, it identifies the fundamental functions and responsibilities of the partners in the system. It should clearly identify the roles that they are expected to play. It should provide adequate checks and balances in order to ensure that the interests of all participants and, most importantly, the interests of the membership - the depositors - are protected.

Legislation should encourage the development of sound, flexible, consistent and progressive operating procedures within the entire system. This includes the provision for appropriate financial and management procedures throughout that system. These procedures

and reporting systems are essential in order to ensure the protection of the members within the overall system.

The legislation and the regulations should reflect the uniqueness of these financial organizations, which are operated on a co-operative basis, and, at the same time, must compete with other financial institutions in an increasingly complex and competitive fiscal environment. It must define the basic parameters that allow them to operate in that co-operative fashion and meet the needs of their membership.

It is with those overall objectives in mind that I am tabling draft legislation that addresses the goals through proposed amendments to the present act. It is my government's intention to make this draft legislation available to interested parties so that they may review it in detail. We look forward to receiving comments and suggestions from co-operators and other interested parties once they have had the opportunity to review the proposed amendments.

The draft legislation has been developed through extensive discussion and consultation between the credit union and caisse populaire system and the government. Since 1983, representatives of the Credit Union Central, La Fédération des Caisses Populaires, Le Fonds de Sécurité, the Stabilization Fund and the government have been meeting as a Law Review Committee to examine the present legislation, identify key issues and recommend possible changes.

I want to take this occasion to personally thank that committee, their support staff, and departmental officials for their dedication and commitment to that task. I believe they have fulfilled their mandate extremely well.

Following the committee's initial work, the government circulated a discussion paper to interested parties within the credit union-caisse populaire system, members of the Legislative Assembly and other interested individuals. This paper contained a government review of the key issues.

This discussion paper was distributed in July, 1984. Following that distribution, a series of regional meetings were held in Winnipeg, Dauphin, Brandon and Morden with presidents and managers of individual credit unions and caisses populaires. These meetings provided an opportunity for further consultation on many specific issues. As a result of that dialogue and numerous other discussions, several key issues and recommendations were identified as requiring further refinement and adjustments.

A series of internal discussions resulted in the Law Review Committee commencing its work again early in 1985. The draft legislation that is now being tabled is a result of their latest efforts. It represents the best possible consensus on many complex and complicated legislative issues.

Some of the more significant changes proposed in the new bill include the following:

A number of definitions would be amended or added.

The private acts concerning the Credit Union Central and La Fédération des Caisses Populaires would be repealed and the centrals would be included in the new act.

Only investments in the centrals and the funds would qualify for liquidity purposes.

The centrals and credit unions and caisses populaires would be permitted to designate

associate membership criteria within certain parameters.

The number of centrals would be limited and membership in them would be compulsory for credit unions and caisses populaires.

Credit unions and caisses populaires would be allowed to issue shares for the purpose of raising capital at the local level.

The stabilization funds would be able to sell debentures within the system for the purpose of raising capital at that level.

Distribution of surplus and patronage dividends would be restricted until prescribed reserve levels are reached.

One proxy vote would be allowed at meetings under certain circumstances.

Disclosure provisions for director benefits and conflict of interest will be clarified and strengthened.

Audit committees would be established at the credit union and caisse populaire level. Members would be allowed to appoint their own auditors.

These changes, as outlined above, and other revisions to the existing legislation, are designed to enhance the operations and viability of the credit union and caisse populaire movement, while maintaining the necessary degree of accountability for deposit-taking financial institutions. They represent a fair consensus that can only come about through a willingness for positive change and consultation and dialogue at all levels within the system.

The tabling of this draft legislation represents the final stage of that consultative process. I will be circulating information concerning it to the leadership within the co-operative movement in the near future with a request for their input and suggestions. Their comments and those of other interested parties will be considered in any further review of the legislation. It is intended that this legislation in its final form will be introduced early in the next Session of the Legislature.

I want to close by thanking the Opposition Critic and members of this caucus for their co-operation in providing this information in this manner, and I know that it will result in the type of consultation and ongoing dialogue that will bring forward the best possible legislation at the beginning of the next Session.

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

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

I may need your guidance in how to deal with the subject matter that's before us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Possibly I could respond to it as being a ministerial statement maybe, Mr. Speaker, to be in order with the rules of the House, and advise the government and the province of the extreme importance of this issue, and thank the Minister and the government for bringing it to the attention of the House today.

It appears that the government's plans have altered somewhat or changed. Most credit unions and myself included, in going through the Estimates of the Minister, expected this legislation to come in weeks ago in the House. However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the government are going to treat it as a White Paper. I'm sure the caisses populaires and the credit unions across

this province, the co-operatives, like myself and the members of the opposition, await the comments of their boards and membership with keen interest when we proceed to this matter at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

On behalf of the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation, I wish to table the report with respect to Section 23.1(b) of The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act for the 15-month period, January 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Strawberries - brochures

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Honourable Minister of the Environment. I wonder if his department had any input into the brochure that has been published by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture and the Manitoba Strawberry Growers' Association that advises people to eat strawberries out-of-hand when picking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there may have been consultations with the Department of Environment, but I should advise the Leader of the Opposition that the wording contained in the pamphlet is very similar wording that's been in the pamphlet over the last four or five years. The reason for that being that, in terms of the production of strawberries during the period of the berries being formed, there is no commercial spraying that is undertaken. Spraying does occur in the period prior to the berries being formed and, of course, after the picking season, in terms of the spraying. But, Mr. Speaker, that's basically the reason, in terms of the words that they're being evaluated, just to make certain that there is no concern. But in terms of the commercial spraying, there is no spraying actually done when the berries are being formed.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister's own pesticide officer in the Agriculture Department, Mr. David Plewes, is quoted as saying that it's difficult to enforce the assurances that no chemicals are used for 15 days prior to this, and in view of the fact that Professor LaBella at the University, the toxicologist, has indicated concern that people's health would be endangered by eating these strawberries out-of-hand, will the Minister of the Environment be advocating that this brochure be changed to reflect the concerns and take into account the concerns that have been expressed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

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

I haven't seen the brochure in question. We'll certainly undertake to look at it and, if necessary, we'll discuss it with my colleague in the Agriculture Department.

Manitoba Clinic - re ultra-sound equipment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health could indicate whether or not a Manitoba Health Services Commission is being sued by Manitoba Clinic because they allege that they have been denied the opportunity to install at their own cost an ultra-sound testing unit in their diagnostic and testing lab.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't be too sure about that. I've heard rumours about that, but I'm not sure. I can't verify that.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not this is one of the prime reasons behind Bill 85, The Act to amend The Manitoba Health Services Commission Act, an act which serves to give the government an opportunity to ration diagnostic and testing services in private laboratories in this province.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why I bother answering the questions by my honourable friend; he wants to use the same language and he wants to mislead the public. Maybe I should leave him with that. It is not a question of rationing anyone; the reason is to make sure that there's no duplication or mushrooming or proliferation of these labs. I answered all that yesterday.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that appearing before committees representatives of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Manitoba Medical Association, and others in the health care field indicating that to their knowledge there was not duplication of services taking place - this had not been indicated as a concern and that they would be quite prepared to work with the Minister in dealing with any concerns that he has on the matter - will the Minister not withdraw the bill which gives him unwarranted power to control diagnostic and testing in private laboratories in this province and really is, in effect, giving him simply the power to ration these services in Manitoba?

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the member proposes to discuss a bill for which a time is appointed for third reading. The discussion of bills, question period, is not

appropriate. You've ruled on that before, Sir, and I would suggest to honourable members that the time for discussion of Bill 85 is the time appointed for third reading. The fact that it is appointed for third reading is an indication of the member's intention not to withdraw the bill, but to have it proceed and we will have an opportunity for debate at that stage.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, the House Leader need not remind us of the fact that we have had the opportunity at the appointed time to discuss the bill in question, Bill 85. What my leader is attempting to ascertain is its reason for its presentation, Mr. Speaker, not discussing the bill or its contents, simply its reason for its presentation and that is what my leader is attempting to ascertain.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be a miracle man like the last person who spoke, and try to talk about the bill without mentioning . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I thank the honourable member for bringing to my notice that a question should not concern a bill which is in the course of passage through the Legislature. It may well be that the reasons as well as the contents of the matter should be discussed at third reading when it is next before the House.

Plan Winnipeg - revision by Aug. 23rd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate whether or not he has written to the City of Winnipeg directing them to implement a new, revised Plan Winnipeg by August 23rd of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I want to take this opportunity to say that we're not rationing any services in health, no more than we are when we decide on the construction of hospitals and personal care homes.

Mr. Speaker, we have — (Interjection) — what's wrong with my tie?

A MEMBER: Ask Rolly. He made the comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I just paid four bucks for this tie. — (Interjection) — You're right, one like yours, yes, but I wanted a better one. It was this wide, and I paid four bucks to get it, and now I've got two. I think there was a question. Can I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Minister have an answer to the question?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've got new shorts, too. Now can I answer the question?

Mr. Speaker, yes, there has been some discussion with the City of Winnipeg and some negotiation and some co-operation now for over a year. After discussing with some of the representatives of the city, it was felt the best way was to bring it in the way we did. I sent a letter to the city a couple of weeks ago, or so, a week and a half.

I might say that I am meeting with the Mayor, who is absent, at his request. I'm meeting with him next week sometime.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister's letter directs the city to implement Plan Winnipeg by April 23rd in a modified version to that which was advertised and to that for which public hearings were held, is the Minister going to ensure that public hearings are held on the new modified plan before it is attempted to be adopted by the city?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the responsibility for that is the city. I'll check again. If not, we'll do what has to be done.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, given that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it must be the end of the Session.

Given that The City of Winnipeg Act requires that there be public hearings and that there be advertising and all of those things, is the Minister's deadline negotiable if they cannot hold the public hearings and do the advertising that's required under their act within that time frame?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

Unemployment - increase in

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier and it has to do with the recent labour force statistics that have been published for Manitoba by his colleague, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics. In view of the fact that year over year, June '84 to June '85, Manitoba's unemployment rate has increased from 7.2 to 7.8 percent and the country as a whole has dropped from 10.7 to 10 percent, a drop of 7/10 of a percent, will the First Minister finally acknowledge that his policies are not working? Indeed, they've been an abject failure after four years of government. We are having our unemployment increase at a time when the country as a whole and most provinces are decreasing. Will he

acknowledge that his job creation policies are not working, that his concern for unemployment is not backed up by firm policies and call an election, and let the people elect a government that can deal effectively with the unemployment problem in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I commend the Leader of the Opposition for finally getting on to the major issue that is concerning Canadians and Manitobans, that is the job situation, the desire on the part of this government to enhance employment and job opportunities in the province.

Mr. Speaker, what the latest figures demonstrate is that this government continues to be amongst the lowest insofar as provinces are concerned in Canada, insofar as our unemployment rate is concerned. Mr. Speaker, this was confirmed by the Royal Bank June Report, which I had an opportunity to read only last night, in which the Royal Bank of Canada - certainly no spokesperson for the New Democratic Party of Canada - indicated very clearly in its report that Manitoba's job record and employment record is due in large part to the positive features of the Jobs Fund program of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to have opportunity to make reference to that Royal Bank Report later this afternoon. The Royal Bank made that comment despite the repeated efforts on the part of honourable members across the way to suggest the Jobs Fund was a "fraud" fund; obviously, a position that is not concurred by the Royal Bank of Canada that indicated that Manitoba is expected this year, according to the Royal Bank of Canada, to have the lowest unemployment figure in the country. Mr. Speaker, the Royal Bank may be a little optimistic, but will be close to the lowest, if not the lowest figure in Canada, according to the Royal Bank of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind all members that questions and answers should not be speeches.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we're not dealing with projections, we're not dealing with expectations and assumptions, we're dealing with reality. These are the figures that are published by this Minister. I want the First Minister, if all of those projections are so confident and optimistic, why is it that the figures show that Manitoba had lower figures in unemployment? That Manitoba is having an increase in unemployment whereas the rest of the country, more than half of the provinces, are decreasing their unemployment figures, June of 1984 to June of 1985. Why is that the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, I know, will be pleased to receive commentary from the Minister of Employment who has

all the exact figures I see written out in some detail. It will be of assistance to the Leader of the Opposition to receive that information which the Minister of Employment is just waiting at the bit to provide the Leader of the Opposition with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may not want to acknowledge it, but frankly, there were 5,000 more people working this past month in Manitoba than previously.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants us to get those charts again, it's categorically clear that throughout their entire period in office the rate of job creation performance in Manitoba was under the national average for the entire four-year period. In our first three years in office we have exceeded the national average in terms of job creation in Manitoba, so that's a record we can be very very proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the honourable member that there has been such a thing called federal cutbacks and as far as I am concerned, the impact of those cutbacks have been unfairly felt in certain parts of this country, including the Province of Manitoba. The members can laugh, but we have \$2.5 million fewer available to us for summer job creation in Manitoba than we had last year - \$2.5 million - and you can laugh about it. But the young people of Manitoba have been denied over \$2 million fewer of job creation funds. So I say with that kind of policy, that kind of program, no wonder we have some difficulties in trying to achieve the kind of performance that we would like.

Mr. Speaker, when you take it into historical perspective, we, on this side, are very proud of the job creation record. We're very proud that we continue to have the third lowest rate of unemployment in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, despite the investment in the Jobs Fund, Manitoba year over year, June 1984 to June 1985 in the youth category, age 15 to 24 had an increase in unemployment of 1.5 percent, whereas the rest of the country had a decrease of .8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier drop his anti-business policies, drop his anti-investment policies such as the payroll tax and some of his labour legislation changes, drop those and call an election, so that a new government with new policies can come in here and do the things that are necessary to create jobs in this province.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition has not only blown his lead, he's blown this Session, and right now he's blowing his credibility with that kind of . . .

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the private sector for a few moments. The construction industry of Canada, western division, just recently issued a report in which they described the recent Federal Budget as a bombshell insofar as the construction industry was concerned in Canada as a whole. They described the

Federal-Conservative Budget in Ottawa as a bombshell impacting the construction industry and its employment across the country. Let that be clear.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about this province. Mr. Speaker, private investment growth in this province last year was No. 1 or No. 2 in Canada - private investment growth - Manitoba, virtually the highest if not the highest in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this year, let me inform the Leader of the Opposition and he ought to be pleased with this good news because of the Leader of the Opposition's concern about private investment growth, the projections insofar as private investment growth is concerned for Manitoba, again, 1985 projections will be the best rate of growth of any province in Canada, right here in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than doom and gloom on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, I think he should join with other Manitobans who look forward to the future of this province and its development, private sector and public sector, with the utmost of confidence, not with a lack of confidence which is daily displayed by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues across the way.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Premier never had any credibility and he still doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, if private investment growth has been so great, why did we drop 5,000 manufacturing jobs in this province in the past year, June of 1984 to June of 1985?

Come on Howard, answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this June over last June, there are 6,000 more full-time jobs in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has been reading his own figures because they show that actual employment in this province grew by only 2,000 people whereas the rest of the country grew by 308,000.

Mr. Speaker, when is the First Minister going to take control of the events of this province and call an election so that we can have a government in place that will bring forward policies to create real long-term jobs in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, as I indicated the other day, ain't seen anything yet.

The Leader of the Opposition can just wait a little bit longer, Mr. Speaker, and we'll be delighted on the basis of our performance and the performances observed by objective observers, the Royal Bank of Canada, the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada,

that have all described - I would have thought, if they had any political leanings, it would be a little bit closer to that of the Leader of the Opposition than to this side of the Chamber - that have all described the investment opportunities in Manitoba as good to excellent; that have all described employment growth in the Province of Manitoba as superior to that which is taking place in the rest of Canada; that have all pointed out quite accurately that the number of new jobs created in Manitoba since they were in power, exceeds the proportion of population in the Province of Manitoba.

We have exceeded by way of employment growth in Manitoba that which the country as a whole has done by way of employment growth, Mr. Speaker. We need, in fact, take no back seat to any part of Canada. Manitobans need take no back seat to any part of this country, Mr. Speaker. The only people who don't recognize that in this province are 23 lonely members in this Chamber that will be even more lonely after the next election.

Seven Oaks Centre - boys assaulted

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Community Services. Can the Minister confirm that on Monday of this week, one junior staff person and one STEP student took 10 young persons from the Seven Oaks Centre to Birds Hill for a swim where four of the boys there sexually assaulted one of the girls?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can advise this morning that I received a report of an incident that the honourable member refers to and the staff and the police are jointly investigating the matter.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain why the staff did not intervene and advise whether or not the staff had the necessary expertise or experience to handle that number of children, 10 young persons?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The matter is under police investigation. There should not be in this House allegations of fact which may not be fact; accusations which may not be tenable. I don't think anything should be done to prejudice the police investigation or prejudice the rights of any persons, victims or accused.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask one more question of the Minister in a more general way then. I would ask the Minister if he would consider recommending to the Acting Minister, whether he would recommend to the Minister, that this department reduce its increased expenses in costs in administrations and communications and spend a little more on dealing with the real problem of child abuse?

HON. L. EVANS: I think, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that my colleague who is away at the present time, is very well aware of the need to do everything we can to prevent child abuse and indeed, is taking various initiatives to address that problem. I think Manitoba is in the forefront in this country in that area and indeed in other social policies that are most progressive.

In regard to this, we have been assured that everything that is possible is being done to investigate the matter and as the Attorney-General has said, it's not appropriate to comment any further on it until this investigation is completed.

Critical Home Repair - cancellation of application

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

I direct a question to the Minister of Housing dealing with a constituency matter of which I have supplied the Minister with information some weeks ago.

A Mrs. Rieben, a senior citizen widow of Kenville had her Critical Home Repair application cancelled because she refused to use two different colours of siding on her home and was told she could paint the siding to match the other.

My question to the Minister is, will he reactivate Mrs. Rieben's application for assistance to complete the siding on her home in Kenville?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

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

As the member is aware, we have thousands of applications under the Critical Home Repair Program. I have asked for a report on that. I should be receiving that within the next day or two and if the case is as stated by the Member for Swan River, we will see what we can do to expedite the application and have the lady's particular desires met.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, I appreciate the Minister's answer. I would expect though that he could move a little quicker than a month since he has received the request that maybe this could be speeded up.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I direct a further question to the Minister of Finance. Recently I've received complaints

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Please, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The Member for Swan River has made an allegation that I received this a month ago. The letter was received in my office I believe some two weeks ago, or less than that. The matter was brought to my personal attention a matter of two days

ago and I should have a report in my office by this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That might have been a clarification. It was not a point of order.

Mobile Homes, sale of - provincial sales tax on

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. He was here and he's temporarily gone. Maybe I can defer my question until he comes back.

I'll direct a question then to the Acting Minister of Finance. I have received a number of complaints recently with respect to the imposing of provincial sales tax on the sale of mobile homes; the purchasers then can apply to get a 50 percent refund on the sales tax. My question is, why does the Department of Finance charge the provincial sales tax on mobile homes in the first place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I understand there's a fairly lengthy preamble, possibly if the member could repeat that.

MR. D. GOURLAY: My question to the Minister of Finance is, why does the Department of Finance charge provincial sales tax on mobile homes and then ask the purchaser to apply for a partial refund of about 45 or 50 percent of that tax? My question is: why does the department charge the provincial sales tax on mobile homes in the first place, especially in view of the fact that there's no sales tax on the purchase of a ready-to-move home?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Usually, taxes are put on in order that revenues can be achieved. Mr. Speaker, I don't recall any changes having been made by this government in terms of the taxation of house trailers. The member was a member of the government for four years and I would say that the same thing was happening at that time. They were collecting the same tax because they needed the money. There are a lot of taxes that we would like to do away with. I think all of us would like to do away with all taxes if we could, but we need the money. We need the money to provide the services people expect.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, why do they collect the tax and then offer the option of a refund if the purchaser would wish to apply for a refund of that taxation? Why do they charge it in the first place?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I think that's a very good question. If we're paying it back at the option of the purchaser, that doesn't make a great deal of sense. So I will take the question as notice and get back to the member and try to explain the logic of it. As I say, it's probably something that so illogical, it can only have been implemented by the Lyon government.

Reciprocal Trucking Agreement - re farm-plated trucks

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Transportation. Yesterday, he took as notice a question posed by the Member for Pembina as to whether or not there'd been any change in the Reciprocal Trucking Agreement as it applies to farm-plated trucks owned in Manitoba and driven into Minnesota. I asked the Minister again today, can Manitoba farmers using farm-plated semis deliver into the United States of America their produce, soybeans, sunflowers, flaxseed and rapeseed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, the question was answered and dealt with in the committee last night when we were dealing with Bill 19. However, I guess since the member was not there, he would like to have the answer repeated here for the House.

I explained that the reciprocal agreement, the reciprocity agreement that was in place since 1954, can be cancelled with 30 days notice by either party. There was an agreement in place since 1954 between Minnesota and Manitoba. Minnesota has changed their policy with regard to reciprocity for F-plates for enforcement reasons, they tell us, and had requested that the province agree to a new reciprocity agreement that would provide reciprocity for all the other categories of licensing, but not for the F-plated trucks above 26,000 pounds.

With the 30-day cancellation clause and with the fact that we would not have a reciprocity agreement at all, we felt it was better to sign that one at this time and consider further discussions with them. They are cancelling or changing all the reciprocity agreements that they have with neighbouring jurisdictions with regard to their F-plated trucks. What this would mean is that the farm-plated trucks from Manitoba hauling into Minnesota would still be able to do so, but they would have to pay a trip permit fee to do so with vehicles that are above the 26,000 pounds.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister whether his department has ascertained the reasons that Minnesota has decided to remove the reciprocal agreement. Does it have anything to do with the fact that there's a moratorium in place to the entry of Canadian hogs into that state? Does that have anything to do with the actions of the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture attempting to fix this hog problem we've had with that nation over the last two months?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There is no relationship whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know. The fact is that they, for enforcement purposes, have decided that this is a move that they would like to undertake. They did give us notice at the beginning of June that they wanted to cancel that form of reciprocity agreement as of July 1st. With that in mind, we had agreed to this and have continued discussions with them.

But there is no known relationship. It affects all of the other jurisdictions as well as Manitoba. Other states that are adjacent to the State of Minnesota are affected the same way as the Province of Manitoba is.

Surface Rights Board - removal of responsibility

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. I hope he doesn't take it as notice because if this is the last Session that he's the Premier he may never get the opportunity to answer it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, continued problems with the Surface Rights Board and being accused of having two sets of rules earlier this year, the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated that the responsibility would be transferred from his responsibility. When will the Premier be taking that action to take that responsibility away from the Minister of Mines and Energy?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll answer the question since it falls in my area. I must say that I have confidence that my Premier will be on this side of the House come next Session and future Sessions, especially if this is the last question period of the Session. Their performance in this last question period has been woefully weak, reflective of what they've done all Session.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated very clearly to the member during my Estimates that we would indeed look at the matter. We would consider which department it might go to, and that is proceeding in due course, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the Member for Arthur would be raising that question, seeing it was answered very fully in Estimates.

Professional engineers - withdrawal of services

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Could the Minister confirm that key groups of professional engineers, being without a wage contract for over two-and-a-half years, will begin to withdraw their services on Monday of next week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm that the Minister of Finance and myself met with representation from the professional engineers and their association yesterday and had a good exchange. They understand, I believe now, that certainly we haven't withdrawn from any attempt to resolve the dispute. Conciliation services remain open. They indicated their concerns to us, and we have said that certainly we will continue to consider them.

Should they decide to withdraw services, that's an action that is open to them. We'll have to accept the right of workers to exercise their prerogative.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister inform the House whether the key groups of the professional engineers employed by the government will be withdrawing their services to the government beginning on Monday, what effect that will have on government programs? Can he also confirm that these engineers are paid approximately 20 percent less than similar engineers working for Manitoba Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

The union will, of course, have to make its determination as to what it will do. In terms of the second part of the question, there are all kinds of different numbers out there for different groups. They may be making more than some and less than others; that's part of the process.

Mobile Homes, sale of - provincial sales tax on

HON. V. SCHROEDER: While I'm on my feet, I took a question as notice with respect to mobile homes a few moments ago, and I do have some further information. The logic of the tax refund is that it goes only to those purchasers of mobile homes who use them as a principal residence. They must show the sales agreement indicating that it is a purchase of a home, and there's a declaration I believe that indicates that they are using it as a home.

The 50 percent relates to apparently roughly the amount that is the cost of the home as compared to the furnishings. As the member knows, furnishings ordinarily in other homes are taxable; that is, a refrigerator, stove and so on, and many of these appliances are built in. So just the home portion has historically - and it's been for a number of years - calculated at 50 percent of the value. That's the logic of what is being done now. So if you're not using it as a home, if you were using it for some other purpose, for a business, for instance, then you don't qualify for the refund.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that staff at this time of the Session has additional work on their load, but I must complain about the Order Paper today.

I wonder whether or not we will have some provision of the Orders of the Day in terms of the third readings of the bills and what order they will be presented. Can it not be possible that during the consideration of the Capital Supply Bills that members be provided with a listing of the bills as they will appear for third reading? It would be helpful to my members who wish to perhaps make comment on some of the bills to have some idea in what order and on what bill they will be appearing.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. I trust that the Opposition House Leader did not, by any stretch of the imagination, purport to criticize the way the Order Paper has been presented today. It is presented in accordance with the format established and accurately portrays what is required under our rules.

Those bills which appear for third reading are those bills which have been reported from committee for third reading. The bulk of the bills do not appear here for third reading for one simple reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is because they were only reported a short time ago. I will ask the Clerk to make available some time within the next hour or so, because we will be in Capital Supply for a little while, a photocopy of today's report from committee, which when added to the third readings which appear on the Order Paper, will provide full information.

But I want to categorically reject any suggestion of criticism of the Table because the Order Paper is prepared as it always has been, and I am sure the Opposition House Leader did not mean to suggest that and I accept that.

Mr. Speaker, to further advise the honourable member with regard to House Business - and I accept his suggestion that that would be helpful before we actually move into committee - it would be my intention to have House Business proceed in the following fashion as time permits:

That we would deal with Capital Supply; following that, in the Committee of Supply, that would complete the consideration of all items in Committee of Supply.

If we finish that, I would propose to call the report stages on those bills for which report stage amendments have been circulated or will shortly be circulated. I believe, in response to a suggestion from the Member for St. Norbert, in fact, there will be a further report stage amendment circulated shortly. I believe there are four report stage amendments with which we will be proceeding after Capital Supply.

Following that, we will be moving, Sir, to Committee of the Whole on the two bills which are currently in

the Committee of the Whole; An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act, Bill 71 - 16 originally, 71 reprinted - and The Statute Law Amendment Act (1985 Taxation), Bill 65 - deal with those in Committee of the Whole.

Following that, Sir, I would propose to call third readings on those bills that have had the report stage amendments on the two bills reported from Committee of the Whole, and all other bills reported yesterday and appearing on the Order Paper, and all other bills reported today from Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee meeting last night. That would conclude the third readings, Sir.

I would expect then that we would proceed with, after those third readings, Committee of Ways and Means on the Main Supply and Capital Supply. I am getting ahead of myself, Sir, maybe next Tuesday by the time we get this far, but we would then proceed with the committee and other stages necessary on the Main and Capital Supply.

Depending on the will of the House, there may be some other items we may wish to consider in that process. Depending on the will of the House, we may or may not have Private Members' Hour today. As I said, Sir, depending on the will of the House.

Sir, if that answers questions about how we propose to proceed, we could go to Committee of Supply now, as I moved.

MR. SPEAKER: I will so put the motion to the House.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates for Capital Supply. The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some questions dealing with a couple of areas; one, the Water Services Board.

I ask the Minister: this \$8.5 million is totally a repayable loan which is going into the operations of the water services in the province; and towns and villages will be repaying these funds?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the \$8.5 million in Capital Supply is to provide for the loan assistance to communities. The total funds that we estimate will be required for '85-86 is in the range of \$12 million, of which we have in excess of \$2 million available in previous Capital Supply Authority, and the \$8.5 million is the additional portion to carry on the existing program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the question was: is that repayable to the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, almost \$12 million is the repayable portion of the funding, the debentures that the communities will in fact raise.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, that is established by a formula with the towns, and they pay the rate at which the province can get the money, plus a percentage or so above the cost of money to the province, I understand. If I remember correctly, the formula hasn't changed, and that's the question. — (Interjection) — It has, okay. It has changed, okay?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refresh the honourable member's memory on the formula, is that we did change the formula a year ago whereby we enhanced the amount of assistance provided to communities in two ways.

No. 1, in terms of communities which have abnormal costs and, generally, they were the northern communities where construction costs exceed the southern construction costs considerably, some by as much as 50 percent, there is an additional amount in the formula to cover those costs. As well, in southern Manitoba, for example, communities like, say, Stonewall or Stony Mountain, which have rock formations, there is an additional cost to take into account some of those additional construction costs by moving the available assistance from 50 percent to 60 percent in those communities.

As well, Mr. Chairman, a change in the way the debenture rate is calculated was made in the formula which will in fact increase the amount of assistance granted to communities.

In fact, the debenture rate now is pegged annually in relationship to the Department of Finance borrowings which will either raise or lower the interest rate payable. There was an amount, I believe, at 8 percent, which was calculated into the formula. When interest rates were well above that, the community, in fact, received far less assistance than would have been the case had the interest rate on the debentures been pegged at the borrowing rate rather than at an artificial rate which was at that time at 8 percent.

So we now calculate the debenture rate or change it annually to more accurately reflect the interest rates that the province has, giving a much more timely benefit to the communities under the program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I thank the Minister for that information.

Mr. Chairman, in the Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund, it is my understanding that the fund at this point is almost to the maximum of its authority. Will this increase that authority or is this just providing the funds to provide up to the maximum of the \$20 million that the Minister has? What is the current stabilization fund at as far as a loan to the stabilization? Can the Minister indicate that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, to the best of our knowledge, at the end of June, the loan to the fund stood somewhere in the neighbourhood of between \$18 and \$19 million.

In terms of our assessment, the additional \$5 million of authority will accurately cover what might be necessary for the fiscal year 1985-86.

I wish to advise the honourable member part of that is that last year we had approximately 12,500 head of cattle, or finished cattle, sold through the commission, that's April to June in 1984. April to June in 1985, Mr. Chairman, that's gone up to 22,600 finished animals sold through the commission; so there's been over an 80 percent increase in the numbers.

One owner finishing, Sir, in terms of whether it is custom or whatever, has caught on and there are a lot more animals marketing and, of course, the loan rate, even though the premiums have changed, we expect the authority that we are asking for it to move that to \$25 million, will in fact be adequate.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister has said, this is an additional \$5 million of authority so that the fund does not in the next quarter run out of — (Interjection) — next year, okay.

Further, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, and the Minister can correct me, this is treated as a loan to the producers. It is a loan fund and will be and is a repayable loan by the people who take stabilization fund. Is that correct?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that being the case before. There are also provisions within the contract whereby at the end of the program, depending on the state of the fund, there is some forgiveness in the amount of subsidy received by virtue of the contract. But precisely, the commission is attempting to run the fund as actuarially sound as they can and other than the interest rate on the fund, which is a subsidy, clearly a subsidy, a direct assistance to producers and the 2 percent premium the province puts in, the remaining portion is a loan to producers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.
The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Hog Stabilization Program is not listed here. Is it part and separate from this. I know that it's not listed here and I may be out of order by asking the question. How is it calculated? Is it figured the same way as a repayable loan to the province? Where does it show as a loan to the Hog Stabilization Fund? It's not here, where is it?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it is not shown because I believe there is adequate capital authority to the Hog Stabilization Plan that has been presented. I want to advise the honourable member that I checked today and I believe at the end of June, hog stabilization in terms of the payout - I believe the month of June, in fact, being that the price is so close to the support level - that the producer premiums will in fact be more than covering any payouts made to producers so that there will be no further drain on the fund.

But I believe, and I'll make a phone call before we are through to check, but I believe there's adequate capital authority has a loan to the fund, with the same provisions vis-a-vis the interest rates apply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ascertain with the Minister of Energy and Mines with respect to

the very significant item on the authority request before us, the \$1 billion dollars, that this \$1 billion dollars that is now being loaned by the government to proceed with the Limestone Project that it, of course, is money that is forwarded to Hydro and money that will not be reflected in Hydro rates until Limestone is on service.

I think it's important to remind Manitobans of that fact, that it is the case and, when the opposition is concerned about future rate shocks that Manitoba Hydro users or indeed the taxpayer generally may have to live with, that that is in fact the point. These monies are borrowed at this time by the government to facilitate Hydro's construction program. I don't know particularly how they call that account, but it is a construction account. It is not put into the system. The cost of the project is not reflected in the system's rates until the entire project is, in effect, built and put into service.

So I make that comment, that that in fact is what is happening to this \$1 billion dollars. The system at that time in 1991 or 1992 will then begin to reflect the very heavy borrowing requirements for this project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

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

That, of course, is the way it has historically been done. The costs of construction, together with the interest costs during construction, have been all rolled in once the operation is in place.

It is true that at that stage there will be a larger amount of payments. There will also, of course, be a larger amount of revenue, which is the other side of that. Of course, you can do it in many different ways. One of the things we have done is we have increased the rates payable now to meet the costs that we have now which was something that wasn't happening for a period of time.

So I just want to make it clear - I think the member is perfectly aware of it - but the billion dollars is not going to be spent in the fiscal year. It's for commitments for contracts that we would be entering into as, for example, the general civil contract, which it reaches now at \$436 million, that is in 1985 dollars, and that that's escalated up with inflation. Some of that could be paid in this fiscal year, but at least we have the authority to enter into the agreements for that and many of the other items that we are working on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Industry and Technology, could he inform the House as to whether any of the \$10 million shown for the Manitoba Development Corporation is destined for Flyer Industries?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's not destined specifically for Flyer Industries, but is really putting in place further capital for the Manitoba Development Corporation as their capital is just about exhausted. So it's not specifically for Flyer but may well be used at some point for Flyer Industries.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister update the House on the whole question of Flyer and the possible sale of that business?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There really isn't anything further to update from what I previously reported to the Economic Committee of the House. Discussions are continuing with a small number of potential properties who are interested in Flyer. Those discussions at this point are not near any consummation of an agreement.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise when this albatross on the backs of Manitoba taxpayers will be removed?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I have responded previously that we are working to bring about an end to the cost to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba because of the ongoing and long-term, or past problems, and continuing problems of Flyer Industries, and we are working towards a resolution as quickly as possible.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give any undertakings to the House and to the people of Manitoba as to the time involved in disposing of Flyer? Will it be done by the end of 1985?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I would expect that whatever arrangements are to be concluded will be concluded before the end of this year.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has the Minister or his department retained outside counsel or any persons to negotiate the sale or disposition of Flyer?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: We have not assigned a specific company like the members opposite did when they were in government at a cost of \$1 million to attempt to diversify the Crown corporations. We are utilizing the general manager of the Manitoba Development Corporation; along with staff from the Department of Crown Investments; and the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, the Industry Branch, business or economic consultants. In addition, we have used outside legal and one outside business consultant.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the warranties by Flyer, can the Manitoba taxpayers expect to receive anything in exchange for the disposition of Flyer?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I don't know what the member refers to when he says, does the taxpayer expect to receive anything from Flyer. Flyer does, notwithstanding its significant losses, provide some economic benefit to the Province of Manitoba and to the citizens of the province.

I would intend to ensure that whatever ultimate agreement is made or is reached with respect to Flyer in the long term that there will be a benefit to the people of the Province of Manitoba besides the obvious benefit of stopping the severe losses that have occurred to date with that corporation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what position does the government take with respect to the warranties on

the buses that it has sold to other cities and, in particular, the City of Winnipeg?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Well, in terms of the past warranties, the corporation is living up to the conditions of the warranties. In terms of any warranties that are undertaken as a result of work that has been undertaken in the last couple of years that will extend beyond the date when the government would relinquish or may relinquish its role as the majority shareholder of Flyer, that would be subject to discussions or negotiations with the party who may be in the position of taking over the majority or sole shareholder of Flyer Industries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Public Accounts as of March 31, 1984 showed that the Manitoba Development Corporation had \$67,957,303 of outstanding borrowing authority. We are now being asked to provide an additional \$10 million. Can the Minister advise what the current outstanding borrowing authority is for the Manitoba Development Corporation?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I will just look to see if I have that information. I believe it was available during the committee review of the Manitoba Development Corporation but, in terms of authority that's not exercised, I believe it's only a matter of a small amount of about \$2 million. The rest of it is either charged against actual borrowing or, in some cases, guarantees of loans with respect to Flyer Industries and other parts of the portfolio.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, at the end of March, 1984, there was \$50 million that was encumbered out of that \$67 million with respect to Flyer Industries for performance bond and bank line-of-credit guarantees. Does the Minister know then what that figure has grown to in the last year? The Minister is indicating he doesn't know.

I missed his earlier answer to the present \$10 million, whether or not that would be basically to further cover the losses of Flyer Industries, or whether there are some other specific purposes for which MDC needs this authority.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: In response to the first question, I regret that I do not have that information available at this moment. If the member would be agreeable, I will have that information sent to him subsequent to today. In terms of the new authority of \$10 million, I indicated that it wasn't specifically earmarked for Flyer Industries. Rather, it was to relinquish or to provide the Manitoba Development Corporation with some capital, because the remaining capital is just about exhausted, though it may well be used for Flyer Industries if the need arises in the next year.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister's desire to have some authority there, but could he give a little more indication of any other specific needs that there might be, because Manitoba Development Corporation has had outstanding borrowing authority again, as shown in the Public

Accounts for the year ending March, 1984. The most recent was 1976, indicating that the corporation has not functioned the way that it had originally been intended to function.

We are now asking for additional authority and I believe we need to have a little more information as to the specific use of this money; that we were not just voting money for MDC in case they might need it. If the Minister can tell me that 95 percent of this is expected to be for Flyer, then there's not much other money. He's indicating he can't tell me that, but does he know whether there are any other specific reasons why MDC would need this money? Are there any other projects that they might be involved in for which they would need loan authority?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There may well be others, but there aren't any specifically at this point in time. There may be others with respect to other parts of the Development Corporation's portfolio, but there are none.

It is more than reasonably possible that most of it may well be used for Flyer Industries, but I cannot say at this point, because of outstanding issues related to Flyer Industries such as warranty claims and other such matters, how much of that money will be used. But there is no question that I would expect some portion of it will be used to provide further capital for Flyer.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, since this Minister has generally been forthright with us in the House and in committee in terms of providing information, I am prepared to let the item go on the assumption that the Minister will provide some information later. But I do think that it's important to the House that they know what it is that we're granting authority for.

I would like to have the Minister responsible for Manfor tell us once again what the \$36.3 million is required for with respect to Manfor. He didn't quite have time to finish the answer yesterday or the day before when we considered this and I, at least, couldn't quite understand the entire need for the \$36.3 million. So I wonder if the Minister responsible for Manfor could tell us again what that requirement is for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The \$36.3 million requested through Capital Supply is actually made up of the requests for two years. It is normal practice in this House over the last few years to approve Capital Supply in June or whatever and that, in terms of Manfor years, covers from September 30, 1984 till the current fiscal year ends on September 30, 1985.

For that period of time the capital authority request is for \$16.3 million. I have indicated that some of that obviously is required for the conclusion of the upgrading, and that the breakdown would approximately be 10 and six, the six being - that's sort of a rough breakdown - required for operating capital — (Interjection) — pardon me? It would be upgrading the retrofit final inclusion. Again, that's only an arbitrary breakdown.

The capital requirements of Manfor are obviously, the internally generated requirements, I presume, are substantially above that.

The additional \$20 million is the capital that is estimated to be required for the fiscal year, 1985-86, the fiscal year for Manfor beginning October 1st of 1985. Manfor had requested that this be approved in advance because of the lateness of the Capital Supply approvals over the last few years.

MR. B. RANSOM: Where is the money to cover the \$9 million loss for fiscal '83-84 for Manfor? And is it the expectation that the \$20 million that is being asked for, for '85-86 is to cover the anticipated \$18 million loss or is there additional requirement for that?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a financial expert, but the \$16.3 million obviously is part of the capital requirements of Manfor broken down into both operating capital and ongoing capital requirements, the construction, etc. So I don't think it's simple to say that you can pull out a figure and say this is the part that would go to sustain the deficit. But, obviously, it is anticipated that next year, it's estimated that we will require some \$10 million for the capital and \$10 million for operating and that was included simply as a way to ensure that Manfor has that authority for the fiscal year '85-86.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, does any of this money go to cover the loss of Manfor? Now that the government has eliminated the debt of Manfor and that equity is provided by the government, does any of this money go for that purpose?

HON. J. STORIE: As I have indicated, I'm not sure how it is broken down. I would assume that given that there is provision for operating capital, that some of it would obviously go towards the loss provision.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, surely it's not satisfactory when we're faced with a \$36,300,000 item of borrowing that the answer we get from the Minister says he presumes that something is the case and that obviously money would be used in a certain way, when he can't tell us that. I would say to the Government House Leader, why is it that when we are here to consider Capital Supply to give the authority to borrow 1.3 billion of money, why is it that we can't get some answers as to what this money is for? It's not the first time that I've raised these questions.

Each year as the Capital Supply Bill comes before us, I have asked the government if they would just simply give us the breakdown of what this money is intended for. Surely, that's not too much to ask when we're approving authority for \$1.3 billion.

We don't have the Minister of Finance here to answer any of the questions, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister of Energy is here, he might be able to answer one question that I have with respect to the \$1 billion for Hydro. Has the government made any further progress in deciding how they're going to be financing the construction of Limestone, whether there are any different methods of financing? They had talked about project financing and the Minister of Finance had said

they had a number of different proposals on the table. Can he update us on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: There have been a pretty large number of proposals submitted to the Department of Finance by financial institutions around the world and very detailed. I think there's been a first review of them and I will expect there will be further discussions with them in the next few months and then with the government.

A MEMBER: Is your light on?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, it is. Can't you hear me? Do you want me to speak louder?

A MEMBER: Now it is.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Okay, I saw my light on. Usually I speak too loud and now I am being subdued.

Just to again say what I said earlier, the Department of Finance has received a number of proposals and options from a fairly large number of financial institutions from around the world, a large number of Canadian ones, ones in the United States, and some in Europe and some in Asia.

I think the first rush has been completed because these groups were coming into Winnipeg to provide detailed proposals in person to the technical people who are looking at this. The lists of options have been somewhat narrowed. They're going to be looked at again and I would expect that it will not be till sometime in the autumn that further decisions are taken and the options do range from project financing of a portion of the development, to options within that to regular financing, using the Government of Manitoba guarantee.

It's a question of looking at what the options are, what the benefits are and looking at what the price is. Some people have indicated that there may be a price attached to this; some people have indicated that there may not be and one has to do that type of detailed analysis. But the technical people thought it would be worthwhile to receive all the proposals, go through them, then narrow them down and take another cut at them.

My understanding is that there is no rush with respect to affirming the financing. That can be done at any time, especially if one is monitoring interest rates in trying to determine when might be the best time to make longer-term commitments because there is some thought that the interest rates will still be going down, probably over the course of the next year-and-a-half.

MR. B. RANSOM: When would the first of this \$1 billion of authority actually be exercised? Has the Minister any idea?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The commitments will be made with respect to the civil contract. They'll be made with respect to the turbines and generators and further tenders as they proceed. So the authorities required for those types of commitments, I think it is possible to make the commitments knowing that this is on the Order Paper but I think that's the flow that will take place.

One has to have sufficient authority to undertake those commitments. The final contract may or may not be signed - I'm not sure as to exactly the signing circumstances of it - but we do know that this is sufficient authority to undertake the contractual commitments that are flowing from the tendering process and the number of tenders that are being called for over the course of the next year. Over the course of the eight years, there are some 58 tender calls, most of them are small, but there are a number of substantially sized ones.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is it possible that under this billion dollars of authority that the government could be borrowing money for the initial stages of the development, say on a five-year term, that they will actually be paying off those initial loans before any of the interest becomes charged directly into the rate base, and that will they use this as essentially interim financing, and then when the whole cost of the project is known or even completed, do they expect then to be going for a sum that would cover the entire cost?

HON. W. PARASIUK: This authority can indeed be used for both purposes; that is, you might be doing some bridging. But if we had a substantial decline in long-term interest rates and people were determining, let's say a year-and-a-half from now or two years from now, that those interest rates had bottomed out, and when one makes those types of decisions with respect to long-term financing one has to make judgments with respect to them.

It may turn out that the judgment would be to in fact go with longer-term financing, that is, beyond five years. This allows that option. You can either do it the short term or the long term and the people who I have talked to in the financial community, in the various financial institutions, indicate that their general consensus is that there still will be a slow decline of interest rates over the course of the next year-and-a-half, possibly two years, and that is why one has to determine whether in fact it is wise to borrow short term and then try and freeze a portion of it. You may not freeze it all, because we'd have a fairly good idea as we let these contracts where those costs are coming in at, I would think within, say, 10 or 15 percent. We should know that within about the next year I think, because I indicated in earlier comments on the basis of tenders that had been received to date the Hydro people are revising downwards their estimates from 2.52 to 2.1 billion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion of the Capital Supply Motion?

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,322,871,000 - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have another question or two I wanted to ask in this regard.

The Minister of Agriculture is the individual who I wanted to ask them to, and he said he would be back in a couple of minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Swan River said he had a question to ask another member, so I'll give the floor up to him and then when the Minister comes back, I'll ask him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

I have been receiving a number of concerns from constituents the last few months regarding the Limestone work project with respect to the Burntwood-Nelson collective agreement. I wonder if you have maps available that identify those areas that are within the agreement. At the time of the Estimates, I received a map that I thought was part of that, but I can't figure it out. There seems to be a line across the 53rd parallel which would indicate that that's as far down as it comes, but there is another line which takes other communities below the 53rd. I wonder if you could supply us with a clear-cut map showing those areas that are within the preferential area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't have that map with me, but I do undertake to get it to the member. I can have it delivered to his caucus office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had another question that I had written down that I didn't have, but it had come to me, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated in his answer earlier, dealing with the Beef Stabilization Program, that it was in fact a repayable program, that under certain circumstances after eight years, if I understood him, there could be some write-off of debt. What kind of circumstances does the Minister have for guidelines? As well, just for participating for eight years, would that qualify them for a total write-off of any responsibilities?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. Those terms, in percentage terms, are part of the contract. I can't provide the details for my honourable friend at the present moment, but I'm sure if he calls the Beef Commission, the standard contract has the percentage terms in terms of how long a participant remains in a program, dictates the amount of forgiveness on support, that there might be a portion of the support, so there is as part of the standard program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister earlier said that it is the intention of the commission to actuarially be viable and to collect the money back. Then does the Minister foresee that the repayment portion or the loan would be repaid through increased premiums over the next four years of the program to make it so that at the end of that period there wasn't any money owed to the province? Is that what he is indicating?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we would hope that the marketplace will take care of the fund and balance it off as best what can, but certainly the last several years, in terms of market prices, that has not occurred.

The commission has a general ceiling in which it operates under by virtue of the contract and support

for producer, and it has to make its premium changes in accordance with the program. But while there is some flexibility there, I believe that the province would not want to should - I'm giving the member the worst case scenario. Let's say the marketplace does not rebound and the situation continues as it is. The province will have to assess its position in terms of how it deals with the producers, but in terms of the long term. The commission, of course, is attempting to run the program on an actuarially sound basis and that is not to say that once projections two years ago that one made are in fact not as accurate today, because one couldn't predict what the marketplace will do.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I just want it clear though. It is the policy of the government that that fund is to be paid back by the producers; that's the point I'm making. As I understood the answer so far, that's the way the Minister is treating it.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated to the honourable member, the program is to be run actuarially sound as best as one can. Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated to the honourable member before, it is not our intention to load an additional burden onto producers, given negative circumstances in the marketplace. But we intend to run the fund as actuarially sound as one can, based on the predictions and the projections that one makes as time goes on.

So, yes, it is our intention to make sure that the program is run actuarially, so that right now the program is in a net payout position because the marketplace is not working very clearly. Support is being paid to producers of animals.

But to say that every penny will have to be paid back will be very difficult in terms of what will - one doesn't know what the marketplace will be in the next three or four years. That's why I can't predetermine what actually will happen. If the marketplace will be down for the life of the contract, surely then the government will have to review its position vis-a-vis the program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the Minister then, on an actuarial basis, it is the Minister's intention over the next four years to collect the funds back that are now owed to the province from the producers that are participating. Is that correct?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, one certainly can make that assumption provided that the marketplace does turn around and there is in fact a period of prices to producers over and above the support price; one can make that assumption. Should the marketplace not turn around, Mr. Chairman, that may be another question.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the question was raised earlier and brought to the attention of the Minister, that with the federal program now being put in place or enabling legislation put in place, I ask the Minister if it would be his intention on joining that program, would it be that there would be a forgiveness of the provincial payback if in fact the Federal Government were to be joined and the producers were to join the federal program, as in fact took place several

years ago on the joining of a federal program on beef stabilization?

What would be his intention? Would it be to call the funds over a period of time or consider the mode? What is his position on that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I had indicated earlier - and I don't think I have changed my position on that - that it would be our intent that there by some phase-in period, but that the fund over a period of time be repaid. However, the main question will be as to when, the type of phase-in period, and the negotiations that go on. Those certainly would be factors which would impact on the government decision as to what is actually negotiated in the program. One continually on these kinds of questions has to speculate, because one cannot give any definitive answers because, as the member is aware, stabilization discussions have been on the table for over a decade. On that question, one doesn't know where it will lead to, and in fact whether or not there will be tripartite stabilization in view of the latest federal changes in the legislation because, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, there are provinces who have already loaded their guns and started firing at the Federal Minister long before even giving him a chance to explain to his fellow colleagues on this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I just want to pursue this a little further. How does the Minister perceive - well, maybe I should first ask, has the Minister had a chance to look at what is involved in Bill C-25, the tripartite stabilization proposal that is coming down? Does the Minister know what's in there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have asked for the details. We don't have the actual written details. I have only seen in the bill what I have read in the papers and commentary from our staff. Some of our staff did attend at the committee hearings of the legislation.

However, we have not seen the actual wording and what it means. What I've read in the paper, Mr. Chairman, I have made some comments on that, but no more than that. We haven't received those notes yet from the Federal Government.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: With the limited information that the Minister has, he has some idea of the background information that is there. Does he foresee both the hog and the beef, the red meats, all coming under that program? Is he supportive of the proposal that has come forward under Bill C-25 with the limited information that he has?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we did have a tripartite hog program negotiated in July of '84. I've said this before and I say it again. It was the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario that basically scuttled that agreement in July of 1984 at the meeting here in Winnipeg where we tried and I, as chairperson, tried to convince my four colleagues who signed the general agreement on

tripartite stabilization to go with the hog program. They said it was all or nothing. As a result, the hog agreement fell apart.

I'm not sure what will occur at this point in time. I think there will have to be a lot of negotiating to go on, but I want to tell the honourable member that the changes that I've read about giving the Federal Minister the authority to make the judgment as to whether an issue or a provincial program is top loading or not is very dangerous, Mr. Chairman, a very dangerous practice indeed. In fact, it throws into question the whole federal position vis-a-vis the American situation, the present situation on hogs across the border.

The Federal Minister is quoted as saying that provincial producers, producers in this country should pay for all their programming so they could have access to the American market, and there should be no additional programs so stabilization is not a factor to international trade.

Given those previous statements, one has a difficult time of reconciling the amendments that he has put forward, giving him the authority to make the judgment. I think, Mr. Chairman, you would have had war in this country from Provincial Governments had it been Eugene Whelan or a Minister of another political stripe on that kind of an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can just see Provincial Tory Agricultural Ministers gnashing their teeth, especially the western ones, on this very issue, being exceptionally concerned, totally annoyed, and being betrayed by the move that John Wise made. But it will certainly be an interesting conference in the next two weeks and that's why I refrain from basically doing what the Minister from Saskatchewan has done; he fired away with both barrels on this issue I can tell you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, okay, I will leave that for the time being now.

But I would like to just raise a few questions under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. We have \$20 million that is set out here under the appropriation here.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate, of that \$20 million - that's the program that he announced some time ago - how much of that money has flowed already at this time.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly how much money actually has flowed, but I can tell the honourable member that there is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 applications that have been approved in that vicinity, and another 100 or so in process.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The criteria that he outlined initially when he announced the program that seemed like a godsend of a program - it has helped a lot of guys - but the criteria was very limited at that time.

I wonder if the Minister would just maybe reiterate who qualifies. I appreciate the fact that 40 applications have been approved, because for a while it looked like there would be hardly anybody that could even qualify under that because the guidelines were so restrictive. I wonder if he could clarify that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact details before me. In fact, the corporation could provide

those details if the honourable member calls the corporation.

But I want to tell the honourable member that this program, the \$20 million, is in addition to I believe \$50 million that has been approved for the regular lending program. We expect to do somewhere in that range of business.

We have expanded our field staff by, I believe, five assistants but it still isn't enough. The clientele, generally, who qualify under this program are those in the severest financial shape who do have management ability and a possibility, by using these funds, of restructuring and saving their farm unit. So the analysis and the time spent on this program is far more than under the regular lending program.

We did attempt, Mr. Chairman, to utilize the staff of the Farm Credit Corporation in assisting us with some of the paperwork because their workload has just gone almost zilch, Mr. Chairman. I think last year the Farm Credit in Manitoba did something in the neighbourhood of \$50 million or more of business, and this year they are less than \$20 million.

The Federal Government did not approve our attempts to use FCC staff to at least assist in appraisal work and that kind of work. But we have additional difficulties in terms of the number of applications coming in at the central level which we are attempting to rectify administrative procedures - we have simplified a lot of them - but because of the number of applications, we still have some bottlenecks at head office; and while the field staff workload has been somewhat relieved by our shifting of staff and additions of field staff, we still do have difficulties at head office just from the sheer paper load that is coming in by the number of applications.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few more questions. I think this is the biggest criticism that I have heard all the time is the time it takes from the time that an individual goes and makes the first approach to MACC until the final approval, if there is approval, comes forward. It seems a very very long time and in many cases people give up in the interim or lose an opportunity in terms if they are purchasing it, stuff like this.

Can the Minister indicate - he says five additional staff have been put on - has he been able to get that time element cut down from what it was? Because I think we were looking at 3, 4, 5, in some cases 6 months. Could the Minister indicate how long it takes now to get a loan processed?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the procedures internally at the field level, it is not taking that long, but it really depends on the type of information that is missing when the analysis is done centrally, and it really depends on how complete the application forms are.

Should everything be in order, that there are no questions having to be raised from head office to the field level, the normal procedure would take in the neighbourhood of 45 to 50 days because you do have a lot of legal documents that have to be signed and there has been some reduction in time.

But I want to tell my honourable friend, that will be a continuing problem with MACC because basically it

appears, in terms of lending, we are the game in town; we are the institution that farmers are using. If you look at what FCC has done, and basically their business has gone zippo, Mr. Chairman, the programs that we've put in have been very responsive. Farmers are attempting to take advantage of them, and the more farmers are taking advantage of them there is no doubt that the workload increases and the time frame in terms of approval, the turnaround time, will continue to be a difficulty.

I don't even want to be apologetic that it will take time because it will, knowing the amount of business that we have been doing in the last number of years where we have moved with the same amount of staff, so I don't even want to get up here and say, yes, we have a problem. We have had a problem; we will continue to have a problem; we will do the best we can in terms of dealing with it because we are the game in town, Mr. Chairman, unlike the Federal Farm Credit Corporation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I don't want the Minister to necessarily get up and take a bow and say that his MACC is the game in town. You have been promoting that idea but if the Minister says he doesn't want to be apologetic for the amount of time it takes, I think he should be apologetic because it's a bureaucratic nightmare and jungle out there.

If you go to the bank, banks borrow money as well, and within 10 days you can have most of your problems straightened out. But, because it is government, an inefficient bureaucracy that's running it, that is why we take so much time. So let the Minister not try and take credit for helping the farm community all the way out the line, because you have many applications, Mr. Minister, that give up because of your bureaucratic bungling there.

So I would just suggest to the Minister, don't hang your hat and say it won't get better because, if we change governments, I can say it will get better.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, here we have the prime example of a member of the opposition whose government was in place three years ago. The procedures that we have had in place all these years are just as much theirs as ours.

Mr. Chairman, we are the only game in town, whether the member likes it or not. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot more applications for loans to MACC than there ever have been. Mr. Chairman, the last year in office, they did \$30 million of business; we're into \$80 million a year. Mr. Chairman, one has to have that difficulty.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now that we've got the Minister of Agriculture straightened out, perhaps the Minister of Natural Resources can tell me what he intends to do with the \$1 million that the Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd. is asking for authority under this act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Member for Lakeside has a very keen interest in that part of the world and, therefore, I don't mind telling him that it's for the enhancement and the viability of a major venture in that area, namely, the hotel at Hecla Island.

The intent is to provide additional financial flexibility with respect to that corporation. The member is probably aware the equity in that company is only about .5 million so, in essence, they really have not been provided with a fair amount of start-up capital from Day One, and have used current account credit, if you like, overdraft credit, for all these years and continue to do so. They are always in an overdraft position, or have been for some period of time. They have also had a couple of slow years. The last two years have not been profitable, which have added to their current account situation.

The Member for Emerson mentions about the moose hunt. Part of the reason for putting the moose hunt into the operations of that lodge is this very problem, and that is to get more clientele on a regular basis, clientele that are going to spend the dollars there to make the facility more viable.

So, in essence, the \$1 million is really for a potential refinancing, if you like, by way of buying more equity in the corporation. As the member may be aware, they are permitted to have \$1.5 million in shares, of which they have only exercised 556,000.00. So they are still in a position to issue another 944,000 shares at \$1 each. That's essentially what it is for. A final decision has not been made as to how that financial restructuring will shape up, but will be decided in the next number of months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs regarding the \$1.7 million, I believe it is, for the CEDF; as I understand it, that is a revolving fund. Is it because there are more loans being approved at this time, or is it because we've had a run on bad debts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: As the Member for Swan River indicated, it is a revolving loan to the extent of \$6 million. The need for more funds is because the size of the loans has been increasing and so have the number. They are anticipating that many more loans will be coming up because of the initiative being taken surrounding the Limestone development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion of the Capital Supply Motion?

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,322,871,000 for Capital Supply for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

I believe that completes the Estimates. Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, reports same, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Would you please call the Report Stage on Bill No. 16?

REPORT STAGE

**BILL 16 - THE HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT;
LOI SUR LE PATRIMOINE**

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the report of the committee on Bill No. 16 be concurred in?
The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour

THAT section 4 of Bill 16 be amended by striking out clause (a) thereof, and substituting therefor the following clause:

- a) shall publish a copy of the Notice of Intent in 2 issues of a newspaper, or in 1 issue of each of 2 newspapers, circulating in the area of the site; and.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour

THAT subsection 7(1) of Bill 16 be amended by striking out Clause (b) thereof and substituting therefor the following clause:

- b) publish a notice of the hearing in 2 issues of a newspaper, or 1 issue of each of 2 newspapers, circulating in the area of the site.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources

THAT subsection (26)(2) of Bill 16 be amended by striking out Clause (b) thereof and substituting therefor the following clause:

- b) shall publish a copy of the Municipal Notice of Intent in 2 issues of a newspaper, or 1 issue of each of two newspapers, circulating in the area of the municipal site; and.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Minister of the Environment

THAT subsection 28(1) of Bill 16 be amended by striking out Clause (b) thereof and substituting therefor the following clause:

- b) publish a copy of the notice in 2 issues of a newspaper, or 1 issue of each of 2 newspapers, circulating in the area of the affected municipal site.

MOTION presented and carried.

QUESTION put on concurrence of Bill 16, as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Would you please call Report Stage on Bill No. 5, The Freedom of Information Act; and Bill No. 74, The Equal Rights Charter Amendment Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 5 be concurred in?

BILL NO. 5 - THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT; LOI SUR LA LIBERTÉ D'ACCÈS À L'INFORMATION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance

THAT Bill 5, The Freedom of Information Act be amended

- a) by adding thereto, immediately after subsection 2(1) thereof, the following subsection:

Exercise of access right.

- (2)(1.1) the head of the department which gives access to a record under this act shall decide whether access is given in accordance with Clause (1)(a) or Clause (1)(b), but where the condition of the record so permits, the head shall give the applicant an opportunity both to examine the record and to obtain a copy of it;

- b) by adding thereto, at the end of clause 2(2)(c) thereof, the words "or provides the applicant with a copy of it"; and

- c) by adding thereto, immediately after the word "may" in the last line of section 14 thereof, the words "in person or through counsel".

MOTION presented and carried.

QUESTION put on concurrence of Bill 5, as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 74 be concurred in?

**BILL 74 - THE EQUAL RIGHTS
STATUTE AMENDMENT ACT; LOI
MODIFIANT LE DROIT STATUTAIRE
AFIN DE FAVORISER L'ÉGALITÉ
DES DROITS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance

THAT Bill 74, The Equal Rights Statute Amendment Act, be amended

- a) by striking out the figure "6" both times it appears in the 2nd line of the proposed subsection 34.3(2) of The Employment Standards Act in subsection 16(1) thereof and in each case substituting therefor the figures "11"; and
- b) by striking out subsection 16(2) thereof and re-numbering subsection 16(3) as 16(2).

I just want to note, Mr. Speaker, I'm indebted to the Member for St. Norbert for both of those amendments.

MOTION presented.

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

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

I thank the Attorney-General for bringing forward the amendments which we discussed in committee last night.

Firstly, with respect to section 16(2), what that does is eliminate the amendment that was proposed to The Employment Standards Act which would have eliminated the reference to a weekly day of rest being "wherever possible on a Sunday". I expressed concerns about that as I think most Manitobans would, Mr. Speaker. I believe the amendment is appropriate; I believe that if Sunday as a weekly day of rest is to be attacked under the Charter of Rights, then indeed this province should opt out of any decision that might be made in that manner by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect, however, to the first part of the amendment, Paragraph (a), I raised in committee last evening the concern that I had raised on second reading. The original bill proposed to bring in adoption leave; adoption leave would have been six weeks. What this amendment would do is increase adoption leave to 11 weeks. I still have a concern, Mr. Speaker, the concern being that maternity leave is 17 weeks. The Charter of Rights says, and I don't think you need the Charter of Rights to come to this conclusion, but using it anyway, it says "every person is equal before the law". In my mind, Mr. Speaker, that means that the laws cannot discriminate against adopted children, and an adopted child must be treated in the same manner as a natural born child.

Now, Mr. Speaker, apart from that argument, common sense dictates that the bonding of an adopted child with a mother is just as important, and indeed, may even be more important than bonding of a child with a natural mother. For that reason, that is why I believe that the maternity leave provision has been included in the bill, and it is a good provision, Mr. Speaker.

I say it may be more important for adopted children - and here I am obviously mainly referring to infants - is that there may be a short period of time where the child is in the hospital without a mother while the child is being placed. So it is very important that bonding take place as quickly as possible and I see no reason why it should not be the same length of time as maternity leave. I think it must be the same length of time. We all recognize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this is unpaid leave, so it may very well be that not everyone will be able to take the opportunity of this type of leave. I believe with respect to maternity leave, unemployment insurance benefits are however, available. I'm not positive and haven't had an opportunity to investigate whether that is available for adoption leave. I would argue if it is available for maternity leave, it should also be available for adoption leave.

So, Mr. Speaker, my argument obviously is that instead of 11 weeks as this proposed amendment would provide, that it be 17 weeks to be equal to maternity leave. Mr. Speaker, I still think there's a problem and it is a real problem in the provisions because the legislation as it stands requires four weeks notice to be given to an employer and as anyone who is familiar with adoption knows it's quite often that adoptive parents only receive 48 hours notice of adoption, so there's a real problem with having the requirement of four weeks' notice and I believe that should be shortened. It's a difficult question to deal with in an employment situation and hopefully that could be dealt with reasonably between the employer and employee. I think in this type of situation, you almost have to rely on good judgment and common sense of an employer.

But because of my concern, Mr. Chairman, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park,

THAT the proposed amendment be amended by striking out the figure 11 in the 4th line of paragraph (a) and substituting the figure "17".

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have his amendment in writing?

It is moved by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that the proposed amendment be amended by striking out the figure "11" in the fourth line of paragraph (a) and substituting the figure "17".

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. The seconder to that motion was the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MR. SPEAKER: With that amendment to show the seconder as being the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I rise to say that I'm ready to concur on that amendment. I just wanted to explain the reason for the differentiation which is still valid, but I think there are some feelings on the issue and I am prepared to accept it. I want to

recall that in law they say, equity doesn't mean equality; one has to have an exact set of circumstances.

With respect to maternity leave, one should recall that under The Employment Standards Act, the 17 weeks are broken up so that a certain number of those weeks can be taking place before birth because it relates to the physical problems that an expectant mother has in those last few weeks; indeed, may enter labour at any time even if it's normal term anytime within two or three weeks before the expected date, so that's why maternity leave relates to the physical condition of an expectant mother and provides that six weeks may be taken before birth and 11 weeks after; the 11 weeks are the part which is partly recuperative time and partly the bonding time.

It is with that in mind we tried really in various ways - and I must say a lot of it is speculative in the absence of empirical evidence - we tried to balance them.

It was by no means, let the record be clear, with any intention to discriminate against adopted children or adopting parents, indeed, the measures are brought in to remove discrimination. But having said that, we're prepared to go along with the amendment and we'll be taking a look between now and the next Session at maternity leave and there's some argument, indeed, that's been carried forward in the federal legislation for moving maternity leave up to 24 weeks, but we'll be looking at that between now and the next Session.

QUESTION put on the subamendment, MOTION carried.

QUESTION put on the amendment, as amended, MOTION carried.

QUESTION put on Motion for Concurrence, as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the following bills: Bill No. 65, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1985); and Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bills 65 and 71 with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

BILL 65 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT (1985); LOI DE 1985 MODIFIANT LA LEGISLATION RELATIVE À LA FISCALITE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering Bill No. 65. Extra copies are available. What is the will of the committee, bill-by-bill? Bill-by-bill.

Bill No. 65—pass; Title—pass; Preamble—pass; Bill be Reported.

BILL 71 - THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT; LA LOI SUR L'ADMINISTRATION FINANCIÈRE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act, bill-by-bill? (Agreed)
Title—pass; Preamble—pass; Bill be reported.
Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted and has passed Bills 65 and 71, and reports same without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30 p.m. in Private Members' Hour, the first item in Private Members' Hour for this day is the Second Readings of Public Bills.

SECOND READING

BILL 97 - AN ACT CONFIRMING LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF INVALID STATUTES; LOI CONFIRMANT LES CONSÉQUENCES JURIDIQUES DE LOIS INVALIDES

MR. R. DOERN presented, by leave, Bill No. 97, An Act Confirming the Legal Consequences of Invalid Statutes, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

The Supreme Court of Canada a few weeks ago ruled that the laws of Manitoba from 1890 to 1980, and some thereafter, were invalid because of the fact that they were not translated into the French language, but the court also ruled at that time that the rule of law was more important and that the court could not and would not tolerate a state of affairs in which there was legal chaos. Of course, most members of the Chamber and members of the public realize that the court itself would never declare legal chaos in the province. What they did, in effect, was to say that our laws were invalid because of the translation requirement of 1870, but that they were temporarily valid.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose, in short, the main feature of the bill that I am proposing and recommending to the Chamber is the fact that our laws are invalid in the judgment of the court, but that we can make permanent the effects of those laws and, in particular, the laws

that were passed between 1890 and 1980. What the effect of this would be, Mr. Speaker, is that the Legislature of Manitoba would guarantee the effects and the ramifications and the consequences of this long period of time in Manitoba history, and we would avoid the useless and costly task of translating old and obsolete statutes. Mr. Speaker, it is clearly the function and the responsibility of the Legislature of Manitoba to make laws, to legislate; on the other hand, of course, it is the function of the courts to interpret.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has made a ruling in principle and now there are practical consequences and ramifications of that. The purpose of this bill is to try to modify or moderate or ameliorate the harshness of the Supreme Court judgment.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of debate about the costs of what the Supreme Court ruling would be. Only a couple of years ago, we were led to believe that to do the complete translation of Manitoba statutes would cost about \$1.5 million more than doing the basic 400 laws in the tartan-bound copies that we are all so familiar with. But now the figures have escalated sharply. Whether this is accurate or political or whether the government is trying to put the darkest possible light on matters, we don't know; but it has been said before and will be said again, but I say in general that whatever the total and final bill will be as a consequence of the Supreme Court judgment, it is only a fraction of what it would have cost if we had gone for the government's proposals. Because we know, in addition, there would have been millions of dollars a year spent on Civil Service positions; we know that there would have been millions of dollars a year spent on printing and publishing; we know that there would have been, of course, millions spent on translation even under their proposal.

So now, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the ludicrous task of going over all kinds of statutes that nobody has looked at for many a year. They are on display in the Legislative Library and on display in the rare lawyer's office but, essentially, you have all sorts of books, and I have a few of them here, one from 1891 with legislation passed in April of '91, An Act respecting County Courts, a Municipal Act, Assessment Act, Diseases of Animals Act, Mutual Hail Insurance Company, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay, Winnipeg Waterworks, etc.

Of course, what is happening is that by some modern miracle we are getting the old material translated; it's coming into this Chamber with the approval and the concurrence of both sides of the House, there is some mumbo jumbo taking place. There are incantations being offered over and above these laws. Lo and behold, once again, as if by magic, they become valid.

Of course, we are also confronted with the useless and needless task of going through this some 4,000 times including, Mr. Speaker, the consolidations that took place in, I believe, 1891, 1902, 1913, 1940, 1954, 1970, etc. When young lawyers graduate from law school and when young MLAs get elected to this Chamber, they are given or they buy, if they're lawyers, the complete tartan-bound statutes, and that will suffice for about 99 percent of the purpose that any of us would ever have.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible for a government to include in its Constitution or in its method of operation almost any other body of laws, almost any other developed

legal and political and social system that they wish to refer to. This could be the Magna Carta. It could be the BNA Act. It could be the laws of Great Britain.

I have here a standard history text that is used in university, McInnis Canada. At the back of it is the British North America Act. Of course, the well known first paragraph of that act simply says: "Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland with a Constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom . . ."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that volumes and volumes and volumes have been written on that basis, and that lives and laws and the country itself has lived on that basis. All that was done in this instance was a single sentence said, in effect, we will follow the traditions and the history and the legal system of Great Britain. They did not then take all those ancient laws, ship them over to Canada in crates, and plug them into the BNA Act. They simply said in a single sentence, when in doubt, consult the laws of Great Britain for ultimate reference.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying by way of this bill, what the Manitoba Legislature should do is to say that all our laws that were passed in English only from 1890 to 1980 should be recognized as the laws of the province, as everybody in this Chamber and as everybody outside of this Chamber does, in fact, recognize them to be.

Mr. Speaker, these laws, of course, were passed. There was an English-only statute passed in 1890. How many generations of Manitobans came into this province and lived under what the court is now suggesting was an invalid period of time? Mr. Speaker, by invalid, of course, we refer only to the translation of our statutes because, first and foremost of course, you had a democratically elected Legislature. Of course, on every single act that was passed, you had first reading in this Chamber; you had second reading; you had committee stages; you had public hearings and presentations; third readings; Royal Assent; proclamation. Then you had the law itself. It was on the basis of the law itself that the courts ruled, that business conducted its operations, that society lived.

Mr. Speaker, I say only in passing that my family came to this province in 1891. My family came from the Austrian Empire in the summer of 1891, my great-grandfather, my grandfather who was nine years old. Our family has been here five generations and lived their lives on the basis of the statutes of Manitoba which have been in effect since that time.

Mr. Speaker, it is the effect of those statutes, the fact that people live their lives on the basis of those statutes that I am referring to. For example, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking here about saying that the statutes are valid. We are saying that the effects of the statutes are valid. So all of us, rather than being in some incredible situation where people's marriages don't count; where their business transactions don't count; where their university degrees don't count; where their courts are somehow or other illegal or illegitimate; where the Legislature itself is somehow or other illegal or illegitimate, Mr. Speaker, nobody really believes that.

We've had 90 years - I'm talking again about the period from 1890 to 1980 - of legislation by

democratically elected Legislatures. That legislation, Mr. Speaker, was confirmed by, approved by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province. Every one of those bills was signed by Ottawa, ergo, every one of those bills was approved by Ottawa itself.

Mr. Speaker, I then direct a few remarks to the government itself, and say that the government, of course, has been very much embittered by the fact that their proposal, which I think was a very expensive proposal and certainly a divisive proposal that was completely rejected by the majority of Manitobans. There are those in the government who want the people of Manitoba to bear the costs of translation. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, this would be punishment for those who opposed the government's proposed legislation. They want the people of Manitoba to bear the costs of translation in the hope that the opposition will suffer some political static or some political loss as a result of that.

They also want to give their allies in the Franco-Manitoban Society another bargaining tool, another opportunity to come forward and make proposals and make suggestions about trading translation costs and translation requirements for services or jobs. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have learned that that, of course, is the name of the game.

Then you have two other positions in this debate. You have the Franco-Manitoban Society and some of their spokesmen who offered the following opinion, and I debated some gentleman - I can't think of his name right now, a professor - Mr. Hébert. His view was not one penny should come from Ottawa to help the people of Manitoba, because they have to pay. They have to be punished for these years of "injustice".

Somebody on the other side of the debate, Mr. Speaker, said to me, I want Manitoba to bear the full costs and the full brunt of translation, because I want every Manitoban to suffer from another point of view. I want them to suffer in paying for the costs of this wasteful and foolish bilingual policy. So you have the two extremes in the debate.

You have those who want to punish the majority of Manitobans for this so-called pain and suffering on the part of French-speaking Manitobans. Then you have people who have another position where they want people to suffer through taxation because of the fact that it might make them angrier than they are about the foolish and wasteful expenditures on bilingualism.

Mr. Speaker, the SFM and some of their supporters have immediately said they never wanted translations in the first place. Well, what has been going on here for the last five years? What was Mr. Forest talking about when he was pounding the table and dancing around in front of the cameras about his fight for having the parking ticket put aside? What was Bilodeau doing when he was dancing around in the courts through Manitoba, all at federal expense? What were these other people doing over all this period of time? Now we have the latest, Mr. Sabourin, saying let's have some compensation payments.

Everybody says now, we never really did want the laws translated. We didn't really want our rights restored. What we want are jobs and services and opportunity for people who are bilingual in a particular way. We really didn't want and didn't need the laws of 1870 to be reinstated.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the First Minister and to the government that they have to seriously consider this proposal. The First Minister said that he doesn't care at all about the costs of translation, regardless of translation, regardless of whether it costs tens of millions or not a single penny, he is going to bring in more services. I say, he's not concerned about translation, but I would like to ask him again as I did a couple of days ago, which services and how much money are you planning on spending in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that I hope that the government will speak on this bill. My concern is that they will get up and adjourn the debate. Of course, we know that if they do that, then the bill will die on the Order Paper. But if they do not speak, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, they will have to answer for their position in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, again I say to the members on the opposite side, by approving this legislation, it may be possible for us to save a couple of million dollars or as much as \$20 million. That should not be lightly dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, as an old philosopher or a writer once said: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world. The point, however, is to change it." Mr. Speaker, it is the function of this Chamber to make laws, to amend laws, and to repeal laws. In this particular instance, we have an opportunity to legislate, and we will see over a period of time whether the courts in Manitoba or the Supreme Court approves of this legislation. But everyone in this Chamber should give this bill serious consideration because of the fact that it will save the useless exercise of translating 4,000 musty and dusty statutes that are of little value to anyone other than for historic purposes.

I, therefore, commend this bill to this House.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak briefly to this bill, put some comments on the record. When the bill was distributed, I found it intriguing, but I wrote to Legislative Counsel for an opinion as to the effect of this bill in the light of the recent Supreme Court decision. I'll read the opinion I received from Legislative Counsel, Mr. Moylan, dated July 9, 1985, and then table it.

In this letter, Mr. Moylan, re Bill 97: "I refer to your letter of July 4th received yesterday, in which you request my opinion as to the effect of the above bill in light of the recent Supreme Court decision. It appears, from Page 49 of the Supreme Court's Reasons for Judgment that rights, obligations and other effects which have arisen under invalid acts of the Legislature and which are not saved by the de facto or other doctrines will continue to have force and effect for a limited but unspecified time until Manitoba complies with its constitutional duty under Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. It appears from Page 66 of the Reasons that Manitoba will have complied with its constitutional duty when it translates, re-enacts and publishes the acts under which the rights, obligations and other effects have arisen.

"Bill 97 conflicts with the views of the Supreme Court, particularly as elaborated on Page 66 of its reasons.

To that extent, it is my opinion that if Bill 97 were enacted and then subjected to a court challenge, it would be found by the Supreme Court of Canada and probably also at lower court levels, to be invalid.

"While it is theoretically possible for the Supreme Court of Canada to overturn its prior decision, I would not expect it to refrain from following its recent judgment above mentioned. Yours truly, Mr. Moylan."

Mr. Speaker, in the light of that opinion, it does appear, despite the probably worthwhile objective of the Member for Elmwood, that this legislation would be invalid and of no effect.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

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

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the proposal from the Member for Elmwood will be very short in that I will simply describe it as another sneaky way to try to undo the constitutional illegality with another constitutional illegality, and say no more about that.

But I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to put a few comments on the record in regard to the Supreme Court ruling of June 13, 1985, roughly a month ago. As I begin, I want to follow in points to be clearly understood.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I speak as an elected Member for Radisson and as a member of the Treasury.

Secondly, I speak primarily to correct some of the misinformation put on the record by some members of this Legislature.

Thirdly, I speak in total support of the actions of this government, of my Premier and of my colleague for St. Boniface. I wanted to make it very clear that I have complete confidence and respect for my leader, the First Minister, and for all members of my caucus.

Fourthly, I speak as a Francophone who cannot accept some of the distortions and inaccuracies spoken by some members across the way, pretending to express the wishes and the intentions of all those who did not align themselves with their own way of thinking.

Fifthly, I speak because I feel it is my duty to do so. I speak now because I want to speak now, and not at the behest of goading, catcalls, whistle calls of some of the members of the opposition. I want it to be clear. I am not their obedient man's best friend, getting up to bark in order to reopen the debate on this issue, as they so clearly did themselves during numerous question periods as well as on Monday night and through this present bill. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has ruled, and that closes that debate.

My remarks are directed to the members of the opposition and especially to the Member for Elmwood who have persisted in their attempt to twist the facts, muddy the waters, and try to absolve themselves of blame which weighs heavily on their shoulders now that the Supreme Court has handed down its decision. I expect, as well, that they feel deep feelings of guilt for the shame they have inflicted on this province and for the waste of the taxpayers' money.

I am proud to be a member of this party because we showed something that is completely foreign to members opposite - courage. Throughout the debate on the French language question, I bit my tongue

because I simply did not want to get down into the mud like some of the members of the opposition did. The members across the way made a decision to play political football with this issue and, as my colleague, the MLA for St. Boniface, has indicated, Francophones were stuck in the middle.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to correct some of the many misconceptions and inaccuracies raised by some of the members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Elmwood have not been honest with the people of Manitoba.

On June 13th, the Leader of the Opposition made some statements that were absolutely incredible. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood termed it as a "forceful" speech on his version of the Gong Show, otherwise known as the Doern Report. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was not a forceful speech, but rather an attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to exonerate himself following the Supreme Court decision. In his speech of June 13, 1985, on Page 2921, the Leader of the Opposition stated, "To entrench an amendment to fully bilingualize our province and to enact legislation mandating French language services in all government departments, that needless trauma, that convulsion to the people of our province will take a good deal of time to overcome . . ."

The Leader of the Opposition and his gang, including this crony, the image builder, the Member for Elmwood, is making another one of his politically motivated statements. He is scaring the people of Manitoba into believing that Manitoba will change overnight and become a French state. He is naive, Mr. Speaker. He is far from honest, Mr. Speaker. He is the one guilty of causing trauma, confrontation and deep social division. He is the one who wreaked havoc on our democratic system along with his gang.

I am tired, Mr. Speaker, of hearing the Leader of the Opposition, his caucus and the Member for Elmwood destroy the intent of the solution this government was proposing to resolve the grave dilemma which was confronting Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I would ask the honourable member to examine his words carefully so that he does not use unparliamentary terms or words in the Chamber.

The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

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

Mr. Speaker, we did not want to have to translate these useless laws since 1890. We did not want to spend incredible amounts of money for a futile exercise. We did not want to make a political issue out of this. The members opposite wanted that and they got it.

Now we must all respectfully accept the decision of the Supreme Court and we will. We have no choice but to comply with it because the members opposite would again proceed to play political games on the backs of Franco-Manitobans because there isn't any statesmanship, reasonableness, practicality, or tolerance to be expected from that side.

The Leader of the Opposition and the other members across the way on Monday night, and at other times before, have labelled me a zealot, an unreasonable person, and to quote the Leader of the Opposition the

other night, "as one wanting to force everything that he possibly could on the people of Manitoba as he did in 1983. He was one of the people who said, we don't care what the people of Manitoba want. We are going to steamroller this over them and it doesn't matter."

Then a few lines later, he chastises me for calling him a liar. I withdrew that spontaneous remark as it was unparliamentary but, Mr. Speaker, it was spoken as the most accurate word to describe the untruths and the distortions which the Leader of the Opposition had spoken on many occasions, especially on Monday night. The same applies even more so to the Member for Elmwood.

Mr. Speaker, let me state clearly. I never wanted to force anything on the people of Manitoba. Like my colleagues on this side and so many other Manitobans, I only sought a reasonable and fair solution which would neither impose nor take away anything from any Manitoban. I spoke infrequently and I asked for what was constitutionally right. Mr. Speaker, I did indeed express my objections to some of the vitriolic distortions and discriminatory remarks expressed by so many members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, is it truth to say, as was stated on February 24, 1984, P.C. News Release, "The NDP language proposal involves an extension of constitutional rights, not a restoration of constitutional rights. All language rights ever conferred under the Constitution were restored by the Supreme Court and the Legislature of Manitoba in 1979 and 1980 respectively." Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision has clearly indicated that both those statements were blatant falsities. Yes, Mr. Speaker, very clearly. The record should be clear, Mr. Speaker. I am appalled by the Leader of the Opposition and his reasoning.

The other night, Mr. Speaker, he said, "and they are giving away all sorts of things in return for nothing, something that the Franco-Manitobans saw of little or no value. They were giving away a constitutional amendment and Bill 115 in return for it."

Mr. Speaker, that is a twisted bit of logic typical of members of the opposite side. How can they even pretend to understand or speak for Franco-Manitobans? How dare they try to decide what is said, what is and is not of value to Franco-Manitobans? What is 95 years of injustice and illegality? Should Franco-Manitobans give something away with nothing in return when it is they who were robbed for 95 years?

Mr. Speaker, again on Monday night, on Page 3675, the Leader of the Opposition said, "Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health tonight referred to the fact that the Franco-Manitobans didn't want their laws translated. I said in this House a year and a half ago that this was of no value to them, that this trade they were making with this incompetent administration in favour of a constitutional amendment and Bill 115 was no trade whatsoever. Because what they were offering was of little value to Franco-Manitobans and that's on the record."

Let's break this down to reality instead of verbiage, which knowingly falsifies the truth.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left, excluding the interruptions?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 10 minutes remaining.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, that's better. Thank you.

Past spent laws, useless for everybody, and which will now have to be translated, re-enacted, and in many cases repealed at a high cost to the taxpayers, that, Mr. Speaker, is millions of dollars in the garbage. There are pre-existing rights that were in existence all along, knowingly disregarded and trampled upon by successive governments for 95 years. In return, Mr. Speaker, was it not amply fair that through provincial legislation, not constitutionally entrenching, they would get some limited French language services, not overnight, but provided over time in a rational and practical way. The provincial bill was to be some form of assurance, not blackmail. Franco-Manitobans would have been absolutely stupid to say, go ahead, amend the Constitution and we'll be happy to simply take your word that you'll provide services in due course, especially after successive governments had disregarded a constitutional obligation for 95 years.

Who is the victim here, Mr. Speaker? Who has it been? Has it been the Government of Manitoba since 1890? Of course not. But this is but a small example of convoluted logic of the members opposite. What Franco-Manitobans wanted was limited government services in order that they may continue to be a vital part of Manitoba. They were not taking anything away from anyone, but they were asking for a small and reasonable part of what was taken away from them.

They were not interested in the useless cost of translating obsolete laws. The Leader of the Opposition has been going around trying to say we were wrong. Mr. Speaker, the prevailing opinion across the land at the time of the debate was clear; the opposition was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Boissevain Recorder from the editorial which recently appeared. "As expected we are now aré faced with the costly and useless task of translating hundreds of laws and statutes into French. No one will benefit from this exercise in futility. This is not what Francophones in Manitoba wanted. All they wanted was the extension of certain government services in their language, a simple request that was guaranteed to them years ago. However, because the opposition in the Legislature decided to take political advantage of racial distress and widespread bigotry that seems to exist everywhere, we are stuck with this expensive and useless exercise." I could go on Mr. Speaker, but I know they will never learn.

What the opposition and the Member for Elmwood have done, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear. As elected representatives and so-called leaders, they deliberately misled a group of Manitoba citizens into believing that this province would change overnight. They insist on blaming the government for this mess when, in fact, it is they who must shoulder the blame for this useless expense. Mr. Speaker, they continue to do so today and they probably will again when the election is called.

The Leader of the Opposition persists in quoting an analysis done by the MGEA. It is his Bible; it is his victory cry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record statements made by the MGEA in Volume 13, No. 1, 1984 - not 1982 or 1983 - issue of Contact magazine and I quote, "The MGEA brief emphatically states our position that the requirement to provide available services in both English and French means

that those work locations affected must have the capacity to provide such services, and does not mean that every staff position in those locations must have the facility to communicate or provide services in either language. Our position is that the capacity to provide these services means that there must be one person who is functional in both languages available during normal working hours at the location specified. Our position is consistent with the government's repeated public announcements that less than 3 percent of employees in government service will require knowledge of French and no government employee will ever lose his or her job or be displaced as a result of the language policy and that career paths should not be affected. The government to date has not disputed our position in this regard and indeed nods of concurrence could be seen on the government's side of the committee table when this part of the brief was presented."

Mr. Speaker, I go on in the same article and I quote again, "For the most part, concerns previously expressed by the MGEA have been met by the proposed legislation. The government is to be commended for accepting the constructive advice of the MGEA. In several key areas and for arriving at a made-in-Manitoba proposal, the MGEA will continue to work towards a realistic and workable implementation of limited language services. The union will further ensure that the implementation of language services is consistent with the government's oft stated intent that job security and mobility within government service will not be adversely affected."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition surely must agree with these statements, that for some reason, 3 percent of the Civil Service is not 1500 positions. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did not look at the whole case, but he chose to pick the most political opportunistic number, the one that sells. He chose to take the most extreme scenario, something once again that Franco-Manitobans do not want.

The Leader of the Opposition persists in spreading the myth of duplicated services and additional staff. Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the Opposition saying that bilingual people are only capable of answering phones and handling enquiries? Does he not think that Franco-Manitobans can offer services to both English-speaking and French-speaking Manitobans? Does he think that they will be asked to work in French only? Does he think that there are not already bilingual people in the Civil Service - and a large number of them? Does he not think that through immersion programs and French language programs, students learning French will also one day, reasonably I assume, have expectations of perhaps seeking employment with the Civil Service and be able to use both languages in that capacity? Does he think like the Member for Elmwood, that this is only a scheme to create jobs for French-speaking Manitobans? Is he that naive, Mr. Speaker?

It is time that the Leader of the Opposition came out from the shadow of his former leader. If he persists on addressing this issue, I hope he will do a bit of his own research. He clearly does not understand the history of our province. History, Mr. Speaker, is not something that you shape, form and distort for your own purposes. It is there; it is real. He should sit down at his cottage this summer and catch up on his history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Member for Elmwood for finally leaving our caucus. He does not deserve to sit on this side of the House and indeed he continues to do a great disservice to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. We were elected to be responsible and true representatives of our citizens but that member, in his own way, has tainted the Legislature. These are strong words, Mr. Speaker, but I have to say I am being generous.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood clearly has a vendetta and he clearly never accepted the fact that he never made it in Cabinet. I thank my leader for this wise decision. His lust for revenge is quite clear and I need only read into the record part of a news release issued by the Member for Elmwood on December 18, 1979, and I quote, "The Manitoba Government should provide more brochures on Tourism and Cultural Affairs because (1) French-speaking tourists visit our province; (2) the Francophone community in Manitoba is fairly large and well-established; and (3) in view of the recent Supreme Court ruling concerning the use of French in the Legislature and in the Courts, one would expect that the spirit, as well as the letter of the law, will be followed in other matters."

Mr. Speaker, the reversal is quite clear; the political motives are quite clear. To go into all the inaccuracies uttered by the Member for Elmwood would take days, maybe weeks. His desire for vengeance on the back of Franco-Manitobans is despicable. He deserves only minimum reply. He seeks attention, and to go any further would be unfair to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are on the record. The guilty parties have been identified. I go no further. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate my complete loyalty to the Premier and my colleagues in caucus. I can assure all members of this House that I will continue to serve Radisson to the best of my ability and without any hesitation, I will continue to serve in Cabinet for all Manitobans as Minister of the Environment and Workplace, Safety and Health.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in addressing a few comments to the bill, or taking the occasion of this bill to make some further remarks with respect to those just put on the record by the Minister for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

I can only ask, Mr. Speaker, what went wrong? When he says, and I believe him, that all the Franco-Manitobans wanted was reasonable, common-sense delivery of services, an opportunity for their language to be respected and used in those areas by those persons wishing to do so. Mr. Speaker, having been in this Chamber for a little while, surely he and the Member for St. Boniface and other members will acknowledge that this is precisely what was happening. That was precisely what was happening in terms of rectifying a wrong, an unconstitutional act that was committed in this Legislature in 1890. I don't have to repeat for the record the steps that particularly veteran members of this Chamber who were, indeed, in this Chamber and participated in some of the moves as they methodically took place - extension of some privileges and rig:its

with respect to parochial schools, essentially, in the early years, Krites (sic) Introduction of French as a language of instruction and by the various departments, the common-sense provision of services in the French language in those areas and those communities where it made proper sense.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents in Elie, St. Eustache, St. Francois Xavier, want that and nothing else, or else they wouldn't keep supporting me in majority numbers the way they have and the way they will again in the next election. I remind members that I have a significant Francophone population in my constituency. I am very proud of being able to represent them, and I expect 60 to 65 to 70 percent of their votes in the next election as I received in the last election.

Then what went wrong? Because they didn't want the heavy arm of law to insist on 100 Francophone positions in the community of Dauphin or in Thompson - well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member took some time to refute statements and reference of a report that my leader took some time to explain and present to this House, and detailed in-depth not a 1984 document and not a 1983, but a full study made by the Manitoba Government Employees Association that went into detail into every regional head office, as Bill 115 called for, to be staffed. They went position-by-position, Mr. Speaker.

We find out that in the community of Dauphin, that virtually has no French representation and no need for French services in that community, but because of its designation as a regional head office, it would have required over 100 civil servant positions in that community alone.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are shouting "false". Mr. Speaker, it's amazing how these people like to take advice. When the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association supports this government on other matters of legislation like the pay equity law, they applaud him. That's fine, they applaud him. This is the same association headed by the same president that prepared that report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is even more shocking is that senior members opposite, from the Premier down, profess ignorance of the existence of that report and yet were prepared to foist on the people of Manitoba a piece of legislation that we believe and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association believe would have that effect.

If you say it's wrong, fine, I won't insist that it's right; I don't know. I don't know. But have you presented an analysis of that report? Have you refuted that report? No, you haven't. So, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong. It is not right for the Minister who just spoke on this bill to react in the manner he has to the positions that have been put forward on this question by my leader.

I will tell you why it went wrong. Mr. Speaker, as truth will out, it surfaced from the strangest source - none other than the President of the Franco-Manitoban Society - when they expressed surprise at the package that was being offered to them by the Attorney-General. Why was that package being offered, Mr. Speaker? And this will go down in the annals of the New Democratic Party as one of the basic, the largest, the most costly blunder of a political party that has yet to be matched because it was put forward because they

thought there was political gain in it. They thought that they could cement for a long time the political allegiance of a minority but nonetheless significant minority group of voters, the Franco-Manitobans. They believed that, and the Attorney-General convinced their caucus of that.

The other surprising thing is the arguments that he used in convincing the NDP caucus. Mr. Speaker, I assure you, I don't have the NDP caucus room bugged or use any other surveillance techniques to know exactly what happened, but I do know exactly how the Attorney-General sold a caucus the bill of goods that proved so disastrous for the New Democratic Party and has caused so much unnecessary pain, anguish and divisiveness to the Franco-Manitoban communities and, indeed, to all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General said . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General assured his Cabinet and his members of caucus that the ill-conceived proposals that he was presenting to his caucus and Cabinet would be supported by none other than Sterling Lyon and the Conservative caucus and opposition totally, because he believed that because we had taken the court action that we had taken on the Forest case a few years before, he allowed himself to be deluded into not believing the substantial difference of what was being offered and the effects of entrenchment and the effects of legislation, just, Mr. Speaker, as we, all Canadians, are finding out what the effects of an entrenched Charter of Rights is.

We now have to pass legislation in this Chamber that says Sunday is Sunday. We now have to pass legislation that will allow communities like Indian Reserves to keep alcohol off their areas, if by local by-law they wish to do so. We are now only finding out with the hundreds and thousands of cases that are piling up before our judiciary system, what it means to have an entrenched Charter of Rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not passing any comment; I am just citing a truism, surely.

That was what was in Bill 115, and that was in the constitutional amendment that the Attorney-General was bringing, and he believed that nobody in this Chamber would take serious objection to it. What a mistake, Mr. Speaker, made by somebody learned and a senior Minister of a government. And what agony has he perpetuated on the people of Manitoba and, most importantly, what unnecessary divisiveness has he brought into this province as a result of doing so?

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the facts and I want them on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, just for the record, rather than having risen on a point of order, I would like to refer to the remarks that I made in this House in introducing the proposed constitutional amendment and in the ministerial statement I made in the week of

May 16th of 1983. I said, and I think it should be noted, that if the issue goes to the Supreme Court, in my view and in the view of legal counsel, the laws of the province, the Supreme Court would hold that the constitutional obligation was mandatory, it seemed to me and to legal advice, and there was no question about that, that that much was obvious.

It also seemed to me, because of the provisions of the Charter, that the necessary consequence of this, and a tough consequence, was that laws passed in violation of a constitutional mandate would be found to be invalid. At the same time, Sir, I said that that could lead to legal chaos. I said, and it's on the record, that I didn't think that would happen, but I did think that the consequences in any event would be tough. That's on the record, and the Member for St. Norbert said exactly the same thing, and that's in Hansard.

I just want to clarify the record on that. I don't propose to enter into the kind of a debate that has been taking place here in the last few minutes that is to some extent the getting off of some feelings. I don't think that helps particularly at this time. Our position has been well stated by the Premier but, for the record, the legal position that was put by myself, as Attorney-General, is on the record and I would trust that no member distorts that position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Monsieur le président, j'aimerais proposer, secondé par le ministre de la Santé, l'ajournement de ce débat.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the leave of the House to dispense with the balance, what there is, of Private Members' Hour and, at the same time, for leave to sit beyond 5:30 p.m. to continue with government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with the remainder of Private Members' Hour, and continue to sit beyond 5:30 p.m.? (Agreed)

Before we continue, when we were at report stage on Bill 74 recently, there was an amendment moved by the Honourable Attorney-General, and a sub-amendment moved by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, which I accepted and was put to the vote and approved by the House.

However, in looking in our Rule Book at Rule 88(8) which is on Page 50 if members wish to refer to it, it is clear from that that a sub-amendment cannot be accepted to an amendment unless there is a resolution of the House. I was apparently in error in accepting that sub-amendment but since it was clearly the will of the House to accept it and to pass the motion, it would be the best manner of correcting the record if the House were to give unanimous consent to retroactively waive that particular section 88(8).

If that is the wish, then I will ask the members if there is unanimous consent to waive the effectiveness of 88(8) in this particular case. (Agreed)

Leave having been granted, the Honourable Government House Leader.

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

As I announced earlier, it would be our intent, prior to dealing with the Supply bills in Committee of Ways and Means and through the bill stage to deal with third readings. I propose, Sir, to deal with the third readings in the order in which they appear on today's Order Paper, followed by those which were reported yesterday and are in the Votes and Proceedings tabled today reflecting yesterday's committee reports; following that, Sir, the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, Third Report, tabled today shortly after 2:00 p.m.

THIRD READING

BILLS NO. 12, 68, 69 were each read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 83 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT AND VARIOUS OTHER ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE; LA LOI SUR L'ÉVALUATION MUNICIPALE ET D'AUTRES DISPOSITIONS STATUTAIRES

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'évaluation municipale et d'autres dispositions statutaires, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the stage of third reading on a bill to change the assessment practices in the Province of Manitoba - and we have to ask ourselves, is there really any change?

Mr. Speaker, it was some 16 years ago when I came into this Chamber, and there was at that time considerable pressure. Both myself, the Member for Turtle Mountain at that time, a Mr. Ed Dow, and several others in this Chamber were pushing for assessment reform in this province. It took considerable time. I recall in debate, the previous Premier of this Province, the Honourable Edward Schreyer, indeed agreed that assessment reform was of prime necessity in this province. But at that time, nothing was done.

Under the previous administration, there was a committee set up to study assessment reform in this province known as the Weir Commission, which did an extensive study of almost three years' duration, presented an interim report and a final report, a report that is, I think, well accepted by almost every segment of society. There have been concerns about some parts of it but, generally speaking, the Weir Commission Report has been well accepted by most members of society.

However, that report appeared some four years, Mr. Speaker. We have had one or two Ministers of Municipal Affairs who have urged yes they are going to move with assessment reform. They get to the point where they're going to have to do something about it and the government decides, well, maybe we're not ready to move yet so we will put a new Minister in so that we can start all over again and that prevents effective assessment reform from happening.

At this particular time we have the present Minister of Municipal Affairs announcing to all and sundry as he has done for the last year and a half that he is pushing forward with assessment reform. He is going to do everything he can to implement it as quickly as possible, but because of this and because of that and because we haven't got the computers in place and we haven't got all the information on computer tape, we can't move on this and we can't move on that.

That argument, I suppose, can be accepted by some. Some of it is certainly valid, but the Minister could have moved forward with a great deal more than what he has put forward at this time. This bill, Mr. Speaker, only deals with the appeal procedure on assessment. It does nothing to indicate to the public what type of classification system the government is planning to implement and the classification system that is going to be implemented at some point in time will vitally affect property holders throughout the entire province. Those property holders have been given no indication whatsoever from this Minister on what type of classification system is going to be put in place.

There is also, once that classification system is put in place, then there is the weighting of various factors that will go into the assessment process and that I can understand the Minister not proceeding with because the assessment, the final figures on the City of Winnipeg had not been arrived at.

So it is impossible to go with the weighting factor in the assessment, but he could have announced to this House what classification system he was going to put in because it has to be decided so that people will know various classifications that will go . . .

The one thing that he has done in this bill is to reassert that he intends to do nothing, Mr. Speaker, because there is a section in this bill that clarifies what he perceives as being a problem and that is in the definition of a farmer in the Province of Manitoba because of a court case. When he does that, all he does is reaffirm that there is going to be no change, and, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba I think wanted a change.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you and I can tell this Assembly that last year I had numerous farmers come to me, some of them who had their residences liable for assessment for the first time in their lives, farmers who had farmed for 30 and 40 years and suddenly their residence becomes assessable.

What was the reason for it? The basic reason was because they were receiving the old age pension. Nothing had changed in their farming practices but, Mr. Speaker, the Minister did nothing to remedy that problem. The Minister said that happened before. All he has to do is look at the number of letters of concern for farmers that have been effected. I would say that five, six years ago, there might have been two or three. That number has generally increased each year as the department started to question more and more the

individual people whose names appear on the assessment rolls.

So, Mr. Speaker, we find that the Minister has told the people of Manitoba that there will be no change made at the present time, not with this bill anyway. He has reaffirmed his stand-pat position and in fact has clarified it so the courts cannot - he hopes the courts will not - upset the policy that is presently in place.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I appreciate the fact that there is some approach made at trying to - certainly in the field of the appeal he has done some streamlining there, but I have to say I regret that the Minister hasn't done more than I deem it was possible for him to do in the field of assessment reform. However, I suppose any little crumb that you get from this government, you should take it and say thank you, because the general attitude of this government to the people of Manitoba is one that does not lend the public to expect too much from them.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I'll invite the Minister of Municipal Affairs to add his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm appalled, and the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, who once told me he thought the Member for Virden knew a little bit about assessment - I'm sure now he's really disappointed. The member has demonstrated that he doesn't even know that little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Member for Arthur will listen too, because I know the Member for Arthur agrees with this bill and agrees with this Minister and does not agree with the Member for Virden. I give him more credit than he even thinks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill implements one-quarter of the Weir Report recommendations and is a complete rewrite of Part 3. It is part of the recommendations of the Weir Report, in terms of how we should proceed with assessment reform. The allegation of the Member for Virden that somehow something changed last year or the year before; that pensioners who are also farmers, are suddenly having their residences become taxable upon receipt of old age security in some form or another, is patently false and he knows that. That's always been the case. It's always been the case that when a people in receipt of pension suddenly earn more from pension than they were on the farm that they would suddenly find their residence taxable.

It's been that way, Mr. Speaker, since 1894, that when off-farm income exceeded farm income, that would occur. Now it only became a problem when pensions were introduced, and as pensions were increased the problem became more severe, but it has been a problem that long. This government has indicated they were prepared to deal with that problem and we've said we're prepared to address it.

We've made a commitment also with regard to the farm residence exemption, in terms of addressing that; and my opening remarks in debate on second reading clearly addressed that question. But the member says that we said we're not prepared to deal with it. We clearly stated that we were prepared to deal with it and made those commitments.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's not only ignorance of the facts, it's ignorance of the remarks made both in committee after second reading and on second reading debate.

Mr. Speaker, we also are committed to dealing with Section 30(1) and (2) and the member knows that. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the honourable member that if he does not believe that this is a good bill - and I challenge everybody else on that side, if they don't believe this is a good bill - that it conforms with the timetable laid out by the late Walter Weir, Chairman of the Manitoba Assessment Commission and a former Conservative Premier of this Province, that it is identical to the timetable he laid out and conforms in all respects with his recommendations; if despite that, they don't believe this is a good bill, I challenge them to vote against it. If not, they're prepared to vote against this bill, then I have to accept the statements of the Member for Virden as what they are, just a bit of straw blowing in the wind.

I believe it's an excellent bill and I recommend it, once again, to the House and reject completely the comments of the Member for Virden.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILLS NO. 75, 20, 66, 87, 92, 95, 96, 18 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

For the benefit of members, I am moving third readings from the Second Report of The Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and I am on Page 281 of our Votes and Proceedings, and the next bill is the first bill of the three that were reported without amendment.

BILLS NO. 3, 8, 17 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I am now beginning to move third readings from the Third Report of Statutory Regulations and Orders Standing Committee which was presented today.

BILL NO. 14 was read a third time and passed.

BILL 19 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (2); LE CODE DE LA ROUTE (2)

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Minister of Highways, Bill No. 19, An Act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); Loi modifiant le code de la route (2), for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I wish to speak to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are not happy with this bill; neither are the truckers of Manitoba happy with the bill; neither

are the farmers of Manitoba happy with the bill. That all became apparent at the committee stage of this bill when representation was made in a very forceful manner by those most directly affected by amendments to The Highway Traffic Act of this kind that called for reconsideration on the part of the government, on the part of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur that Bill 19 not be read now but six months hence.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the hoist motion which was the request of the majority of those people in society who will be affected and impacted by this bill. In committee hearings two evenings ago, we heard the Manitoba Truckers Association ask for at least a six-month opportunity to further try to work out with the Department of Highways a more acceptable way of dealing with some of the problems that they're trying to solve; that it was their objective and ambition not to reduce the amount of product that would be carried particularly by the smaller transport companies in the country, but would be to increase it. It was their opinion, the opinion of those people represented by the Truckers Association that was not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, as well, it has been brought to our attention and to the attention of the committee that there is no urgency; that under the former Minister of Highways, as I'm sure he would agree, some of the work had been developed from the task force which had been carried out for some three years, and the immediate demand for amendments to this act really aren't required. I think the purpose of the public hearings are to listen to and to work for those people, and draw legislation that is indeed workable.

The Heavy Construction Association, Mr. Speaker, made representation to the committee and, as well, indicated their concerns of increased costs, increased costs for the industry, that the purpose of the government was really not to do anything more with this bill than to increase revenues for the province. That, I don't believe is a very direct way to get at the funds that they require to operate the government, I think that they can do it in a more direct approach if it's necessary.

The Minister made the argument, which is not acceptable to me, that they needed more money to put back into the highway system; I agree. Well, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the response to the heavy construction industry, but was in fact the response to the Keystone Agriculture Producers presentation that that really was what their intention was in the restriction of farmer-to-farmer hauling, that in fact they wanted to get the revenue to keep up the road system from the commercial truckers.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Highway's reputation in keeping up the road system and putting money into it is extremely poor. The Minister of Highways did not do a very good job in his research in my estimation. He did not do a very good job in selling this bill, these

amendments to the people of Manitoba, and in fact he did a very poor job in persuading members of the opposition that it was the right thing to be doing at this particular time.

There were some excellent presentations made on behalf of the Vegetable Growers Association and the Keystone Agriculture Producers Association, representatives of the farm community. The Minister has, I will give the Minister credit for trying to make an amendment. We haven't really had the opportunity, in the short period of time that we have seen it, and haven't been able to make an assessment or get a response from the Keystone Agriculture Producers or the Vegetable Growers in response to that particular amendment, Mr. Speaker, so I can't, at this particular time, pass judgment as to the total impact that the amendment will now have on the farm community.

However, let me put it this way, that when it's working - and it appears to be working - don't tinker with it and change it until you're sure that the change is going to be better than what we currently have; that I would expect the Minister of Highways to respond to on this hoist motion. I would hope the Minister of Highways would stand in his place and explain to us how he feels. I'm sure he did it in committee, I wasn't in committee last night or on the committee so I cannot make that kind of judgment and I did not hear his argument to this point.

MR. D. ORCHARD: He didn't have any.

MR. J. DOWNEY: But I did discuss with the Keystone Agriculture Producers and the Vegetable Growers some of their concerns prior to and, because of the fragility of the vegetable industry in this country, because of the extremely difficult time which the Minister of Finance well knows the sugar beet industry in this province is having, that to impose legislative changes that would impose further difficulties to that industry is not acceptable at this particular time; particularly when we had to push and shove and shoehorn the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier of this province into giving some support this spring before a crop was put in. It would not make sense, in our minds, Mr. Speaker, to now go out and impose a legislative change that would take away - maybe that's what they're intending to do, but I would hope not - to take away the support that they gave them through a subsidy program in the production of sugar beets this spring.

There are too many unanswered questions, Mr. Speaker, to accept this bill at this particular time. That is why we are now requesting support by the government to give it a hoist. There is no urgency.

I want to make one other point, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Minister said in the committee stages that they want to remove, and I know that there's some people hauling agriculture commodities without the proper authority; that's the problem that he's trying to solve. I would say to the Minister and his department that there aren't many Highways Department offices in Manitoba that don't know where and who these infractors are and where the infractions are taking place, that I'm not so sure that we need a legislative change to actually accommodate what we're after. It is probably

the will to do the work that has to be done or to stop what the Minister's trying to do with this legislation more than anything else; and I think I could get agreement from a lot of people who are fairly familiar with the activities of hauling agriculture commodities with licensed agricultural trucks, non-farm trucks and that type of thing.

I think to try and fine-tune it with legislation to the point that we're attempting to may in fact work in the reverse. I would hope that the Minister of Highways, I would hope the government, rather than try to say, look, this is an emergency bill, that it has to be done, we have to put it through at this particular Session, I would hope they would reconsider. It is unanimous request basically of the community, as I read it, as I talked to them, and would hope that this kind of consideration would be given to this bill at this particular time.

Therefore, I would like to see support, Mr. Speaker, for the hoist motion that has been just introduced by my colleague, the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It's rather frustrating to see the Member for Arthur stand up, and the Member for Lakeside, who were not even at the committee last night to participate in the debate on the clause-by-clause or to hear the arguments, then to come up and raise all of the concerns back again that were addressed by the Member for Pembina.

It shows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they have not read Hansard, they have not talked to their colleagues, they do not have an understanding of what is being proposed in this bill. It's so obvious that they raise again concerns that were raised by those who presented, who made presentations, without making any reference to the solutions that were suggested, that I made last night, and the fact and the clarifications that I gave at the committee hearing last night, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The fact is that there will not be any effect on the dump truck operators, and so the brief that they made, with regard to the effects that the bill would have, is not relevant at this particular time. Any effects would come about as a result of a regulation change to Regulation 231-73 under Section 286 of the act, and that would be dealt with at the time that the government was considering making those changes. So that does not affect the proposals made that were made here. They are not impacted on and, therefore, should not be considered in any negative way towards the bill.

The fact that the Manitoba Trucking Association in their briefs did not deal with all of the positive elements, the fact is that they have stressed the urgency of moving forward with this bill over the last number of months and years that we've consulted with them. They're anxious to see the matters that we are addressing in the bill being dealt with, particularly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with regard to the matter of fixed rates and having to file any deviations from those rates.

They realize that practice has not been, in fact, followed; that they have not followed the fixed rates.

They do not want to see that continue in this province and they would rather see us go forward with a maximum-rate system immediately, as soon as possible.

What they were concerned about was the matter of minimum rates and they did not address any alternative solutions in all of the consultations we had with them as to how we should deal with predatory pricing and non-compensatory pricing. We have put in place a mechanism to deal with that and we have given them our word, our commitment that we will work with them in ironing out the details and guidelines as to what is deemed to be not in the public interest.

So I think that the commitment is there. They know that our record is good with regard to consultation. They've stated that. We've talked to them on numerous occasions and we have received their input and we have acted on their input. So I was rather surprised and disappointed to see that they did not emphasize that to a greater extent at the hearing but, certainly, they'd know that we have listened to them and they know that they will be consulted.

The matter of the farm amendments dealing with the extra revenue that the Member for Arthur talks about is irrelevant as well because of the amendment we moved last night. The amendment that we brought in clearly outlines that any truck that is being used to help others for compensation can continue to do that if it's a farm truck, providing they do not receive more than out-of-pocket expenses for that assistance to their neighbours. That is in the spirit of neighbourly help. That is something that the opposition and the members of the Keystone Agricultural Producers, the Vegetable Producers as well, have stated that they simply want to receive their out-of-pocket expenses. They don't want to make money on their neighbours. They want to help each other and that truly is in the spirit of farmers helping farmers that has helped to build our province and make it what it is today. I think we have recognized that spirit and they have the complete authority to continue to engage in that practice in helping each other.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendments are as a result of extensive consultation with many groups. We realize that this is a very complicated area and I can only say that the opposition, the Member for Pembina when he was Minister of Highways, realized that there was an antiquated regulation system in this province. He took no action on it because he didn't understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He was not able to understand what was going on. He did not understand the regulations and, therefore, he could not take any action. We have taken positive action after a great deal of study and an analysis of those regulations and the kinds of changes that would be needed after a great deal of consultation and we have put this bill forward for consideration.

There is an urgent need to move on those areas that we've outlined in this bill. There will be some regulatory changes, some changes as well in the board's rules and procedures to address all of those changes to streamline regulations in this province. It's not just a matter of those in the statutes. There's a need, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to amend regulations, to streamline the processes and to change the board's rules and procedures as well. There's three parts to the changes that we're proposing and this only deals with one small

part of them and that is the act changes, the statute changes we're proposing that we've put forward and that the Committee has accepted.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only say that I'm disappointed with the opposition. I feel that they're grandstanding on this, that they have not taken the time to understand the issues. It was clear when the Member for Pembina was speaking, he didn't even understand the definition of a commercial truck. He did not understand any of those amendments that were being proposed. He did not compare, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendments of the new proposed amendments with those statute sections that were already in the act. He could not even make that analysis without comparison.

I don't think that he's taken the time to study this. He doesn't understand it and, therefore, something he doesn't understand he wants thrown out and that is deplorable conduct for a member of the Legislature.

I would, therefore, reject the motion that the member has made.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the Minister is trying to tell the House today is that he naturally knows what he's doing; and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, anyone who has watched the Minister of Highways in this House in Estimates and from the outside the industry knows he doesn't what he's doing and that's why we're proposing this hoist motion so that he doesn't not only damage his already damaged reputation by passing bad legislation, but we don't want him to pass legislation that's bad for the industry; an industry that employs a great number of people in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister made some obtuse comments about my understanding of the Highways and Transportation Department when I was Minister for two years. I want to tell the Minister, quite frankly, that I will put my understanding and my record in the Highways Department against his any time, any place and any forum that deals with transportation in this province and nationally because this Minister does not have any understanding. This Minister spends time as he did in the Committee last night and nights before signing political letters at the expense of the taxpayer of Manitoba rather than dealing with the real issues in his department. That's his problem.

This Minister said that he gave his word to the industry, the Manitoba Trucking Association, that he would take a look at a section to which they have objection. He said that his record is good in terms of consultation, that he has spent some two years consulting with the industry on a process that was initiated by the former Highways Minister, the MLA for Lac du Bonnet; and that's interesting that he would make that statement that he has consulted with the industry. Unfortunately, with the volume of Committee work we have done in the last several days, it's unfortunate that the Hansards are not available for the Committee hearings Tuesday morning or Tuesday evening. We could have read back to this Minister statements made by people in the industry who are objecting to this legislation. It is not as **the Minister**

has said, that they have only a small disagreement. It is not that they consider this legislation urgent. They said this could wait six months. The Minister did not deal factually with their presentation this afternoon and he knows it, but that's fine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the industry will now know it when they read his remarks; and they will know how much they have a Minister of Highways that does not value their input, their comment, and their concerns.

He talked about the consultation process and then the president of the MTA comes in and says, no, that isn't what we discussed, that isn't what we believed was coming in; and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister talks of consultation. It was not there; it did not exist. This legislation is not good legislation for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will give the Minister one credit out of this legislation and it was something that I was unaware of that the industry was desirous of having, and that was the newly granted authority in this legislation for the board itself - the Motor Transport Board itself - to grant fines, and impose fines - not grant fines - impose fines on trucking firms who are in contravention of their licence.

They indicated and I questioned them, because I didn't know whether the Minister was bringing forth good legislation, and I questioned them on that, and they indicated that that was, under the circumstances, a good provision to provide to the board because the board now has the decision of either if they find someone in infraction of their franchise and their running rights, that they have basically only one choice and that's to pull their running rights. Now this allows them to have the carrier continue on, but it gives them the ability to impose up to a \$5,000 fine per infraction and the industry likes that as a method of internal policing. It gives some teeth to the board.

The point that my colleague, the MLA for Downey made about the current . . .

A MEMBER: Arthur.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What did I say, MLA for Downey? MLA for Arthur, sorry. He's so famous that I get confused.

MR. H. ENNS: His name precedes his constituency.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right. It will probably be changed in the next reorganization to the constituency of Downey.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has got an infraction — (Interjection) — Yes, well he won't be. He'll be catching bees after the next election.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has got problems in enforcement in the industry. Those problems have been long-standing. They were there when I was the Minister; they were there prior to that.

So he's trying to address problems of enforcement in the industry with legislative change; legislative change which was obtusive, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's a demonstration of how little this Minister understood the kind of amendment he was bringing forward because he had to, after presentations, particularly by the Vegetable Growers and the Keystone Agricultural

Producers, he finally realized that his amendment was a bad amendment.

Now bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Minister has said he has had full consultation with all the affected parties on this legislation. Well if that was full consultation, why did he have such a bad amendment and why did he have to change that amendment to attempt to clean up a mess that he created? Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under the act right now, the existing arrangements of the neighbourly sharing of transportation vehicles to get perishable vegetable crops to market is there, has been there for many years, is working. There is no problem in terms of fines and enforcement, etc., etc., because it is completely permissible.

It was only this Minister, "after consultation," in his words with the Vegetable Growers industry, that he brought in an amendment that was going to stymie and stop long-standing work arrangements between neighbouring farmers in the vegetable industry in Manitoba. That's some kind of listening and consultation. This is a government that listens.

Well this Minister, if he listened, he did not understand and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's we are putting a six-month hoist on this legislation, because the Minister still doesn't know what he's doing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he talks of consultation? If his amendment in this act was so good, why did he have to come back with a major amendment to his proposed changes? Obviously he didn't listen to the concerns; obviously he didn't understand the concerns and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I concede to him that he did have consultation; he did listen to them but he didn't understand. He didn't know what they were saying and he come up with bad legislation that had to be attempted to be changed by a twelfth-hour amendment which, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in posing questions to the Minister as to how they determine what are out-of-pocket expenses? He doesn't have that kind of information. He isn't able to tell us how the policing of this is going to take place because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll be quite frank about this, this amendment that we have in the original bill that the Minister had to amend with his tail between his legs, like a whipped puppy dog, this amendment could be simply called the "Kleysen amendment," because the transportation firm, Kleysen's, undertook and believed they could operate within the existing act on farm plates hauling sugar beets and that was an objectionable practice to this Minister; and he attempted to change it with an amendment that was going to destroy many multi-year existing agreements and working arrangements with the farm community.

He just didn't understand what he was doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and now he's asking us to pass this bill when all of the presenters disagreed with portions of it, and one by one, if we had Hansard we could go through and show where the industry agreed, point by point, that this legislation was bad. Now that opportunity will not probably exist for us to examine Hansard today because it's not going to be ready, but I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those objections are there; one by one to the amendments that are contained in this bill; yet this Minister perversely figures he has to pass it. I know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this Minister has never gotten a bill through the House yet, without problem, without amendment, without

substantial difficulties; because he doesn't understand the industry and what he's doing and he still doesn't with this legislation.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister, in proposing amendments which apply to the rating schedules for the trucking industry, has developed a maximum tariff rate which is of agreement with the industry. The industry basically prefers that. What the industry is concerned about is the parallel amendment in here which establishes a minimum toll, which establishes whether a toll rate offered by a company is detrimental to the public interest. But yet there is no definition, there are no guidelines that this Minister can lay before committee to tell us what is going to be considered predator pricing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister is saying the small truckers all want that. The Minister doesn't understand what the radio carriers are concerned about and they are more concerned about this Minister coming up with some guidelines based on his lack of understanding of the industry that are going to affect them even more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will point out to you, and it's not exactly legal, but there is a clause in this bill - I won't refer to it directly; the Minister knows which clause it is - it deals with six tolls that are established by the Transport Board. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the President of the MTA pointed out one example, and it would be one of many, where the radio carrier could be very adversely affected and lose the business of transporting beer to their local communities if this board interfered and established this fixed toll for minimum rate and they set it too high so that ABD, the Associated Beer Distributors, would simply invest more money in their own trucks and do their own transportation from Winnipeg and from the Brandon warehouse to every hotel and establishment in Manitoba and who would be the loser, Mr. Deputy Speaker? It would be the radio carriers, those very same small truckers that this Minister just said he was trying to protect.

On the basis of that kind of pointed observation and analysis of a bad amendment this Minister proceeds with it. He doesn't have the guidelines in place. He doesn't know what direction he's taking and he doesn't know the impact on the industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's not my words. Those are the words of the association representing those radio carriers and other transportation firms in Manitoba; not my words, their words. Pointing out to this Minister the danger in his ability to have the board establish a minimum rate, theoretically, to prevent some of this predatory pricing, what you can do is have one commodity removed completely from our radio carriers, and Lord knows, they have enough competition to face without having to compete with a board and a Minister that doesn't understand their industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister said in response to that, that the concern expressed by the President of the MTA, you know what we'll do is we won't proclaim that section of the act for several months until we set up the guidelines, until we establish how we're going to handle this, how we're going to investigate it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point the MTA made was then if you're going to do that, then simply pull the bill. That's the point we're making. The Minister doesn't know what he's going to do. He can't put that section in force until he has his consultation so why is he wanting to pursue this legislation now?

I'll tell you why. Because he can't stand another setback in the House. He can't stand another exposure of his incompetence as the Minister of Highways and Transportation. That's what his problem is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is his ego that is driving him to push this bill through. It's not his desire that the industry be better served by better legislation, it's his ego. He's on a personal ego trip on this legislation and he wants it pushed through with the weight and majority of his colleagues over there to the detriment of the people of Manitoba and the industry that he is mandated to serve in the best fashion possible in Cabinet. That's hardly responsible legislation and the act of a responsible legislator.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another small example - not small - major example of the incompetence of this Minister was brought to light in the last couple of days. This Minister does no longer have the reciprocal agreement with the state of Minnesota for farm-plated trucks. Semi-trailers owned by farmers no longer can haul their flax to the crushing mill in Minneapolis because this Minister incompetently let that go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what's the impact and what is the reason this happened? You'll recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister have been busily flying down to the capitals of the States that have put an embargo and a ban on our hogs. They've been doing this theoretically to help the farm community in Manitoba. We are given to understand by the people who told me that this reciprocal agreement was now lost by this Minister that they agreed to it to stop hogs from going down to Minnesota after hours when the highways inspectors couldn't necessarily catch them on the road and Manitoba hogs were still getting into Minnesota. So Minnesota came to this Minister and said, you know, we should maybe modify our reciprocal agreement on farm plates, and that way we can get at these hog farmers who are trucking after hours. This Minister said, hey, gee, good idea, yes, we'll do that. He didn't realize that when he give that away he give away the ability of farmers to haul their own flax and canola down to Minneapolis at a premium price under most circumstances to what they can get in Manitoba. He's depriving Manitoba farmers of their livelihood with that act alone. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what faith should Manitobans have that this Minister knows what he's doing in this legislation when he has given away the reciprocal arrangements for farm-plated trucks with Minnesota. What confidence do we have in his ability to legislate and negotiate properly on behalf of Manitobans? I suggest none, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister perversely will pursue this legislation. He will impose on the trucking industry legislation which the board can require them to file with the board a rate schedule which may not be at the maximum but a negotiated rate and then make it available to the public. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the trucking industry is a very competitive business, very competitive. In Manitoba, the competition that we enjoy has given us one of the best trucking industries of any provinces across Canada. No question about it. The example of it is in the fact that we have, in percentage terms, a higher percentage of our working people employed in the transportation industry, the trucking industry in Manitoba than in any other province in Canada. Manitoba is a leader.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, why? Because our industry has been competitive. It has been innovative and it has been one that can operate as efficiently as anybody else in Canada. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Minister now is putting legislation in in which under the competitive environment, they publish the rates between a shipper and a trucker for all to see, including the competitors so that someone can come in for five cents a loaded mile less and undercut the rate because it's nice and public. Now, what kind of a competitive environment is the Minister creating when he's passing legislation that allows that? Do you really believe that that's the way it should go? I know that you people over there believe that there should only be one trucking company and one rate and one shipper. I know that. But what you're doing here is attempting to get to that on the backs of a competitive industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's pretty obvious by some of the comments that are coming across the way right now that it's not only the Minister of Highways that doesn't understand that, it's the Minister of Agriculture and others over there. They don't understand what this guy's doing. They don't understand what this Minister of Highways and Transportation is doing. — (Interjection) — No, the Member for Ste. Rose doesn't understand this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has a piece of legislation and I'll just reiterate for members of the House. It's a piece of legislation that if it doesn't pass will not change anything in the trucking industry. The industry will operate. It will not change anything in terms of the relationships amongst the farm community in their ability to assist neighbours in hauling their goods and produce to market because the current act allows it. It does not change any operating practice in the trucking industry.

What it does do if this legislation is passed is put new rules in place which the industry says, need more time to understand what the Minister is doing. That's why the industry suggested this bill not be proceeded with. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we agree that when faced with a piece of legislation that all the briefs objected at least to one part of it. The only part that was not disagreed to was the ability of the board to levy fines; and that's the only part that was not disagreed to in this legislation, but yet we have the Minister wanting to ram it through. It doesn't make sense because even the Minister himself says that portions of it where he recognizes the problem will have to be left out of the proclamation until he gets his act together and knows what he's going to do with them and sets up the guidelines for the minimum rate setting structure that he's conferring on the Motor Transport Board. He's going to do it coincidentally and interestingly enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in consultation with the industry that he says he's worked with for three-and-a-half years and that same industry was surprised that he was bringing in this amendment.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have no opportunity or no other choice on this side of the House but to agree with every presenter of a brief to this legislation that it doesn't have to proceed and that, Sir, is why we have proposed the six-month hoist - and I would think in the interest of good government that members opposite would also concur with the six-month hoist - send their Minister of Transportation back to the

drawing board over the summer where he has a little bit of time on his hands; maybe he'll understand what he's doing in these amendments, and maybe he can come back if there's another Session next spring with legislation that more meets the needs that will not infringe on the industry in an adverse and negative way. He might even get it right if we give him another six months, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's what we're trying to do to help this incompetent Minister, is give him a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'd like to rise and make only a very few brief comments to lay on the record my disappointment in the manner in which the Minister of Transportation has handled a couple of his bills that he's attempted to guide through this Legislature, particularly Bill No. 19.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I haven't followed terribly closely the debate around that particular bill, although I was one of the members of the Committee that listened to the representations made by various people to Bill 19 the other evening.

I, however, though became a little bit more intrigued once the Minister brought forward his amendment which would again allow friends and neighbours to convey the produce of individuals who are either close by or with whom there's been a long-standing arrangement. I said on the surface I could accept that in principle. However, the Minister also in bringing forward the amendment, indicated that out-of-pocket expenses would have to be covered. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a major provision.

I asked the Minister at that time when he showed the amendment to me, I asked him whether he would be setting up a bureaucracy to police that type of out-of-pocket expenditure. I asked him how he would monitor those types of expenditures and, whether or not he was serious. Because I think one has to be very careful when they bring forward legislation that when they ask people of the land to obey certain laws and regulations that they also put into place laws that can be followed without having to create out of people, lawbreakers.

So at this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to register my disappointment at the Minister, in bringing forward the amendment didn't share with us a deeper insight as to how he saw this procedure working. How is it that my vegetable grower from La Salle, Manitoba - and I'll use an example - one Jim Mosiewich, who is a small producer; a quarter section, I believe, of vegetables. How is he going to receive a billing from - he told me last night - that Jeffries Brothers from Portage who have hauled his produce, who have come down Highway No. 1, gone to La Salle, picked up his produce and brought it into the Vegetable Marketing Board? Under what basis are they going to arrive at an arrangement? Now I'm sure they can arrive at an arrangement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But the point being, who on behalf of the government is going to monitor that and what are going to be the regulations in effect? Is somebody from the government going to come out and ask either Mr. Jeffries or Mr. Mosiewich, in this

case, to show whether a bill has passed, where a bill covering the out-of-pocket expenses has passed from Mr. Jeffries to Mr. Mosiewich? Then is Mr. Jeffries going to have to show that government inspector that receipt has been provided to Mr. Mosiewich for payment of that service?

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise only because the Minister in bringing in that amendment which he says will so adequately address those situations where neighbours are helping neighbours and are legitimate - and thank goodness at least I think we all agree there's legitimacy there - and that the question needed to be addressed. At least, I give the Minister that much credit. He addressed the legitimacy of the argument, but I think it was incumbent upon him and the government to bring forward something a little bit more concrete as to how neighbour is to charge neighbour and friend is to charge friend within the area of agriculture. So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mutters, there's not a problem. Well, if there isn't a problem, then why doesn't he lay before us a deeper insight into his thinking, or is he attempting to allow those within the farm community to now compete at full compensatory rates, in full competition with those legitimate full service trucking firms?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise only to put those concerns on the record and I felt badly when the Minister spoke that he didn't address that specific question, because certainly he didn't do so last night in committee when he brought forward the amendments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'd just like to place a few comments on the record vis-a-vis some of the comments made by the Member for Morris and the Member for Pembina. I believe those gentlemen, and especially the Member for Pembina, who at one time was the Minister of Highways, would not want to countenance or continue to countenance the matter of allowing commercial operators to circumvent the law. Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the comments that I've heard today, clearly that's the position he wants to continue, and even the farm community, Sir, has said we don't want the kind of system that was in place to continue because we don't believe that some commercial operators should get the benefits that we, as farmers, do.

So what is the difficulty, in terms of the amendment that the Minister of Highways has put forward, vis-a-vis the use of farm trucks for their neighbours? What is the difficulty with it? What is the difficulty with his amendment? Mr. Deputy Speaker, all the submissions, in terms of the submissions from the farm community on changes to the legislation, in terms of CAP and others, have said we don't want benefits bestowed on people within the industry that should not get them. The Honourable Member for Pembina continues to defend the situation of - I'll put it on the record - the Kleysen situation, because that's basically what he is defending.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina.

Is this a point of order?

MR. D. ORCHARD: This is a point of order. I realize that the Minister of Agriculture doesn't understand the provisions of this.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No member can interrupt any member, unless on a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let the record not show, by the Minister of Agriculture's untrue words, that I support the Kleysen calling under the present provisions. That is simply not true, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

A MEMBER: Oh, yes, it is.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And when a member says something that is not true it has to be corrected. The Minister of Agriculture did not hear me say that in my presentation, but yet he insists on putting it on the record as a falsehood, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it is simply not correct.

I am pointing out to the Minister, and if he listened to me, the problem the Minister of Highways was trying to address was the Kleysen problem. In no way did we support that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the Minister of Agriculture to withdraw the allegations that I supported Kleysen's operations in sugar beet haul because that's simply not true.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not heard a point of order and I don't intend to withdraw my comments. Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the member, who was the former Minister of Transportation, says in this House that he does not countenance the operation that has been carried on by Kleysen's, why didn't he do something about it when he was Minister of Transportation? So he facilitated that kind of movement and the farm community clearly has said we don't want that kind of a situation. We don't want to give benefits to people who are not truly farmers, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't see any difficulty between farmers assisting farmers under this act. The Minister listened to the farm community, said that we will, rather than allowing only three axles as being the limit on a weight limit, we will go the full limit of having five axles or more in terms of farmer assisting farmer, but clearly, Sir, out-of-pocket expenses, fuel costs on a mileage basis. I mean, really, what are out-of-pocket expenses? That is true neighbourliness. Wouldn't you do that? Wouldn't the Member for Pembina do that for his neighbour, because if he won't do that for his neighbour, of charging him the fuel costs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then he will be charging him some compensatory rate, some commercial rate. If he's going to charge him commercial rates, to the farmer who he's helping, what difference does it make? What difference does it make then to the farmer who he's going to charge full rate? It doesn't make any difference.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've only been up several minutes, but I've heard enough baffle-gab and diversion

by the Member for Pembina on this issue that it can't stay on the record. Clearly, the Minister of Highways listened to the farm community and in fact has amended the legislation. Some of the baffle-gab that the Member for Pembina wanted to put on the hog issue and the reciprocity, we will give them reciprocity. We'll give them the Member for Pembina as our trade for reciprocity, in terms of the hog issue. That's what we can do, is give them the Member for Pembina.

The Minister of Highways did not initiate those kind of changes in the reciprocity treatment. It was Minnesota that initiated those changes. I see the Member for Lakeside; I know he wants to move the issue but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those kinds of comments can't be left on the record to confuse the farm community.

If the members opposite are truly saying that farmers will help farmers and be able to just say we will cover our out-of-pocket costs, there is no difficulty. This legislation will clearly assist them, but the Honourable Member for Pembina was Minister of Highways, did nothing to address the problems in the trucking industry and clearly this is one way of dealing with the question.

QUESTION put on Hoist amendment; MOTION lost.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

BILLS NO. 37 and 40 were each read a third time and passed.

**BILL 55 -THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT;
LA LOI SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION
DES ALCOOLS**

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, at 1 o'clock in the morning, when we dealt with certain amendments to this act, one of the amendments that was put forward by the Minister in charge of the Liquor Control Board is the amendment which will now allow the sale of Nevadas and allow the games of chance to be put forward in beverage rooms. At that particular time, I indicated to the Attorney-General that I had certain concerns with regard to that move because I think many of us realize what will happen with regard to the sale of those tickets.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, my question at that time to the Minister, and since it was 1 o'clock in the morning, was whether or not the passing of this amendment meant that the sale of those Nevadas and games of chance, in particular, would be automatic within the beverage rooms once we've passed this act. The Minister at that time indicated that today they would be providing me and the members on this side of the House with an explanation on whether or not, indeed, the beverage rooms would have to make representation to the Lotteries Commission to deal with that, and I would have appreciated having that information before we dealt with this bill.

I just reiterate to members opposite that my concerns were put on the record yesterday, and that is (1) by moving into this field, by allowing the sale of Nevadas within the beverage rooms, you are going to substantially increase the sales of those tickets within those beverage rooms. I want to say to members opposite that right now there is a system in place where the St. Boniface Research people are the ones that benefit from the majority of that money. I would just caution members opposite that if these tickets, and I predict that the ticket sales will probably triple in the next couple of years if you're going to sell them in the beverage rooms, that there is a mechanism in place whereby other groups will be able to tap into some of those funds, because you're going to have a pretty large increase in those sales.

Mr. Speaker, I say to members opposite that I know there are many good reasons to increase the sale of lottery tickets and the former Minister of Lotteries, as well as the new one, realizes that if we really wanted to maximize lotteries revenues we could expand it to a point where we'd be into instant-wins and that type of thing and all facets and make a lot more money. I think there are certain times when all of us want to make sure that the checks and balances are in place with regard to that.

What's happening here is we are taking it one step further and there will be a substantial increase in Nevada sales in the beverage rooms. I say to members opposite that I hope they're fully cognizant and fully aware of the move that they are undertaking at this present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

I'd just like to address a few remarks in third reading debate on this bill with respect to the points that were raised just most recently by the Member for La Verendrye. I think there are a few points with respect to that particular amendment that he's speaking to that should be put on the record, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the situation as it exists right now with the sale of break-open tickets in hotels, in premises, is one that was instituted some time ago, not by this government, but by the previous government with respect to the sale of the break-open tickets.

I think the other point that should be made is that this is only changing inequality, an unfairness that exists at the present time. Because what happens now is that private clubs, legions and others can sell break-open tickets in the licensed area. There are only hotels that aren't allowed to do it. The situation is now that hotels

have somebody immediately outside of the beverage room sitting there selling the break-open tickets.

You know what else, Mr. Speaker? Its unfairness is also in that it does not allow the smaller businessperson, the smaller hotel to have the same kind of privilege that the larger hotels have. The larger hotels can afford to hire somebody to sit outside the beverage room, but in some of the small communities, some of the small hotel owners, that are having in some cases a difficult time to keep their hotels running, are not allowed to do this because they would have to hire somebody to sit outside of the hotel room to sell these tickets. Large hotels can do that, but small hotels cannot do that. So I think that this amendment merely changes an inequality that exists, one between small businesspeople, who I thought members opposite were in support of, and large hotel owners. So it's giving a break to the little guy, to allow the little guy the same opportunity as the large hotels.

Secondly, it changes an inequality that exists between hotels and private clubs such as legions, or army and navy, or other private clubs, or beverage rooms. I note that one member spoke in opposition to this amendment. I wonder where the rest of his colleagues stand on this in terms of fairness and in terms of being in support of small business people in the hotel industry.

I should also point out that representation was not only made by the Hotel Association with respect to this amendment, but also by the Health Research Organization that are the ones that benefit - the Manitoba Research Foundation - the umbrella organization for health research in the Province of Manitoba.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILLS NO. 58 and 60 were each read a third time and passed.

**BILL 72 - THE TEACHERS' PENSIONS
ACT;
LA LOI SUR LA PENSION DE
RETRAITE DES ENSEIGNANTS**

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Education, that Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; loi modifiant la loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak only briefly on this bill because I recognize that members are anxious to complete their responsibilities in this Legislature today, at some point in time, and many of them have predicted an early end to this evening's sitting and so on.

But unfortunately the other day when I was preparing to speak on this bill at Second Reading, I was afflicted by a sudden back problem which caused me to go and see a doctor and did not give me the opportunity to speak on this bill. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that members on the other side have taken great delight

in noticing that members on our side were not exactly united on this particular bill.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side have carefully considered the various aspects of the bill and I have to tell you that it's difficult to know what matter of principle is involved in this bill, because some of us believe that the matter of principle in this bill is that teachers should be allowed to retire at full pension at age 55. Other members believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's not a question of that; it's a question of who should pay for the added costs for the early retirement?

Mr. Speaker, members opposite of course don't have that difficulty. With the number of teachers they have in their caucus, they're in blind, full and total support because obviously this lines their pocket very very much more quickly in the future and . . .

A MEMBER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The last remark by the Leader of the Opposition clearly imputed a motive and a motive of pecuniary interest with regard to the voting record of members on this side of the Chamber. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that allegation.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Thompson will stop his childish shouting, I will be happy to indicate that I believe, that as a matter of principle, that the teachers on that side ought not to be voting for this bill, because I believe they have a vested interest in this bill but that's their decision to make and if they choose, Mr. Speaker, not to see this as a conflict of interest, I will not impute a motive to them and I will say that they need not . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: . . . they need not be concerned with what I have to say with respect to the financial rewards that they might gain as a result of this bill, I'll suggest that has nothing to do with their motives in putting forward this legislation.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I believe that as a matter of principle, they should not be voting on this matter, but that's their decision to make.

I'll go back to the point. They have blindly followed in with the support; they have blindly followed in with the urgings of the many teachers who have heavy influence on this New Democratic administration and they — (Interjection) — the comments of the Attorney-General strike at the heart of the matter. It's listening to only certain particular people and that's the great difficulty that this New Democratic administration finds itself in. Right . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: . . . in their very Cabinet document that they agreed upon on their strategy, they tell us more clearly than anything else what motivates them, Mr. Speaker, and it says, "Concerns of key constituent groups" and obviously in this particular case we're talking about key constituent groups. They believe that the Teachers' Society and its executive are their key constituency, Mr. Speaker, that's the case of the matter and that's where it rests.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are getting me off-track. I've been trying to talk about . . .

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, bring them to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to be short but we have the childish outbursts of the Member for Thompson and many other people who are attempting to get into the fray without standing up to speak. There will be many opportunities for them to stand up and speak.

The problem is that the member can't speak from his feet, he can only speak from his seat because he's always being muzzled, as so many of the others are. Mind you, he has nothing of importance to say when he does stand up, so there's absolutely no point in him going through with it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, rather than blindly support the legislation, as I say, some members on this side have a concern about where the money should come from. Mr. Speaker, I don't regard that as the matter of principle but I think - there's no question that all of us agree - that when we are granting a special privilege to a special group in society, that it would be better not to set the precedent whereby the public taxpayer picks up part of the expense of granting them the opportunity to retire at 55 and full pension.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to agree with the fact that teachers should be allowed to retire at age 55 on full pension. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, and that's why my colleague, the Member for Morris, brought the amendment to committee that would have it being fully funded by the teachers themselves; because in terms of principle, there are many groups in society today who have the right to early retirement at full pension.

For instance, members of the police force can retire at 45 on full pension; the City of Winnipeg Police; members of Armed Forces can retire anywhere from 45 to 55, depending on rank, Mr. Speaker, on full pension; members of the RCMP in their forties can retire on full pension.

Those things, I believe are established, and I see nothing wrong with teachers being allowed that privilege. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that being put in that preferred category, there ought to be some onus on their part to pay the full costs of retiring at 55, the added full costs that are incumbent by that.

There are other programs available; the Early Retirement Incentive Programs that have been brought in by other school divisions, Mr. Speaker. You know we can talk about the burnout, we can talk about the desire to get young teachers in and all of those things are relevant. I think all of those things are supportable and laudable that the Minister of Education has pointed out in the course of debate on the bill, but I do believe that when teachers are being singled out for special treatment in this regard they should be willing to pay for the entire cost of the early retirement option on their part, the extra cost of retiring early at age 55.

I think that the members opposite and the Minister of Education have made an error by blindly following the dictates of the leadership of the Manitoba Teachers' Society on this matter, because I think that this gives an incorrect perception for one thing, the perception that only certain groups will be given special treatment by this administration and the perception that all of the other people who work very diligently and very hard in society - people who work as farmers, people who work as small business people, people who work in factories, people who work in many ways in contributing to our society - are not given this entitlement, are not given this opportunity.

I believe that by singling out only certain people for this particular incentive, for this particular privilege - and it is indeed a privilege - that probably all people in society would like to have. I think it's acceptable to say that this group is entitled to it and deserves it for all of the commitments that they make and the services that they render to society, but I believe that it would have much better for the added costs to have been fully funded by the teachers themselves, to ensure that other people in society weren't angered and offended by it.

I say to you, as you go throughout the province, all those people who work on the factory floors, who work as labourers, as skilled tradesmen, as farmers, as engineers, or whatever have you; all of them would like that privilege. I say this is a dangerous precedent for the government to set for one group who are totally within the employ of, in essence, the government, because they are.

If the funding for education comes largely from the Government of Manitoba, the control and jurisdiction and all of the things come from the Province of Manitoba and this is really a major group of people who are employed almost totally, in effect, by the Government of Manitoba, and they are being given retirement at full pension at age 55.

Now it doesn't take too much logic to recognize that this will be a serious item of bargaining for the MGEA in the not too distant future, that this will be a serious item of bargaining for the organization of professional engineers employed by the Province of Manitoba, for people who work in our hospitals and health care institutions, for all of those different areas. I suggest that the Minister would have been far better off to say, fine, we'll accept all of the reasons why there is a positive thing for society in allowing teachers to retire at full pension at age 55, but I believe that we have to say in fairness that you people should pick up the added cost 100 percent, not just 70 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it gives the impression that every time the Teachers' Society barks, the Minister jumps and

her colleagues go with them, and it gives the perception that their priorities are misplaced; that rather than talk about quality of education, about standards, about improving all of the things that we want to improve for our children and our grandchildren and the people who must be educated in the future; rather, all we're interested in is giving extra privileges, in a financial and economic sense, to a group in society who are already comparatively well treated by society.

Now I used to say, when I was younger - in fact when I was going through high school - that teachers were terribly underpaid and I believe that to be the case. I believe that teachers deserved a great deal more and I have been supportive of teachers being better and better and better treated in an economic sense over the past couple of decades, because I believe they're entitled to it and they're deserving of it.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Education has done nothing but concentrate on the union-oriented issues with respect to the Teachers' Society over the past couple of years. The things such as tenure, transferability and portability of tenure, and all of those things that she was dealing with in the past couple of years, have not been things that were designed to improve our quality of education, our standards of the training of our young people; they have been designed only to aim at the economic welfare of the teachers.

I say that that perception is unfortunate because I know that many teachers, many of my friends who are teachers, would prefer to be discussing and talking about and supporting things to do with improved standards and capability of education. They wouldn't want it to be perceived that all they're interested in is the economic side of their well-being, and yet that seems to be where the Minister of Education and her colleagues' priorities are and I think that's unfortunate. I think to overcome that perception, she would have been better off to suggest to them that in bringing in this privilege of retirement at full pension at 55, they should have at least paid 100 percent of the additional costs of that added move.

Mr. Speaker, I say as well that she said, well, this was the best deal we could negotiate. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean that there isn't a better deal to be negotiated. Both from a perception standpoint and from an economic standpoint for the Province of Manitoba, the best deal would have been an agreement that they pick up all of the costs of this added privilege in gaining retirement at full pension at age 55 because I believe, Sir, that that in all respects would have overcome the concerns of everybody on this side as well as many of the people throughout the province to say, who will never be able to get this privilege or if not, for many many decades to come who worked very hard, who put in their time and effort to pay taxes for this administration and of course for the education costs of this province because so much of their taxes go to pay for education today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that I support the principle of giving the teachers the opportunity to retire at age 55 and for that reason I support this bill. I regret that it wasn't structured in a way that would have seen the full costs of it transferred or being picked up totally by the teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

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

My comments will be very brief. My leader has put on the record extremely well the various viewpoints that we've had on this issue from this side.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly review certain aspects of Bill 72. The compliance section was acceptable to everyone on this side. That was the law of the land and the changes that referred to compliance were totally acceptable to everyone, even though at this time we're beginning to realize the true costs of the pension changes that came into law one or two years ago, but that was totally acceptable.

The change in part-time pension reform was totally acceptable to everybody on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. The revenue guarantee aspect of it, the Minister has dwelt upon that issue completely and it was one of the ones that I daresay we had the greatest difficulty with. The Minister has spoken volumes as to how the province has made such a good deal because they've traded away the revenue guarantees.

As my leader has just said, what they've traded away and brought into place is the massive precedent of government funding at age 55. Nobody on this side is opposed to any individual in society, any group in society retiring at age 55, indeed at age 50 or 45, whatever age they choose within their democratically elected associations to strike upon, not one of us.

But the omnibus nature of the bill, where the government brought in two or three very fine parts and yet brought in a major precedent whereby government would now fund, at age 55, was unacceptable to some.

I wouldn't have spoken at all, Mr. Speaker, but my cousin, a teacher from British Columbia, was in Winnipeg today - I had lunch with her within this building - and I asked her about the pension provisions in existence in British Columbia; full pension retirement at age 55. But do you know how many years service, Mr. Speaker? Not 30, but 35. Manitoba is leading the way on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour claps. Then why didn't he bring it in at 50 years? — (Interjection) — That's right, and that was the other comment that I was going to make, Mr. Speaker. The Bennett Government - and I'm not in any way supporting what they've done - in the month of June passed legislation on the last teaching day whereby they could dismiss teachers, terminate teachers unilaterally. Mr. Speaker, I'm not advocating that and nobody from this side is; but the point is, when you're government and you're boxed into the corner that you are, you do desperate things. That's what my leader was pointing out to the Minister of Education and to members opposite. Don't tie the hands of government severely by this precedent motion of funding retirement from teaching at age 55. None of us are opposed to anybody retiring at that age.

So, Mr. Speaker, I only put that on the record because I honestly believe that within the teaching profession across Canada there is a concerted effort to move forward from the viewpoint of the teachers in certain jurisdictions and Manitoba has been picked to take the first step in this area of offering total pension reform. The Minister calls it reform. Mr. Speaker, I can't debate that at this time, but 30 years commitment to profession and then full formula retirement at age 55.

Mr. Speaker, I know the debate has been long on the issue. It's raged in some respects, but I think it was important that I put the comments on the record.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I just feel it's important to put a few points on the record, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, and I'm glad that point was raised about what's happening in B.C. You know, they fired 2,000 teachers. They don't have to retire them when you fire 2,000 teachers, with no cause. I would much rather have the system we have where we are protecting jobs of teachers and all other people in all other fields and bringing in progressive legislation like this that will, in a very good way, open up job opportunities for our young people.

One of the points I want to remind the members, because they consistently like to say that we're doing it for our friends or doing it for teachers, I have never had so much response from such a wide range of people in and out of the education community supporting this legislation. I mean, 42 school divisions have written letters in support, and last night we had both the representatives of the Superintendents Association and the Trustees Association putting on record their total support for this legislation.

I mean, it's not just the teachers saying that we want this for ourselves, it's all of the educational groups and communities - the major ones concerned and responsible for education - saying this is good legislation, not just for the teachers, good for the education system, good for our young people who want jobs.

We have about 30 or 40 schools and the other groups - there's a number of groups and I can't remember all of them - but the Status of Women, Retired Women Teachers Association, Hanover Association of Principals, all of the students from all of the universities — (Interjection) — Hanover, yes Hanover Association.

So just to sum up, the point I want to make, I'm responding to the suggestion of the members opposite, that this was just done. It was in the interests of teachers and it's just done for the teachers. Everybody that shares responsibility for the education system knows that what was done is going to benefit the children, the quality of education and the education system.

When we say we negotiated, I didn't say the best deal we could - that sort of suggests we took what we could get - we negotiated the best deal you could possibly get when you're negotiating a deal like this and they're not just paying for it. I remind the members I think their amendment said that we should be paying, that the teachers should be paying for the early retirement penalty removal, and we don't disagree with that. We said to them when we were bargaining, this is a major benefit and we have to negotiate because the costs should not be borne by the taxpayers, so that was one of our basic principles during the negotiations.

We negotiated so that the \$6.2 million - I started on their amendment - their amendment said teachers should be paying for compliance. You didn't separate the early retirement penalty and say teachers should be carrying the whole costs of that? You said they should be carrying all the costs of the whole package.

Now teachers are people. The compliance issues are basic reforms that are required under The Pensions

Act and teachers are as entitled to them as anybody else in the Province of Manitoba. There's a law of Manitoba and all of the people in the province are entitled to get them, so regardless of what the members opposite think of the teachers in our province and of the teaching profession - because I have never heard so many negative things said about teachers in terms of the malignment and the negative charges that they have made about our teaching profession - they are people and they are entitled to the same basic rights that everybody else is.

Now I don't disagree with the point that they should be paying for the penalty. I think that's what you really wanted to say but you didn't know how to get it into your amendment, that you think they should pay for the penalty, \$6.5 million, \$6.2 million. What did we do? We negotiated a deal that says the teachers are going to pay all the costs, theirs and ours in the first five years; and apart from that we removed the revenue guarantee clause, that the actuary says in his recent report, would have cost the Province of Manitoba \$75 million, and would have put an additional \$75 million into the pension plan.

Now there's nobody in this Chamber that can argue with, I think, the actuary figures, because he is the person that knows and the figures that we have to accept.

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

MR. C. MANNES: I wonder if I can just ask the Minister a very small short question?

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, just on the \$75 million; is that present or actual?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's all of the figures that we quote because of the way the fund is set up, is present value. — (Interjection) — So what we've got is a \$6.5 million cost on the one side and a \$75 million potential saving that would have been money the government would have had to pay right out of their pocket. Now how can you get a better deal than that, Mr. Speaker? You can't. The taxpayers of this province are going to be better off because of what we negotiated and the education system is definitely going to be better off.

I think there's one other point I want to make and I think this is the only opportunity I've had to put it on the record. I have had some concerns all the way along during the Estimates Debate about the negative statements made about teachers and made about the teaching profession. I mentioned this before. — (Interjection) — It's related to the bill.

So I want to go on record as saying, I disassociate myself from all those comments that are made. I think there is no basis for them; that teachers are a professional group of people doing a very good job with a lot of credibility; and I reject the negative and the maligning comments that are made by the members

opposite and have been all along about the teaching profession.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILLS NO. 73, 78 and 82 were each read a third time and passed.

BILL 85 - THE HEALTH SERVICES INSURANCE ACT (2); LA LOI SUR L'ASSURANCE-MALADIE (2)

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act (2); Loi modifiant la loi sur l'assurance-maladie (2), for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the bills that we honestly believe that the Minister and the Department of Health and the government has not given due and adequate consideration to. Mr. Speaker, in saying so, we're not unmindful of the very serious problem that delivery of health care present to any jurisdiction, not only here in Manitoba but across this country, in our efforts to maintain as we all want to maintain the very best of health care.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the government and this Minister has shown a rather callous attitude towards the College of Physicians and Surgeons that has served the people of Manitoba and this province well and that were not shown a great deal of courtesy, to put it politely, when they were here to listen to the reasons why this government was proceeding with this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, most important of all is what the longer-term consequences of this will have with respect to specific health care to the Manitoba citizens who are in need of it. Are we going to be encouraging people to go to Rochester, or to go across the line because they can't wait for the services? Mr. Speaker, if this government and this Minister doesn't like the word health "rationing", then at least address yourself to the real problem here.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that Bill No. 85 not be read now but six months hence.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take a great deal of time because the Minister — (Interjection) — Well, with that kind of encouragement over there to take a lot of time, maybe I will take a lot of time.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't have the opportunity to discuss with the Minister or, more importantly, members of his staff when people in opposition from the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the MMA and private individuals were at committee speaking to this bill

because there was no one representing the bill at committee. I appreciate the Minister, who is probably not supposed to be out that late at night for whatever reasons, but I found it offensive. My leader has indicated to the Minister that at least an attempt should have been made to have somebody from the Health Services Commission there to listen to the concerns, to give the Minister some idea of what the questions were and what the answers were as well as the formal presentation. But that wasn't there and that was an oversight on the Minister, an oversight on the government. It's part of the kind of organization that we've gotten in winding down this Session from the government in that we had what? - 25 or 27 bills to deal with and we went through the entire group of presentations in basically one evening on all those bills and it lasted till 2:00 in the morning. At that stage of the game, those individuals from the MMA, the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the private physicians who were there spent some six hours waiting for their opportunity to speak and address comments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated in reply to questions that the capabilities in the majority that are contained in Bill 85 already exist. The Public Health Act has part of them and the Health Services Commission by regulation have part of them. There is nothing basically changing substantively in this bill according to the Minister. That being the case, Sir, then we have repeatedly asked on this side of the House, why is the legislation coming forward? It would appear as if the legislation was brought forward without the kind of consultation that it needed. The Minister will say "not true." He indicates to me that I had a phone call and he has knowledge of that phone call from one of the groups who had concerns over it. That individual indicated and clarified to me what his meaning was of the "no consultation" that was indicated at the hearing that night. I accept that individual's explanation; he probably explained the same thing to the Minister. I'm not sure.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, what we have, and of course we're not going to get this Minister to acknowledge the fact, in Bill 85 is the government's ability - Before I get into this, I acknowledge the Minister recognized one flaw in the legislation in that he, with this legislation as originally drafted, was removing the standards from the College of Physicians and Surgeons. It could well have been interpreted that way in required amendment to assure that the standard setting that has been in place, and served the province quite well, contrary to comments from the Member for River East, and the health care community quite well, that those maintenance of standards still remain with the college.

Mr. Speaker, what anyone who looks at this bill must conclude is that it is necessitated by this Minister's often enunciated analysis of where the expenditures in health care are going. He points, as he's done since the UMM Convention in November of last fall, where costs are going to, I believe, get up to \$3 billion - I think is the figure he uses - by the year 2000 in health care just doing the things that we're doing now. What the legislation that we've got in Bill 85 is doing is taking the MHSC which is currently the paymaster, if you will, and conferring under them licensing capabilities, the ability to determine if and when labs can operate new

ones and, as well, the ability to revoke the licence on existing labs. That's in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, given the circumstance that to date the present abilities within legislation and regulation that the Minister already has, that have existed for a number of years, have seemingly served the diagnostic laboratory provision of service reasonably well because I reiterate, the Minister did not point out any shortcomings in that process of operation of diagnostic lab. The only thing he pointed to in his introductory remarks was the escalating costs, which haven't escalated any greater, indeed less, than other lines in his Estimates over the 10-year period he chose to use as an example.

So, Mr. Speaker, given that the Minister didn't identify any need and he hasn't really identified any need for this legislation, we must conclude that this is the first step that this Minister and this government are taking. I think the Minister maybe knows it, but probably his colleagues don't understand what he's given them, this is the Minister's first step in being able to ration the service that's available and ration the availability of medical care in Manitoba through this legislation. I don't expect his colleagues to understand that's the ability conferred in this bill, I don't expect that. But the Minister, I think, understands what he's doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us, Minister included, and I don't think there's an MLA in this House that over the last number of months, maybe a year, two years have not had a number of calls from constituents and concerned people about the waiting time for some diagnostic tests. CAT scan and ultrasound are the ones that are most often referred to and in Estimates we know we are below what is the national average in terms of the capability of providing CAT scans to the Manitoba public. We should have at least one more.

Ultrasound, my memory doesn't serve me as to whether we're within the recommended national standard on there, but we have significant waits for both of those procedures. Particularly with CAT scan, we're dealing with a diagnostic procedure involved in probably the most hideous disease that anyone can contact, that being cancer, where people through mental stability, cannot tolerate a four to six to eight-week delay for the scheduling of CAT scanning.

Now I just want to tell the Minister - and I haven't checked my message board because I got in late this afternoon - but I had his department, the MHSC, checking out one individual's extreme concern about the change in policy that the Minister in MHSC has put forward in terms of availability of out-of-province service, namely individuals going down to the Mayo Clinic - I had an individual phone me who, for the last several years at least, has been going to the Mayo for her medical requirements. Those in the past have been covered and she believes with a fervour that I have not run into with any other individual that's called me, that she is probably alive today because of the Mayo Clinic and doesn't want to give that right up; but with the new policy that's in place of the last several months, she is going to the Mayo Clinic this weekend at entirely her own expense.

She needed an ultrasound for comparison from several months back when she last was down there to have this diagnostic procedure of ultrasound done. She needed another one to track the progress as to whether

she needs this surgery and she couldn't get it in Manitoba because her physician didn't think that she needed it; so as a result, she's going down there at entirely her own expense.

Mr. Speaker, one can appreciate, when you start examining the Department of Health and where the costs are going, one can appreciate some of the moves the Minister is making and that all governments are probably going to have to make because of the escalating cost and the technology that's in place in terms of diagnostic procedures. They are very expensive; they are consuming and will continue to consume fairly substantial dollars in the budget. Mr. Speaker, it was because of that, that the policy was changed whereby you couldn't go down without some pretty stringent approvals - you can no longer go out of province, for instance, to the Mayo Clinic to have those tests and other procedures done, and this individual is one example. There are, no doubt, many others.

Mr. Speaker, I can see the problem the Minister is faced with. He does not have the ability to go to Treasury Board as even our Minister of Health did from '78 to 1981 and get double digit increases in the budget which we were able to do, and at that time we were coming in at as little as a \$36 million deficit. Today, circumstances have changed. We are running \$500 million deficits and this Minister only comes with 2 percent and 3 percent increases in his Health budget. The crunch is on.

I think there is a growing recognition that the crunch is on. The Minister is talking that the crunch is on and the Minister is legislating, knowing the crunch is on; and what we have in this legislation is restrictive legislation which will provide financial control to the government on diagnostic testing procedures and financial control on the diagnostic labs. This is a budgetary piece of legislation, not a medical piece of legislation, because it is conferring to the Minister and to the MHSC the ability to determine needs, not needs as to the provision of health care, but needs as to meeting the budget of the MHSC and the dollars that are allocated to this Minister from the Minister of Finance. That's the need that is being met with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is an attempt to ration medical services in the Province of Manitoba. Currently they are being rationed simply because it takes four to six to eight weeks to undertake an ultrasound diagnostic procedure or a CAT scan. That currently is our method of rationing, and it exists.

Now with this control being conferred and tightened up, no new labs will be approved unless the need of the Commission is met, i.e., that they have the dollars to fund them; and that includes, Sir, the installation of new ultrasound equipment in various hospitals or clinics.

This legislation will allow the MHSC, by their criteria of need, i.e., the budget, to say yes or no. Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer will be no because the budget won't allow it. So I think if we honestly deal with what this bill is conferring to the Minister and to the government, we will recognize and Manitobans will recognize that it is restrictive legislation designed to enable this government, and indeed future governments, to meet and control the budget by rationing diagnostic services. So, Mr. Speaker, that is

why I would prefer, and my colleague, the Opposition House Leader has put the six month hoist on this legislation.

We do not believe from the presentations that were made at 2:00 a.m. Wednesday morning that the Minister has undertaken sufficient consultation with the MMA and with the College of Physicians and Surgeons to bring this legislation forward at this time; and we believe that consultation should take place and maybe at the next Session the Minister can more adequately explain the need for this legislation because he hasn't done it to date.

When you have the major providers of medical services in the province coming to a committee meeting, as they did on Tuesday of this week, and sitting as professional people from 8:00 in the evening - and some of them were there for the morning Session even at 10:00 in the morning - sitting from 8:00 in the evening to 2:30 in the morning, the next morning, to make their concerns known to the Committee and to the members of government on that Committee, Mr. Speaker, I think that shows that the people affected by this legislation and the people with the knowledge of where the system of medical health and health care delivery is going in the province expressed the kind of concerns they did, I think it's something the Minister and this government should listen to very seriously and should go back to the drawingboard with this legislation at the next Session. Because I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, the Minister will agree that there's nothing in this legislation that he can't already do, so we don't need it right now.

We don't need to have the restrictive ability there until we know where we are able to go, until the Minister is able to stand up in the House, or preferably at the next set of Estimates, next consideration of the Department of Health Estimates, where we can have an open and full discussion on this; because even debating legislation there is some restriction because I can't back and forth ask this Minister a series of questions for an hour-and-a-half or two hours, that's not practical in debate on legislation. But in Health Estimates that happens and we can get to the answers and members in his caucus and members in my caucus can better understand where we're going. When we understand where we're going, the people of Manitoba will better understand where we're going.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, at the present time I think it is premature for the Minister to insist that this legislation go forward. I think it needs to be held pending the next Session but, more importantly, held pending some very serious discussions that the Minister and the MHSC should have with the MMA, with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. That appears to be not have been undertaken in an adequate and complete fashion so that we quite frankly believe that this bill should not be proceeded with. We think that it would be in the interest of all members of this House and the people of Manitoba that the bill not be proceeded with. It doesn't prevent anything from happening. The Minister still has the majority of the abilities under current legislation that he's conferring on the department with this bill, but he doesn't have the ability to severely restrict and ration as given in Bill 85.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I hope that members opposite, maybe they'll want to take a five-minute recess. I don't know. — (Interjection) — Maybe

they would want to consider on this side of the House we would be quite willing to break off for five or 10 minutes while members in government ask their Minister of Health if they really need to proceed with Bill 85 because there were some of the members over there were present at Committee at 2:00 in the morning and heard the concerns. They were legitimate concerns - and we're not talking about a Highway Traffic Act which the Minister of Highways has bungled which doesn't really affect the health and the well-being of people - we're talking about an act that has impact on the health of Manitobans. It's much more important that the government give serious consideration to not proceeding with this bill rather than Bill 19 as we tried to get them to not proceed with it.

So I would welcome the opportunity if the government so wishes to talk it over for five or 10 minutes to understand what they're doing, to understand that it's not necessary to proceed; and to understand that they could come back after having more open consultation and discussion with the MMA, the College and individuals who are affected by this legislation.

I know, and the Minister as well will know that the Manitoba Association of Lab Technologists have a great deal of concern about this legislation. I can't say whether they have had any consultation with the MHSC on it. I can't say whether they have - the Minister is nodding his head - We won't get into the Minister's method of consultation. The Minister's consultation is an interesting process, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Well, your consultation quite often is awful, Mr. Minister, and I hear that on a regular basis. We heard it on Tuesday night or Wednesday morning that your consultation was not acceptable. I know you'll attempt to answer that as you attempt to answer the consultation you had with the chiropractors. Let's not get into that debate because you'll lose that one.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister should very seriously sit down with this caucus and should talk over the necessity of this bill because we understand this Minister sometimes. We could easily accommodate the government an opportunity to discuss for this Minister the necessity of this bill. He will tell you in Cabinet and in the governing caucus that he has no ability that he doesn't already have in legislation. But what he will tell you if he is completely frank is that this bill allows him to control the budget for diagnostic services and, thereby, to ration the availability of that kind of service to the people of Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that members in government might want to seriously consider the implications of legislation which has the net upshot of giving the government and this Minister the ability to ration health care. He might want to give that some second thoughts before proceeding with it.

So with those comments, I fully support the motion put forward by my House Leader to defer this legislation for another six months pending consultation with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the MMA so this government and Cabinet and caucus of government have a better understanding of what they're proposing and where they're going with this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

I just wanted to make a couple of comments on the resolution motion before us and also on the Main motion.

Firstly, I want to say that I'm in opposition to the motion that's been put forward with respect to the hoist of the bill for six months which would, in effect, kill it.

Secondly, by a principle, I must support the bill, Mr. Speaker, and also indicate that as one who did sit through the Committee hearings that night and listened to the delegation - as much has been made of the fact that the Minister of Health unfortunately wasn't there - I did have the opportunity to listen to the delegations. I did have the opportunity of having discussions prior to the introduction of the bill and after, in fact, that very morning with the Minister of Health, I'm satisfied that this bill is one worth supporting.

I'd also like to make one other comment, Mr. Speaker, and that is with respect to some of the general comments that the Member for Pembina is saying with respect to this Minister of Health, I would suggest that in terms of this bill and in terms of other bills relating to health and in terms to the health care system in this province, that we have one of the finest health care systems in the country here in the Province of Manitoba, and a good deal of the credit goes to this Minister of Health contrary to the comments of the Member for Pembina.

So I am opposed to the motion of hoist, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the opposition for their kind offer of a five-minute recess. I appreciate that very much but I must decline. I must also say that I do not intend to support their amendment, not because we have the majority here; because I am convinced that . . . I don't know. Listen to my speech. I won't try to tell you why half of the Cabinet is in favour and half is against, like your leader did. I promise not to do that. But in the meantime let me tell you this, I would hope that we can be serious for a minute because this is very serious. I thank the honourable members who spoke - I think that they did so sincerely - but I want them to reflect a bit on what is at stake here. I think it is very important.

First of all let me say that in the new few years especially, the Minister of Health of any government will not win any popularity contest, I can tell you that and my honourable friend is absolutely right. I can tell you this that my honourable friend from Pembina is absolutely right. I've been saying and I will keep on repeating, I think the first thing that the people of Manitoba will have to appreciate, first of all the program that we have here in health, in Canada, and in Manitoba, which I think in general is second to none in the world. I think they'll have to — (Interjection) — You couldn't give me a better lead. I'll go and kiss you after this just for . . . Not you, I wouldn't kiss you, you'd have your moustache . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the situation is, as I've said, that I will keep on trying and I hope that

many of you do try to explain and make the people of Manitoba conscious of the cost of this good service that we have, because you know the more you have, the more expectancy there is out there.

Now my honourable friend beat me to it, he said, what about the deficit?

A MEMBER: He said it's tied to the deficit.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right, the deficit. I want to say in advance, that I'm not running this opposition down. When I say it's one of the most conservative . . . Well, for the next five minutes, all right? I would say that the opposition is one of the most right wing that there is in Canada right now; and I would say that they are constantly telling us, like the Honourable Member for Morris, what about the deficit? Well, let me explain that a deficit is brought about by people leading in debt usually. That is called a deficit. When you've got enough debt; it's a deficit. All right.

Well I'm saying it as a fact also, that there is a deficit and that you people say, you bet, and you're absolutely right. There is a deficit and that's something that concerns all of us, and supposedly more so the people on the other side, because we are usually the ones that throw money at problems. Remember we throw money and you say — (Interjection) — All right, that's good, everybody agreed, I heard yep, yep, yep, all over the place, and everybody agrees on that.

Now after this is the taxes. You know how you love taxes.

A MEMBER: No you do.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, all right, I'm sorry. You don't want taxes and you don't want deficit and we are the ones that throw money at problems and we like taxes, all right, okay. You know pretty soon, you'll be sitting here and I'll be out there and . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're right. Absolutely, absolutely, because you will be supporting this bill, because you will be asking for this bill and many more. I'm doing you a big favour on this. — (Interjection) — Why? He hasn't heard your speech, he was away in his office. He hasn't heard you at all, so he's going to twirl your moustache again if you're not careful.

Mr. Speaker, we've established then that you think we have high taxes and you don't like the debts; but you want more. Every single one of you have advocated more in the field of health, either a personal care home, a hospital for Vita, or . . .

A MEMBER: A baseball park.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You know you might be the closest one to it all, that might be the best thing for sanity anyway, if we had a baseball park around here. You know, Mr. Speaker, they're throwing me off constantly.

Mr. Speaker, we've established then the high cost of health care. We've established the taxes, we don't like taxes and we don't like deficits, and that is one of the

main reasons why this bill is so important. I won't play games; I'll be very candid. You put the meaning — (Interjection) — You really know how to hurt a guy.

Mr. Chairman - see I'm calling you Chairman - Mr. Speaker, the situation is this and I'll be very very candid. My honourable friend — (Interjection) — Can you clean up the Chamber so I can make my speech, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can see your amendment is very very serious. I can see it in your face. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious you're not very serious with this amendment. It's okay to have fun but you don't want to hear the answer.

A MEMBER: Call it to the vote.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You don't want to hear what I say; you want us to call it to vote right now? Is that what you're saying? You don't want to hear my answer?

A MEMBER: I want to hear your answer, so I can respond, tell us.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right, that's what I was trying to do. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that yes, it is to control, to make sure that there's no duplication, mushrooming or proliferation of labs. And we would be doing exactly what we have been doing in the past, nothing more and nothing less. But you are right, somebody mentioned this afternoon that with enshrining the Bill of Rights and so on, it's a different ball game; and right now if it goes to the court, I would think - like many other things that we've had to bring in legislation like B.C. had to bring in legislation on certain things - that the courts would decide the standards are there.

I've recognized, we've talked about that, not only after their presentation but before in Second Reading. I told them there would be some changes, that we realized that the language could be misleading and wanted to make sure that the people that had the right and that had been delegated or mandated by the legislation to look after the standards, was the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and there's no problem there.

But the situation is that if then that anybody can open a lab, providing the standards would be all right, what would you have? And think about this seriously. This is all that has to happen, that you could have one at every corner of every street, you can have problems. Oh I know you say that now and that's probably what they said before they had - and we have, for instance, too many doctors in certain areas of the country, in the province, and not enough in other areas. That is a big problem in every province, mostly in B.C., Alberta and Ontario, and for a Conservative, or at least a right-wing government, B.C. brought in quite a bit of legislation on that and then when they were ruled out, when the courts decided that their legislation wasn't valid for some reason or other because of the Bill of Rights, they brought in other legislation and there has to be a bit of that. You can't go out paying for everything.

Remember, we said we didn't want the high taxes; we don't want the debt. I don't think anybody who's

talking is advocating that we should bring back the premiums. We just brought in legislation that was supported by everybody that there'd be no extra billing. — (Interjection) — You didn't support me - hurry up, make up your mind. Mr. Speaker, some of the provinces now have given up and said we can't afford Medicare. Some of the provinces are saying that now and that's exactly what we're trying to do, is trying to get the best for the bucks that we're spending. Well, if that's a crime, I say to the Member for Arthur, well, then I'm guilty because we have a responsibility to see that we get the best for our dollars, to see that there's no abuse and there are all kinds of things that can be done.

We have an advisory committee, a standing committee that will advise the government, and that's the way we've been operating for years, that the former government operated like that before. Before there was no challenge to the system then. If you're right in saying that we should not do that, then you're not on your toes, because you should decide that only standards are sufficient for the people to be able to open a personal care home even if it's in short service and the same for hospitals and the same thing for everything else.

You have all been mentioning again that the need for more facilities such as CAT scan - and I agree with you and this is one of the reasons. We haven't got all the answers. I wish the heck I did and there are so many difficult things that we'll have — (Interjection) — Well, I've got that answer. I know that would be the biggest mistake ever if I could see you in this portfolio, because you would be so mixed up by worrying about premiums and wanting to give more services. In fact, you are probably less conservative than the rest of them. You're a socialist; you want the farmers to get everything for nothing. You're the biggest socialist free-enterprising farmer that I've ever heard of. You want even their loans to be given for nothing and you want everything.

So, Mr. Speaker, I guess we welcome the levity, but it is a serious thing, and the situation is that we can not let this thing get out of control. I'll give you some examples. You might have, for instance, in a rural area, you might have a lab in a hospital, somebody comes in, decides to set up a clinic and build a lab and you know there's not going to be enough business for the two of them. What's going to happen? One is going to go out of business anyway or they're both going to go ahead and try to pay for - and that will be a temptation - the equipment and so on and then start asking for more and more. You think that automatically more means better, and it is not true at all, especially in the field of health. More doesn't automatically mean better. — (Interjection) — Well, I have nothing to do with that department.

The situation - you have to be very careful. Look at what happens in the States on the same CAT scan that you're talking about. There are some hospitals with 50 beds and I can give you the name of that hospital, privately, that has a CAT scan because the competition is so great. You are saying that we changed to allow that, now that the people can't go to . . .

A MEMBER: It's the private system that you don't like and it's got CAT scan.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Did I say anything against the private system? What did I say? — (Interjection) — Oh, I usually do. I was talking French. How the hell do you know what I was talking about? You understand? No, you might understand French, but not Frenchmen, I'll tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is that that can't be allowed to go. You might have the same thing in the hospitals. The next thing, people would want to own CAT scan, would want to own some of these things. If we're going to have a battle on that, let's have it. If you are in favour of privatization of the health care, say so, and — (Interjection) — that's what it looks like.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And I was too good. I said more doesn't necessarily mean better, that's what I said. The situation is that you go to the States, for instance, you said we've changed the regulations that we don't automatically, because if you phone the Commission, in many instances, you can have a service insured, but you have to make sure — (Interjection) — Oh, yes, yes, yes. The situation is that you can't go any more and have all the tests that you were going to have, and you all agreed with me. The other afternoon you agreed with me before that, yes, it's true they were having all these tests because of the malpractice insurance in the States and they had to cover up for them. They'll be the first one to admit they don't like that, but they have to do every single thing and it's ridiculous, because, yes, the Member for La Verendrye admitted it. To say that there has been no consultation, that is not true.

I wasn't going to discuss the phone call. Those are personal things that I don't usually discuss publicly, but you mentioned it and the only reason I didn't talk to that person at all was because he called staff and he said you were making a big thing out of it and he wanted to make sure that you understood.

Now we went further than we should have. I confess, mea culpa, that is not something that is usually done that you give a proposed bill to somebody else, to anybody, and we did that. Of course, they weren't free to mail it to every member of their association, but there was some discussion with the Commission; there was some discussion with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, so that was done and it comes to that.

It's obvious, if you're saying that we should privatize the health care, we don't agree with that, very very strongly oppose that. You won't believe this, but as far as I'm concerned, it's certainly not for any ideology reason at all. I don't think it works, I think it would be too costly and we certainly intend to vote against this resolution. We think it's a bill that might not be popular. It's something that has to be done and any Minister of Health, the Minister of Health of the future, will have many more harder decisions to make than that or we will lose the system completely or the public will have to pay for it because there'll be a lot more reductions and many more things that will be de-insured.

I ask you to think again because the future is at stake and you can not live with that. Think again, and I'm sure that you will want to withdraw this resolution and support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in addressing the Teachers' Pensions Bill, I don't intend to be lengthy. Members opposite might perhaps convince me otherwise, but I wanted to address a few comments to this bill and I'll say that I regret - and I don't say this in a negative critical way - about the Minister of Health because I said the other evening when he was not able to stay with us until the late hours, and indeed we were discussing this bill at 2:30 a.m., and I recognize with health concerns he should not have been there and I did not criticize him for not listening to the presentations that were there.

I was critical, however, that no senior member of his staff was there to listen to some excellent presentations by representatives of the MMA, of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and medical practitioners in this province, who had some valid and, I thought, reasonable comments to make on this bill.

If the Minister thinks that members on this side are not serious when we say that this bill ought to be hoisted, ought not to be dealt with; he's dead wrong, because we are serious. This is a bad bill, Mr. Speaker, in many different ways. It seeks to do things that are inappropriate from a viewpoint of health care in this province. It essentially is a rationing of health care services in this province, particularly diagnostic and laboratory services in this province which, in many ways, are one of the most valuable tools that the health care profession has.

They can be extremely cost effective in the sense that as was said before us in committee, many more people could possibly be treated in out-patient settings if proper diagnostic and laboratory testing facilities were available, so that the cause of their problems could be identified, so that we could avoid the necessity of hospitalizing these people for lengthy periods of time because we weren't sure what the ailment was.

It can be extremely cost efficient to have proper diagnostic facilities and, Mr. Speaker, I implore the Minister of Health to listen, if only briefly, to what I am saying. Because one of the prime rationales that I have heard, in fact the only rationale that I have heard from this Minister, is that there must be the opportunity, ultimately, to control what he says is the proliferation of diagnostic and laboratory facilities in this province, otherwise it'll get right out of hand and we won't be able to afford to provide quality health care.

Well I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not a situation that he should put himself, or worse, the MHSC into in the sense that the decisions on whether or not laboratory testing and diagnostic facilities are required, should not be left to the accountants, to the controllers, to the bean-counters of this province, to the bureaucrats of this province, they should be and have to be made by the health care professionals of this province, because only they can judge whether or not somebody needs to have a laboratory test or a diagnostic process in order to ensure that they know what the ailment is and how it can be best treated, most cost effectively and most efficiently, and the Minister is totally ignoring that, Mr. Speaker.

He is suggesting the only thing that's important is that we shouldn't have too many labs, we shouldn't

have too many CAT scans, we shouldn't have too many ultrasound units because that's bad because it costs us money. Mr. Speaker, what's important is that we can properly diagnose, so we can test to positively identify what the ailments are and we can treat them as efficiently and as effectively as possible. The last thing we need is somebody hospitalized, occupying a bed at immense cost to the province, because we haven't been able to determine what the problem is.

I know a former member of this Legislature, somebody known to many people here, who was on his deathbed - and I say this not as a criticism of any health care professionals anywhere - but was nearly on his deathbed for months, Mr. Speaker, because of a diagnosis problem, and only when the proper diagnosis was made was the ailment able to be cured.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister talks about the fact that a small 50-bed hospital has a CAT scan.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Do you think that's good?

MR. G. FILMON: Well, you know we have a problem here where people in the past only had to wait a matter of weeks for a CAT scan and now we're into months, and yet in a small community like Boissevan, my colleague from Turtle Mountain who had somebody who urgently needed, according to his physician, a CAT scan, was able to go across the border to, I believe, it was Rugby, North Dakota, and get that in a matter of a day; it identified the problem and it led to the cure of the ailment and it was a positive thing in terms of reduced costs to the health care system, Mr. Speaker. It was not an added cost to the health care system.

What we're talking about is the opportunity to practise preventative medicine and that is being relinquished in favour of cost control - cost control. Mr. Speaker, but who's making the decisions to whether or not these diagnostic and laboratory facilities are necessary? It's not the medical professionals, it's not the health care professionals, it's the bean-counters who are making these decisions and, Mr. Speaker, that's wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I think on a number of occasions that it was an advisory committee made up of people from the MMA, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Faculty of Medicine, a doctor or chairman from the Department of Health, and so on. So that's quite unfair what the member is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that that committee of people recommended this bill to him? Well, oh, now he's saying that they didn't recommend this bill and that's the point, Mr. Speaker.

The health care professionals of this province in no way are supportive of this bill and in fact, they feel betrayed by this Minister of Health because he has done this largely without their knowledge.

Now he may say that he floated some potential legislation and other things by them, but the MMA was

at committee; the College of Physicians and Surgeons were at committee; health care professionals in this province, Mr. Speaker, all of these people came to committee because what they see in this bill is the superimposition of the will of the government over the medical profession in judging and deciding whether or not it's in the public interest to have adequate diagnostic and laboratory facilities.

The Minister, I believe, said at committee that it was in the public interest to control the costs in a manner such as this. Mr. Speaker, we have organizations such as the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the MMA to police the members of their associations and their organizations, the health care professionals. They are ready, willing and able to work with this Minister to cover his concerns about whether or not there are abuses, whether or not it's getting out of hand.

He gave one example of what he saw as a potential to happen. I'm not sure whether or not he was saying that it existed but just as a potential to happen that someone would set up the laboratory and diagnostic facility that would be duplicative of a similar facility in a public institution. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that he could get together with the MMA and the College and say that's what we're wanting to guard against, and we want your profession to be aware that we can't have these duplications of facilities. We have limited resources and so on - but he didn't say that.

He didn't get together with them. He didn't express the concern, just as he did with the pharmacists of this province when he said that they had major problems with respect to pharmaceutical supplies in personal care homes. He said, Mr. Speaker, that he was simply going to take it over, the distribution of prescription medicine and pharmaceutical supplies to personal care homes. He was going to take it over centrally by government without consultation with the pharmacists.

When confronted with the reasons for his decision, Mr. Speaker, what he said was that the pharmacists were overprescribing. The pharmacists don't prescribe at all. They just merely fill prescription requirements, so he was criticizing the medical profession by implication. Mr. Speaker, it's in an article in the Toronto Globe and Mail, and I'll cut it out and send it to him. There are some serious criticisms by this Minister and his Deputy Minister, of pharmacy and of the medical practitioners in this province in a manner that I thought was inappropriate, but they were fighting to defend themselves against a decision that they had made without consultation, without discussion.

I see the same thing here; the medical practitioners, the professionals in this province who want to ensure that they have the opportunity for the best diagnostic facilities, the best laboratory facilities, so that they can reduce the costs of health care in the province in the hospitals are being denied that opportunity, and it's being taken over by the heavy hand of government.

Now the Minister said in committee that one of the reasons he had to act was that, between the years 1974 and 1984, the cost of diagnostic and laboratory testing in this province had increased four times. What he didn't recognize was that the costs of health care institutions, of the hospitals, had gone up five times in the same period of time, and the cost of personal care home, institutional care, had gone up tenfold in that period of time.

So indeed costs are rising dramatically in many areas of health care, but this is one area of health care in which there is a potential to be more than cost-effective, in fact to reduce some of our health care costs if it's properly done, if these facilities are made available. I don't have the confidence that this Minister or his bureaucrats know in a professional sense what is required in diagnosis and testing in this province. They don't have that information. They are merely the comptrollers, the accountants, the number crunchers, and they are superimposing their will on the health care professionals.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing more or less than a straight move to limit services in the health care of this province; to ration laboratory and diagnostic services; to take the decisions out of the hands of health care professionals and put them into the hands of bureaucrats. It is bad legislation, and I regret that this Minister has been able to convince his colleagues to support this bad legislation.

We on this side believe that this bill ought to be hoisted, and not proceeded with at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I would like to ask the honourable member if he would permit a question.

MR. G. FILMON: Certainly.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the honourable member sees any comparison between his remarks with respect to the interests of the medical profession in terms of calling the tune here and his suggestion earlier of potential conflict of interest with regard to Bill 72, The Teachers' Pensions Act.

MR. G. FILMON: There is no doctor on this side of the House voting on or talking on that. My reference was to the fact that there were a large number of teachers on that side who had helped in the drafting and were supporting and voting for a bill that was going to give them better pension benefits. That's a direct conflict of interest. There is no conflict of interest whatsoever in this case. The Government House Leader's logic is absolutely off the rails.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
In the interests of expediting the business of the House, I hope to keep my comments relatively short. Mr. Speaker, I think that the debate we have entertained here this evening in the last half-hour or so is quite indicative of the different values between our side of the House, the New Democratic Party, and the Conservatives towards the health care system and towards Medicare.

We have the members opposite decrying people who administer probably one of the best health care systems

in the whole world here in Manitoba as being a bunch of bureaucrats and not professional people in health, and I resent that, because the people in the MHSC who are running our health administration are professional people. They may not be medical doctors. I hope they're not all medical doctors. But they certainly are specialists in medical administration and certainly in delivery, and the design for services and medical delivery.

For the Leader of the Opposition to stand in his seat as he just did a few minutes ago and to call these people and imply they are some kind of a bunch of bumbling bureaucrats, I think is a damn insult to the good, fine people and the work that they have dedicated towards running the health administration in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when we're dealing with . . .

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other provinces in this country who do not even allow private labs to be working. They are New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Labrador. Those provinces do not even permit any private labs in their system.

We have, in the Province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, a province where a couple years ago members can remember on both sides of this House they were closing down hospitals. They were closing hospitals. A report from January 4, 1983 indicates that, in Toronto — (Interjection) — could we have some order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
If other members wish to join the debate, they will have the opportunity to do so in due course.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
In Ontario where a few years ago they were closing hospitals, they were told by their own hospitals that they could save the medical system in Ontario \$140 million if they would allow the hospitals to do out-patient laboratory tests. The hospitals included the Toronto General Hospital, Mount Sinai, the Hospital for Sick Children have told the Province of Ontario they could perform tests for their outpatients at less than two-thirds the price charged by private labs. Less than two-thirds the price. He said, given licences, the hospitals would get a chance to compete in the market and reduce the cost of laboratory tests.

What we have the Minister of Health trying to do in this province right now is to try and set up through MHSC a better system to both control new private claims coming onto the market, as well as expansion of services within the present claims. I think that the

people who are reviewing the costs of doing them in our hospitals have some fair idea as to what kind of tests are required and the frequency of their tests. We have the question of accuracy in the tests.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. D. SCOTT: In other provinces that aren't exactly social paradises, you have the government of those provinces already requiring the same procedures we are establishing under this legislation for new facilities to have the approval of the health care administration of that province. So, Mr. Speaker, when we have the members opposite decrying that this province is doing something out-of-step with the other provinces, it's exactly the opposite.

What we are trying to do with this is to improve the quality of services. The Member for River East, in previous debates, has shown most clearly that the public facilities have a much better record than the private facilities have in the quality of the tests and also in the price. So if we get more services and expanded our public capability to provide more laboratory services, I would suspect we could save a bundle of money here in Manitoba as well as people in Ontario are attempting to do right now. It is irresponsible for us not to take those actions.

As the Minister of Health aptly pointed out this evening, the members opposite always squawk about increased expenditures. It doesn't matter where it is. Health as well, education, you name it, they criticize it. Yet they also want to reduce taxes, and we saw what happened when they reduced taxes last time they were in office. They reduced taxes for a family of, I think, it was \$15,000 income a year, a family saved \$11.00. A family with \$50,000 saved \$700.00. So we know that anything they do with the tax system is going to be most maldistributed. That is going to put an increased burden on the lower-income groups and the modest-income people of this province, as well as they're going to put more restraint as they did when inflation was 12 percent, they increased health expenditures 2.9 percent, one-fifth the rate of inflation.

Maybe that's why they wanted more to be passed out or doled out to private services. Maybe that is part of the reason that the former Minister of Health, when he was sitting in this Chamber and the member who just resigned from this Chamber to run federally unsuccessfully - thank goodness! - when he wants to privatize the administration of our hospitals, when already the administration of our medical system is among the most efficient in the whole world. And he wants to privatize it.

That, I think, is just the toe in the door of their attitude towards medical services. If it's not privatizing labs, if it's not privatizing the administration of hospitals, it will be going on and getting into private hospital facilities as well and expansion of private claims. The costs will just mount and mount and mount and the province, if we maintain the health care system we have right now, will have less and less control over those escalating costs. The same incidence that we have in the private

labs right now is to try to keep some limit on the number of tests that they will do, let alone the quality of tests that they do.

So they talk out of both sides of their mouths when they talk about governments trying to save money. The trouble is, when they talk out of both sides of their mouths, the problem is that they enact it once they get into office. What happens is that the health services suffer in the province. The sick people, the people who need treatment, the people who need diagnosis are the ones who suffer because of a lack of improvement in services.

We've heard them talk of CAT scans, CAT scans, CAT scans, and the Leader of the Opposition implied tonight, I believe, what's wrong with having a hospital with 50 beds having a CAT scan. These people are technocratic ignoramuses when it comes to equipping hospitals with high-tech equipment, Mr. Speaker, and yet cutting back on the basic level of services. There is other equipment other than CAT scans and the \$1 million plus that CAT scans costs.

Last year, I got an opportunity to review some new medical technology that I would love us to be able to bring into this province. I would hope in a relatively short time we will have it in this province. These are magnetic resonance machines which do a much clearer picture than CAT scans on soft tissue. They're just superb for breaks and whatnots as well, but they are really spectacularly accurate machines. I saw it in the St. Joseph's Hospital in London, Ontario. The head of that section, who is the toy bagman for southwestern Ontario, by the way, spent a couple of hours with me explaining, showing me how the machine works, showing me the details that they can get out of those photographs.

It is simply a magnificent system, but again it's exceptionally expensive and we have to weigh off whether or not we can afford to move towards those high-tech systems if that is going to take money away from the other side. A much lower-cost system is just coming forward from Japan to be able to predict the incidences of cerebral hemorrhaging and other disorders . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I must point out to the Honourable Member for Inkster that the word "ignoramus" appears on the list of unparliamentary expressions. I would suggest he consider withdrawing the word and not using it forthwith.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, I thought I beat the list, Mr. Speaker. I shall withdraw the comment "ignoramus". I guess the comment stands by itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, there has been a new system, if the people read the news out of Japan, where they have a system where, within 10 minutes, they can without going through the extensive procedures for CAT scans already do an awful lot of the prediagnostic use to see if a person has had a brain hemorrhage or is in threat of possibly having a stroke, so then they can implement procedures to try and limit that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Minister of Health in closing for bringing forward this legislation.

It is a first step. I personally would like to see it even go further towards a strong commitment for us to expand the public facilities, because we have a responsibility to provide the facilities publicly and not to continue to finance and subsidize private clinics.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

I am going to be very brief with my comments, because a lot of these comments have been made. The Member for Pembina made an excellent presentation, so did our leader and there's no sense in repeating all these comments that already have been made.

But there is no doubt about it that this bill is going to be placing certain restrictions upon health care and I realize and I recognize the Minister's problem that he has. That health care costs are rising all the time and it is going to be more difficult to provide the type of health care that we have been providing up to now. I think it's time that all of us realize and recognize that fact, that somewhere something will have to be done.

However, when we're talking about cost control, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about preventative medicine and preventative medicine can be done in a number of ways, one of them, of course, being good health practice and I believe that it's in an area in which we maybe could be doing more, bringing good health practice to the attention of the residents of Manitoba.

But, the other, Mr. Speaker, is early diagnosis. We know that early diagnosis with CAT scan and with ultrasound is now available. We should not curtail this early type of diagnosis and this expertise that is now available. We only have two CAT scans, Mr. Speaker, in all of Manitoba; that is not enough. We need more equipment so that we do not have these long waiting lists because there is no way that these two CAT scans can meet the demand which is there. So, ultimately, we have to pay more because we cannot have this early diagnosis and the same, of course, with ultrasound.

But to me, Mr. Speaker, and I said that I was going to be brief, to me the thing that is most scary of all is that the government is going to take control of the standards. Mr. Speaker, the minute that this government is going to take control of the standards, then it is cost from then on. It's cost that will determine the medical standards in this province; it will not be good medical practice. Mr. Speaker, that is the scary thing about this particular bill, that the cost is going to control the standards. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy had one of his normal kinds of sleazy shots from his seat. I don't profess to be professional in everything like his, but I do want to put on the record, because I think it's an extremely important matter that's being overlooked by this committee and I appreciate that everyone's anxious; it appears as if the Session may end sometime in the next few hours. I'm disappointed in the Premier that he isn't paying

attention to what is being said. He wasn't a part of a committee; he hasn't listened to the committee. My leader the other night sat up with a bad back and listened to what the medical profession had to say, the doctors of this province.

I want to speak in support of the doctors who I heard the other night while I was at committee. Mr. Speaker, we have to take it very seriously. We have to take the matter that this government are now rationing health care services to the people of Manitoba. I go back, Mr. Speaker, to that great pledge of the now Premier of the Province that he said now in their campaign literature, care not cutbacks. Mr. Speaker, he said, care not cutbacks. What the people of Manitoba have to know, Mr. Speaker, is that it's cutbacks not care, with the NDP.

The Premier of Manitoba has to be able to stand up and defend the cutback that he's putting into the medical profession by moving with this bill; that he is actually rationing; he's taking away the facilities of the doctors to have the kind of unlimited use they have now of the diagnostic labs. That's what he's doing, Mr. Speaker, he is reducing the amount of funds available for the health care system in this province. So it is, in fact, cutbacks not care with the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I'll make reference to a couple of other points because what did we see this government do? This government has proposed to put in place the charges for meals for people in hospitals. Now if that isn't a user fee, I don't know what is, Mr. Speaker. That again is another cutback. Mr. Speaker, what the people of Manitoba have to be told over and over again is that these people say one thing and do another. There's more evidence showing up every day. We do have, and have had, one of the best health-care systems of any province or any country in the world, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that under this government we are going to fast see them erode.

I want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by putting one more point on the record. The governments say, spend more money. They say to the Tories you want to spend more money and increase the deficit. No, Mr. Speaker, we want to prioritize the expenditure of our money. We would do away with the foolish advertising of their political image, Mr. Speaker. We would do away with the hiring of the political hierarchy that they've put in place, Mr. Speaker, and we would prioritize it putting it in place to accommodate the kind of health services that are needed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is what our policies are. Not to use the money foolishly like the Member for Inkster to advertise his image, Mr. Speaker, to get up and put the kind of dribble on the record that he has tonight.

Mr. Speaker, it is, cutback not care, with the NDP. The people of Manitoba have to be told it over and over again and I want one other example put on the record, Mr. Speaker, because representing the western region of the province as I do, I want the record to show that I have had several calls in the last few months from people who have now had to wait - the time of waiting for elective surgery in Brandon has gone from a period of exactly double - elective surgery waiting time in Brandon. The Member for Brandon East struts around here as if he's done everything for Brandon. He hasn't done anything for Brandon, Mr. Speaker, other than give a double waiting list to the elective

surgery in that Brandon hospital. — (Interjection) — That's what he has done, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Finance says I'm such a pain. They've cut back on the personal care homes in Brandon, Mr. Speaker. That is true. Well, stand up and refute it. You are not, Mr. Speaker. The whole point is that with the NDP government, it's cutback not care. This particular legislation should be hoisted; it should be reconsidered and I again want to point out that I would have thought that any Premier who prides himself and his party in being such carers of health care, would have at least paid attention to the doctors that were at the committee the other night, or at least had some comment on this bill. But he hasn't stood and said anything. He runs around telling the people one thing and does another.

Mr. Speaker, we have to hoist this bill in the best interests of long-term good health care in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would simply like to bring the opposition back to the world of reality for a few moments. I know that they tend to get carried away with the rhetoric of free enterprise and I know that they like to talk about cutbacks not care, etc., etc. But I kind of wish that the new health critic would have had the time and the opportunity to read the report and recommendations of the Provincial Diagnostic Services Review Committee of October 1983. You know, legislation of this kind doesn't come out of the blue. It's not based on some philosophical bias of the Minister of Health. In fact, I find this particular Minister of Health the least socialistic of any Minister in the NDP government. He's even less socialistic than some of the Ministers of Health in other provinces of Canada, which are governed by Conservative Governments.

The Diagnostic Services Review Committee did a survey of this particular kind of legislation all across Canada. They didn't simply out the blue say, hey, let's require the approval of the government before new private labs are set up. They said what's going on elsewhere? What is going on elsewhere? What were the results of the survey, Mr. Speaker? Well, they asked the question. They asked all the provincial governments, what are you doing? B.C., what do you do? Alberta, what do you do? Saskatchewan, Ontario, the Maritimes, what do they do? Is approval required prior to the establishment of construction of any of the facilities such as laboratory, radiology, ultrasound and/or nuclear medicine facilities, etc., etc. B.C.? Yes, in all areas. Alberta? Yes, in all areas - Alberta. B.C. the most Tory province in Canada, they said yes. Saskatchewan, yes, in all areas. Ontario, yes, for labs only. That is what this regulates. Quebec, yes, in all areas. New Brunswick, yes, in all areas. Nova Scotia, yes. Newfoundland and Labrador, yes.

Well, who said no? The opposition in Manitoba said no. That's the only party of any semi-official recognition that recognize status that has said no. The Manitoba Conservative Party is the only branch of the Conservative Party in Canada that says no. Why?

Because they didn't do their homework. They didn't look to see what was going on elsewhere in Canada. All they did was rush to a few of the private lab owners and say, "What's going on? Is this going to hurt you?" Of course, the lab owners said, "Yes." Of course Dr. Trainor said, "Oh, this is terrible. It's terrible." Well, what do you expect?

Why don't you look at what the public interest is before you start talking about something that you haven't investigated. How did this thing get so far out of control that you have moved a hoist without even knowing what you are talking about.

The Leader of the Opposition is totally ineffective in his opposition. The Health critic hasn't investigated the situation that this legislation refers to. What have they been doing all Session? This is Bill 85. It is way down the list. They've had plenty of time, and they have done nothing. Their research has been totally inadequate. It is a completely inadequate opposition, Mr. Speaker. It's disgusting. Why can't they give us valuable criticism? Why can't they say something useful instead of saying, no, let's wait six months while we have the chance to look into this.

Why don't we have an election? Why don't we let the people elect a new opposition to replace these people over here who obviously can't do their homework, who can't come into this House with a well prepared brief, with a well prepared set of arguments? Why can't we have an election so that we could have new people in the Conservative Party?

Mr. Speaker, a hoist is useless. What we need is an election to get rid of this bunch over here and to get an effective opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I was going to speak, but the Member for River East has said it all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?

I believe the honourable member has spoken on this, oh, pardon.

QUESTION put on Hoist Amendment, MOTION defeated.

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

QUESTION put on Third Reading Bill 85, MOTION carried.

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

BILLS NO. 94, 5, 16 were each read a third time and passed.

**BILL NO. 74 - THE EQUAL RIGHTS
AMENDMENT ACT; LOI MODIFIANT LE
DROIT STATUTAIRE AFIN DE
FAVORISER L'ÉGALITÉ DES DROITS**

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 74, The Equal

Rights Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le droit statutaire afin de favoriser l'égalité des droits for Third Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed Third Reading of Bill 74.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Banman, Birt, Brown, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyer, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Hyde, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Lecuyer, Mackling, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Steen, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 46; Nays, 0.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

BILLS NO. 28, 36, 47, 57, 59, 62, 65, 67, 70, 71, 81, 84, 86, 90, 98, by leave, were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill No. 53, The Pay Equity Act; Loi sur l'égalité des salaires for Third Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yeas and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill 53.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Banman, Birt, Brown, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyer, Filmon, Gourlay, Hammond, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Hyde, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Lecuyer, Mackling, Manness, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Steen, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 44; Nays, 0.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Before I propose that the House move into Committee of Ways and Means to deal with the Main and Capital Supply items, because I am uncertain as to how much time we will need for that and the First Reading in Committee of the Whole stage, Sir, and that may come at closer to 10:00 p.m., our normal hour of adjournment.

I would ask, Sir, at this time, if I could have unanimous consent from the House to proceed past 10:00 p.m. this evening if necessary?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to proceed past 10:00 p.m. if necessary? Leave has been granted.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The Honourable Member for River East.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MAIN SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyer: Committee come to order. We are considering the resolution for Main Supply, do you wish the resolution read? Dispense? Discussion? Pass.

CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion for Capital Supply. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for Capital purposes, the sum of \$1 billion. Dispense? Discussion? Pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has passed certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. V. SCHROEDER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 49, An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1986 and to authorize Commitments to expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to authorize the Borrowing of Funds to provide for Cash requirements of the Government (The Appropriation Act, 1985); Loi allouant à Sa Majesté certaines sommes d'argents pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 mars 1986, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes et à faire les emprunts requis pour subvenir à ses besoins de fonds (Loi de 1985 portant affectation de crédits); and Bill No. 56, An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the Borrowing of the Same (The Loan Act, 1985); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (Loi d'emprunt de 1985).

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 49 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, (1985); LOI DE 1985 PORTANT AFFECTATION DE CRÉDITS

BILL NO. 56 - THE LOAN ACT, 1985; LOI D'EMPRUNT DE 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER presented, by leave, Bill No. 49, An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1986 and to authorize Commitments to expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to authorize the Borrowing of Funds to provide for Cash requirements of the Government (The Appropriation Act, 1985); Loi allouant à Sa Majesté certaines sommes d'argents pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 mars 1986, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes et à faire les emprunts requis pour subvenir à ses besoins de fonds (Loi de 1985 portant affectation de crédits); and Bill No. 56, An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the Borrowing of the Same (The Loan Act, 1985); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (Loi d'emprunt de 1985) for Second Reading.

MOTIONS presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the following bills: Bill No. 49 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31,

1986 and to Authorize Commitments to expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government, (The Appropriation Act, 1985); Loi allouant à Sa Majesté certaines sommes d'argents pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 mars 1986, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes et à faire les emprunts requis pour subvenir à ses besoins de fonds (Loi de 1985 portant affectation de crédits); and Bill No. 56 - An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same (The Loan Act, 1985); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (Loi d'emprunt de 1985) and refer for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills No. 49 and 56 with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

BILL NO. 49 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT; LOI DE 1985 PORTANT AFFECTATION DE CRÉDITS

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering Bills No. 49 and 56. What is the will of the Committee? Bill-by-bill.

Bill No. 49 - The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a couple of questions of the Minister of Finance. For several months now, we've been considering the expenditures of some - in the range of \$3.5 or \$3.6 billion - and we spend very little time on the review of Estimates of revenue. I think it's only right that we should spend some time on that.

I would ask the Minister of Finance, at this point, how the income tax collection appears seeing that we're close to three months after the April 30th deadline of taxation for personal tax statements, I'd ask the Minister specifically whether we are still on course of the revenue estimate of \$652 million; and I would also ask him to tell us whether he can quantify the impact of the scientific tax credit, whether indeed he can quantify, at this point in time, what effect that has had on the revenue coming to the Provincial Government.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the collections to date for the 1985-86 fiscal year for income tax are right on track with what had originally been estimated. We have not been informed at the moment that there will be any variation.

With respect to the previous year, we are down approximately, I believe it's \$90 million in income taxes overall from what had originally been predicted, at the moment; that's not finalized. Of course, when I say that, it can be finalized a couple of years from now. That's really when we will know exactly where we were for the year.

The Federal Finance Department has yet to quantify the scientific research tax credits for us. I think on June

27th there was a taxation officials meeting at which a variety of provincial officials from the various provinces were asking those questions. The answers still are not there, they feel that it will take a little longer to get an answer. We still believe that it is a very significant amount. What we are hoping, though, is that it is a part of the \$90 million.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is suggesting then that for the fiscal year 1985, which has completed, that there will be potentially a \$90 million shortfall under forecast as to the revenues.

I have before me the Detailed Estimates of Revenue that was presented just a few months ago, and the estimate of deficit for the year that we have just completed was \$488 million. Is the Minister then saying that that number can be increased by \$90 million as of the knowledge he has at this point in time?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, no. In fact, we are in the process of closing the year off. We have provided quarterly reports, and the reports have indicated, since the six month mark, I believe, that we were having a problem with income tax revenue. Certainly, in the ninth month we were saying that there was a serious problem with income tax revenue, but that has been offset by stronger provincial revenues and lower expenditures than expected. We still expect to be approximately on the original target.

MR. C. MANNES: If, in fact, the no-share of the \$90 million is applicable to the scientific tax credit revenue loss to the province and, indeed, whatever that portion is, however unquantified at this point in time, falls into this fiscal year, will that sum be a direct increase to the total estimated deficit of \$496 million in the '85-86 fiscal year?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, if there are additional losses, they would show up in 1985-86. I should say that the only indications we have had is that there is a possibility there might be a little improvement and not that the dollars are there, nor has anything specific been given to us, it's just some indication that there might be a little improvement over the income taxation revenue that was originally forecast.

Provincial revenue so far is on track a little better than what we had originally predicted overall for '85-86.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister tell us when the province will know as to the losses that can be expected because of the scientific tax credit provision that was in place in 1984?

He has indicated that, as of late June, when officials from the provinces came together, at that time they were unable to determine or ascertain the magnitude of that potential loss. I think everybody agrees that there is a significant loss there potentially.

Can the Minister give us some idea when the province will know again the magnitude of the loss?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: This particular item is entirely outside of our control in terms of when we will know. It is only when the Federal Finance Department will tell

us that we will know. So I can only say at the moment that we do not have a target date from federal finance and we don't know when it might be that we will get updated information.

I think all Manitobans are certainly concerned about that particular tax and happy about the fact that the present Minister of Finance in Ottawa acted relatively quickly to stop what was probably one of the most obscene tax giveaways that have been devised in many years.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister share with us the parameters of the estimates of loss to the province?

I have talked to people in financial circles; they claim that there was close to \$1 billion worth of scientific credit business done within Manitoba alone, representing in the minds of some a potential loss of revenue in this province of \$100 million. Obviously, there are various forecasts.

Can the Minister tell us the range in which potentially the loss may fall?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The best guess that we have, and we have to emphasize that it is a guess, would be that it would not overall be more than \$30 million to the Manitoba Treasury, keeping in mind that whatever numbers the Member for Morris has could contain within them corporate tax credits which do not affect the provincial revenues. It is only the personal tax credits that affect our revenue. That's the best guess we would have based on very very rough information.

MR. C. MANNES: When that number is known, will it be reflected immediately in the quarterly report?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, when the number is known - now we still don't know that it's not included in the \$90 million. When it is known it would show up; that is, when we don't receive the \$30 million, when it's deducted from our payments, our income tax payments, at that point it would immediately be noted as a drop in cash flow in the quarterly statement.

MR. C. MANNES: A different area, Mr. Chairman, I am looking at Page 6 of the Revenue Estimates, and I see under the listing, Government of Canada, the established programs cash transfer that Manitoba has estimated to receive an additional \$57.4 million under that program.

I ask the Minister of Finance where that money has been allocated. Has it all gone into education and into health?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: \$57.4 million into which area? I don't have the expenditure estimates with me.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister talked about the expenditure estimates. I am looking from the revenue estimates. I'm looking on Page 6 thereof, under the general heading, "Government of Canada Finance," and Part B - Established Programs Cash Transfer. The number of 426.5 million is an increase of 57.4 million from last year. My understanding is that it is in support of post-secondary education and health. Can the Minister tell me whether all of that has been directed to those two areas of expenditure?

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

In view of the fact that we're spending more than \$1.6 billion in those two areas, I have no difficulty in saying that every single penny of it will be spent and we're going to be putting in far more dollars than the Federal Government into it.

MR. C. MANNESS: One final question, Mr. Chairman.

The total expenditure within education, that broad grouping including the public schools sector, plus health, came to somewhere in the magnitude of \$60-some million. That was the increase in those two major departments. Nearly \$57.4 million of that was projected to be picked up by way of transfer from the Federal Government.

Can the Minister tell us why it is then that so much money in the tune of \$500 million had to be borrowed in support from the other provincial programs?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The member has to keep in mind that one should look at the overall revenues. The overall revenue increase from the Federal Government, including the numbers he has just read out, including the equalization payments, including the taxes they collect for us, including CAP, including everything - we wind up with a net increase of something like certainly less than \$20 million of an increase in overall transfers. That is on a base of approximately \$3 billion.

I don't have all of the exact numbers here tonight, but it is a very very low increase. As the member says, even though we are only getting, overall, in all areas, \$20 million approximately more from the Federal Government than we got last year, we're still spending \$60 million more, as he says, in health and post-secondary education. Of course, there are other areas where expenditures are up as well. So we are very very clearly keeping up with our end of the bargain.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have before me that total Government of Canada directed revenue to the province. I believe it is subtotal 3, and it comes to 1.107 billion which is some \$69 million more than last year by the forecast. I suppose my question still holds. We've increased in the departments, other than the education and health. The Government in the Province of Manitoba have seen fit to increase the expenditures and support thereof to the tune, obviously, of \$400 million or \$500 million, and that is the only point I am trying to make.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, those numbers, of course, have to be updated. The numbers, depending on which item you look at - if you look at General Purpose Transfers, EPF Cash, Special Purpose Transfers, etc., you can come up with different numbers. Of course, in that document, we were anticipating equalization payments that were \$22 million higher than what we are apparently going to receive. We were expecting that we would receive the same amount of dollars in 1985 as we received in 1984, and of course, that is not the case. We've got a drop of more than \$20 million there, so that is something that has to be taken off those numbers and so on. There are always some adjustments to be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal in a little more general way with the mismanagement and the incompetence of this administration and the request for funds.

One could go back to the catalogue of what turned out to be false promises that they started out with in 1981. We have seen four years of an administration that really lacks direction. It lacks what one would consider a common purpose other than to make sure that taxpayers of Manitoba end up with a debt that will take generations to repay.

The Minister of Mines and Energy shakes his head. Well, when you are looking at a \$1.8 billion increase in our deficit in four years, and the fact that we are now seeing a reduction in health care services, getting cutbacks in the health care. Yes, they are passing legislation to do it, Mr. Chairman, when they are proposing the — (Interjection) — Well he says it doesn't wash. Mr. Chairman, we are not asking anything to wash. All we want to do is make sure the people of Manitoba understand clearly what the New Democratic Party is doing. They say one thing and do another.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose said the polls will tell. Well, that is what we've been pleading with the government to do ever since they lost the language debate and the people of Manitoba and the Legislative Assembly backed them off in this Legislative Assembly. They lost their mandate to govern. They lost their mandate to govern, Mr. Chairman, in a true democratic sense of the word. How, Mr. Chairman, can anyone have respect for them, if they didn't have the guts to carry through with a path in which they have set out on? Then, Mr. Chairman, in spades, have been proven that they were wrong, proven that they were wrong in what they were proposing.

Mr. Chairman, what we need is a poll all right. We need to go to the polls. We want to go to the polls, Mr. Chairman. Yes, let's go. The Member for The Pas says, "Let's go." The Member for Rupertsland is anxious to get there as well, but he can't, Mr. Chairman, because his Premier hasn't got the courage to go to the people.

The Member for Radisson tonight clearly pointed out where he's at. Of course, we won't make a lot of mention for the member for Inkster because we know what his credibility factor is with the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the priorities of this government. These are some of the concerns and, of course, I want to put it clearly on the record that constituents of mine are deeply concerned. The fact is that they're concerned about the priorities of this government, that we spent some 18 months debating — (Interjection) — ask the taxpayers how they like the Main Street Manitoba Program.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, they're concerned that they are paying tax money to debate a language issue, to go 18 months in the Legislature; that the government really weren't getting on with the affairs of the province; that the waiting time for elective surgery in the Brandon Hospital now in western Manitoba has doubled in the term this government have been in office.

One doesn't have to pick the record of the legislative speeches up to tell the people of Manitoba what has happened. They don't have to be told by the Member for Inkster that their government cares about people in giving them **health care**. They don't, Mr. Chairman.

The people understand quite clearly in the Brandon area what is available to them under the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman, one does not have to overemphasize to the people of the Grande-Clairière or to other regions of the western part of the province about how this government cares about the control of a pest of near biblical magnitude, and that of course being the grasshoppers. Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba don't have to pick up the Hansards of the Legislative Assembly. All they have to do is look what happens before them in their own communities.

Mr. Chairman, the people who milk cows, who ship cream and who are now not able to deliver that cream to a market, don't have to be told by legislative document or by record of Hansard what, in fact, is happening to their industry. They know daily that the New Democratic Party and the Minister of Agriculture have failed to give them the kind of returns for their labours and their efforts that they would normally get under a Progressive Conservative Government and did get under a Progressive Conservative Government, Mr. Chairman.

It has been said many times that if you want people to listen, you have to say it over and over again. Well, we'll continue to say it over and over again. We've got patience; we've got persistence. We've got patience and persistence and we have got the ability to tell the people of Manitoba, to point out to them when the election campaign comes that our policies do mean something.

We did have a deficit for a period of time that was left by the former NDP, but we had worked aggressively not to get rid of health care or to reduce health care as this government, but we reduced the high cost of carrying charges in the deficit, but as well, we maintained a reasonable health care system, one which I think this government would like to now see in the province. We have also put in place some facilities that we're extremely proud of at the Health Sciences Centre. There was a commitment by this government to spend money to upgrade and to make sure that the kind of services and backup was available to some of the best medical system in this country — (Interjection) — no, Mr. Chairman.

The member says sum up. I'm not going to sum up, Mr. Chairman. I am going to use my time in this Assembly to speak on behalf of my constituents and the people of this province. I am not going to be muzzled and knuckle under as the Member for Radisson did. No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to be muzzled and knuckle under. I am going to stand up and say what I think over and over again — (Interjection) — yes, yes.

The Member for The Pas, I'm sure he can go home and really boast of what he said in the Manitoba Legislature. Mind you, it wouldn't take him long to boast of what he said in here, but he hasn't stood in his place and defended his government on one issue.

I want to deal with one other area, Mr. Chairman, particularly this area, because it has a lot of meaning to the Province of Manitoba. Oh yes, we've got the Limestone cowboys running around the province. That's their election campaign machine. That is their whole idea of winning the next election.

Mr. Chairman, remember the people that are going to be paying for that. The people of the Province of

Manitoba are going to be paying for that. That's who is going to pay for it. There is nobody else going to pay for all this money that is being borrowed. It's the average person, not the average NDP kind of person that we would talk about. They have some idea about an average Manitoban.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Progressive Conservative Party represents the average people all right. They represent everyone from all walks of life, from city to country to north to south, because we speak truth and we speak on behalf of those people. We never have, Mr. Chairman, tried to tell the people of Manitoba that things were all rosy and that we're going to again spend for them several billions of dollars so that times are going to be better. We've got to look very carefully and speak very loudly on behalf of those people who are going to be left carrying the debts of the people who are supposed to hold in trust the monies of those people who live in the province.

It's not going to be the people of Northern States Power or the United States that pay off the Hydro, Mr. Chairman. It is not going to be in the long run — (Interjection) — no, Mr. Chairman, it's not going to be. They haven't sold it to this Legislative Assembly. They haven't sold it to the people of Manitoba. Yes, they have sold it to the people of Manitoba and to the rest of Canada, those several thousand people who have applied for jobs because, goodness knows, under a New Democratic Party, there haven't been many jobs of any meaning so they're anxious to grab at something.

In fact, that is where their big plus is. Sure, it's the immediate job creation, although it is only going to be 400 this particular year out of 7,000 people that have applied for work - pretty small potatoes, Mr. Chairman.

But the long term, Mr. Chairman, let's run this comparison. The long-term employment for what they're developing is something like 40 jobs. We have got an agricultural industry that has, as Stats Canada would say, 29,000 people directly employed in agriculture. What have we heard the from Minister of Energy, the Minister of Finance? All they can do, Mr. Chairman - and I won't use the word that the Premier used yesterday - is complain and begrudge the support they've given to the farm community, which has really in a direct sense been very small, because most of it is either through MACC loans, or beef and hog stabilization loans, but really very small.

Oh yes, the Minister of Finance wants to brag about the money the farmers got. He said, look, the farmers even use the provincial highways. Did you hear the debate, the Minister of Finance a year or so ago he, not only said it, it was part of his calculations that the farm people actually have to consider the money that goes into the highways as money that they are getting. How ridiculous; how stupid! That's what he is - ridiculous and unreasonable. With that kind of thinking, Mr. Chairman, this government and this province will go down fast.

I want to get on with the introduction of a bill by the Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 24, called The Family Farm Protection Act. Why was it introduced? Tell me, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister of Finance tell us; can the Minister of Housing tell us, h has farmers in his constituency. Does it now mean the New Democratic Party are not going to protect the family farm? Is that what it means, that you just in title only and the rest of them can go to the dickens? Was it for image?

The Minister of Highways and Transportation, representing the farm community of Dauphin, how is he going to explain to his constituents in the farm community that, yes, they introduced the title to the Family Farm Protection Act but there was nothing that went with it, there was no bill.

The Member for Ste. Rose, that great pride of the west lake area, you know, he stands in the Legislature and tries to tell us all the money they have spent on the farmers. What they have done is lend money to the farmers; they haven't spent any great amount of money on the farmers as far as giving it to them.

The Minister of Health says I am one of the great socialists on this side. Mr. Chairman, it's not called socialism, it's called fairness to those people in society. Fairness to the farm community who were pledged, and the pledge was broken, that they would get support and assistance under the New Democratic Party. We saw nothing but a tremendous increase in bankruptcies. Increased bankruptcies is the record of this New Democratic Party. So the Family Farm Protection Act was nothing there, nothing but smoke and mirrors. Yes, that's all there was, Mr. Chairman, nothing in the Family Farm Protection Act.

So one can only assume that it's lip service that they give to the farm community, lip service and a title. I can't do anything but go to the farm community and go to the people of Manitoba and use it as an example, again they were promised and didn't get. They didn't even discuss it. The Minister of Agriculture did not even discuss what was going to be in it.

I, Mr. Chairman, am extremely disappointed that we have had four years of bankruptcies of a magnitude that should shock anyone, but it doesn't shock this government. They just continue to try to gloss over it and say that everything is fine. They introduce a title to a farm protection act that means nothing. That's what this government really means to the farm community. They will leave an albatross of debt around their neck.

Another area which I want to touch on in my comments tonight, and I am disappointed that the Minister of Agriculture hasn't responded to my grievance yesterday, or made some comments in this regard, because I want to know, the people of Manitoba want to know, everyone wants to know where our No. 1 industry is heading, but we haven't heard. We are always playing catch-up agriculture with this Minister. The Minister of Agriculture and the Premier continue to play politics.

I said yesterday, and I will state it again, that we have seen in the farm community an energy crisis started in 1973 of which the farmers bore the brunt of it. We saw, following on that, an interest rate crisis which again the farm community bore the brunt of. Today the farm community, not only in Manitoba but in all of Canada, are going to bear the brunt of an international agricultural trade crisis. We again would like to know what this Minister of Agriculture and this Premier are going to do on behalf of the farm community.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, although the intent after he was forced to go to the States to talk to come of the governors really was, what I say again, a political move to try and gain some credibility. But there has to be some longer-term policy statements and

objectives coming from a government if they can expect to continue to hold onto political power in this province. We have some ideas, Mr. Chairman, as to what has to be done to straighten out and to resolve some of the problems.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister of Agriculture, because that's what his responsibility is, is for the farm community. He is going to be going to Newfoundland, I am sure, in a few days, the Annual Ministers of Agriculture Conference is probably around the 18th of July; he is going to Newfoundland to discuss agricultural policy and agricultural matters. We have not seen or heard one policy or one statement or anything that he is going to be proposing or doing at that meeting. Why wouldn't he have, Mr. Chairman, if he was really serious about looking after the farm community, why wouldn't he have stood in his place and made a presentation to this Legislative Assembly? He wouldn't even go, when he was invited, to the Federal Government, when they invited him to go and speak on Bill C-25 to, either make comments, made recommendations, he didn't even go, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the farm community. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because he didn't see any politics to assist him and his party in getting re-elected. That's the problem with the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman, what are the answers? What is some of the direction that has to be taken? Well, Mr. Chairman, it has to be taken, first of all, from a Cabinet and a caucus that has some cohesiveness and works together, not one that has demonstrated in the last couple of days the incompetence, the misguided and misdirection on different issues, and I don't have to mention them again, the main one, of course, being the language issue that they do not have a common goal, or a common purpose, or common direction, or common understanding of what has to be done on it. If they have, why haven't they demonstrated it? Why haven't they told us what it is?

Mr. Chairman, I say on behalf of the farm community that they expect and they deserve more. They expect and they deserve leadership when it comes time for dealing with a third crisis that they have to now face with an international trade war, and that's really what they are in.

Now the Minister of Finance is going to stand and say look what he did. He even put some money into highways so farmers could use it. Isn't that big of him? Well, Mr. Chairman, all the rest of the money that he has put into the farm community has basically been on a repayment loan basis. The Minister of Agriculture has said that over and over again that's what it is.

I would have liked the Minister of Agriculture to have stood in his place and tell us what issues he is going to be dealing with when he goes to the conference on the 18th of July, or whenever it is, in the middle of July; that's what I would have liked the Minister of Agriculture to stand and tell us. What are his policies dealing with the third crisis? What are his policies? He is going to be spending money; he is going to be requesting money; part of it's under the bill in which we are debating, but I haven't heard him, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in the next while, this evening, the Minister would be prepared to stand in his place and provide for this Assembly what his programs **and** policies **will be, what** his

recommendations will be when he attends that meeting, if he has any. If he hasn't, it doesn't surprise us, it doesn't surprise the farm community, because all the way through his four years as the Minister of Agriculture, he has to be pushed and pulled and tugged to get anything out of him. It's unfortunate for the people of this province that he hasn't been able to demonstrate some leadership ability.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister would come clean with the farm community, come clean with the people of Manitoba. Of course, we don't expect that of the Minister of Finance. He is a great game player, and hasn't been able to come as clear as the people would like to see. But the Minister of Agriculture must have been associated enough with farm people that he can't fool them. He must understand that by now. So I would request to the Minister to give us some idea what his longer-term plans are so that we have a clear understanding and can continue to consider that agriculture is on a sound footing in Manitoba.

Unfortunately, they haven't demonstrated it. They haven't given us any assurance of that, and there has certainly been no long-term plan or any proof of policy that's going to assist us through the difficulties that farmers are again facing on this third major crisis.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Minister of Finance.

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

The member has again demonstrated that he has absolutely no policy other than a policy of attempting by any means, fair or foul, to regain the power that they so justly lost several years ago.

He starts off talking about agriculture, doesn't recognize the fact that this government is putting more money into the farm community than any other government in the history of Manitoba, and we're proud of it. We're very proud of the fact that we are out there supporting the farm community, which his government was busy attempting to destroy, not deliberately, but with its policies, with the policies of neglect, with the policies of support of the Federal Government.

They had a Tory Federal Government, the Clark Government. They had a Liberal Government. They're all the same. They kept Bouey in as chairman of the Bank of Canada under the Tories. Then the Liberals came in. When the Tories were in, the Liberals were complaining about high interest rates. When the Liberals came in, the Tories were complaining about high interest rates. The one thing they had in common was, when they were in office, they did nothing, other than to raise interest rates.

He was the Minister of Agriculture who raised interest rates to 17 percent for Manitoba farmers, and he has the gall to come in here tonight and say, we are the ones who care for farmers. This is the government that brought in the Interest Rate Relief Program for farmers that saved thousands of farmers in this province. This is the government that brought in the program to reduce interest rates for farmers on mortgages already put out by that government from 17 percent down, I believe, to 13 percent down to 8 percent now. And he has the gall to say we do nothing for agriculture.

He says, Mr. Chairman, that all we do is lend them money that we get right back. He forgets that he was

wrong when he said that nobody would take part in the Beef Assistance Program. Remember that? He said it will never fly. The farmers don't like that kind of thing. It's flying, all right. So is our hog program. It's flying all right.

We are investing, we have confidence in our agricultural community. We're demonstrating that confidence, and our farmers know it. Even though that member is out there giving false information to the farmers, we will be providing them with accurate information.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Arthur have a point of order?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. We heard the Minister of Finance make a false accusation on the record that I am spreading false information in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could you state your point of order, please?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to withdraw a statement that he just put on the record — (Interjection) — yes, he did, and he accused me of spreading untrue information in the farm community, false information. I want him to withdraw that statement.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, is he not going to withdraw that?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, I'm going to prove it.

Mr. Chairman, the member just finished a speech in which he stated to this House that he was going to go out there and tell the farmers that, during his term of office, interest payments were reduced. The Member for Turtle Mountain heard him say that.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, you did. You said, we have reduced debts and interest payments, and we're going to tell the farmers - that's what you said. What you did was increase the debt of the province, and you increased interest payments for the province. You did both of those things.

You ran around this province in 1977, suggesting that you would reduce the deficit. You increased it. By the time we took office, the deficit was far greater than when you took office.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's a lie.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There it is. We have a historical record that that man is trying to distort. It reminds me of the Keegstra trial. That is the kind of politics played by that member. He would distort history in order to prove a point. He does not, he cannot accept . . .

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Finance made a particularly unsavoury innuendo which amounts to attributing motives to a colleague of mine, which is clearly against our rules. When he reaches out of some clutchbag, way at the bottom of his feet to make reference to the Keegstra trial and in any way try to associate my colleague, the Member for Arthur, as in any way having said or in any way been associated with it simply is not acceptable, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Minister of Finance to reconsider that suggestion.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the member said that I was lying when I said . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Now you're saying you didn't say that it was a lie. You're lying again.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I say it from my seat a lot, but I didn't say it for the record.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the member said I was lying when I pointed out a historical fact, the historical fact being that the deficit was larger in the last Tory year than in the year they took office. That is a historical fact.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Prove it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That is exactly what Keegstra is saying.

MR. H. ENNS: The Minister of Finance introduced the subject matter of the Keegstra trial into this debate, and I want to know what relevancy that has, and whether or not he would want to consider withdrawing that reference.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before turning back to the Minister of Finance, I would suggest that in this debate it is not appropriate to bring up the trial of a Mr. Keegstra in Alberta. I would hope that the tone of debate from both sides of the House will temper somewhat. I fully expect and I fully appreciate the emotions that can rise as the House moves toward wrapping up the Session but, ladies and gentlemen, if we could temper somewhat our debate, we may be able to progress a little more quickly.

The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suppose it's okay for him to call me a liar for stating a historical fact. Mr. Chairman, that's fine.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. I did not hear the Member for Arthur from his feet call the Minister a liar. I did, however, hear him say it from his seat. I do not know whether or not it will show up in Hansard and we shall check the records to see whether or not it showed up on the record.

The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, that is what the member is saying he is going to do. He is going to go back to his riding and tell people there something that is historically, demonstrably inaccurate. The Member for Turtle Mountain and others on that side know full well that it is totally inaccurate, unfair and improper.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise reluctantly again on a point of order because we do want to move these proceedings ahead.

I'm simply asking the Minister of Finance to withdraw the introduction of the Keegstra trial which, as I am told, in the first instance is before the courts. It shouldn't be referred to in any event. But, leaving that aside, it is simply not acceptable to have the Minister of Finance, on record, on his feet, speaking on the record and draw that kind of a reference into this debate.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I'll withdraw that remark.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I will, however, say that I find it despicable that we have a member of this House who was a member of the Cabinet between 1977 and 1981 who has all of the access of any one of the other members of this Chamber to the statements, financial records, of this province. He is still stating, notwithstanding those financial records of this province, that he is prepared to go out there and tell his constituents (1) that they lowered the deficit; (2) that they lowered interest costs; (3) that they lowered the debt. That is astounding and totally inaccurate on every single count.

But it does bring up the question of how badly that particular government went away from what it said it was going to do when it took office. Because they did say in 1977, that when they took office, they would reduce the deficit. They would balance the books. That's what we heard. That's what they could not deliver. In fact, they went the other way.

When we took office, the numbers were for the 1981-82 year, the projected numbers were something like \$262 million on a combined basis of a deficit. Even with all of the doctoring they wanted to do, all of the moving of 1978 expenses into 1977 and 1976 into 1977 to top up 1977-78 at its highest possible level, they couldn't reach that kind of a number or come even close - couldn't even come close. They had to change the bookkeeping system in order to build up that deficit and even so, they left office with a larger deficit than they came in on, a larger deficit than they even came in on. He never signed your financial statements once without question in any one of your years. This is the only government that has had him sign it, the only government in the last 10 years.

The member gets up and says, we didn't cut health care costs; we didn't cut education costs. — (Interjection) — you didn't say education costs. I'm sorry. So you are admitting you cut education costs?

I'll tell you, you also cut health costs. This is at a time when we had inflation in some years at double

digits. In those years, you were cutting back very seriously on health care costs, and there are no Manitobans who believe that you were maintaining health care - not a chance.

You say, Mr. Chairman, that Manitobans need a Cabinet and caucus that is together. That's what we've got right now. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, every time your leader gets up, somebody pulls another arrow out of his back, but half the time you twist it first. You've got two different groups there who are sort of eyeing the leadership, looking around, smelling around, you know your leader is wounded.

We have a Premier who will be the Premier as long as he wants to be because the people of Manitoba know full well that what we have here is far better than anything that group can offer, the whole bunch of you.

Here is a member who suggests we do not have unity and their education critic and their leader vote different ways on an education issue. That's not leadership, and that's not unity. If you can't carry that caucus, get them supporting you, you don't have leadership and you do have disunity, skipping out on votes and that sort of thing.

But then they come along and they say, look, we want health care just like everybody else. Then they say, at the same time, it's okay for the Federal Government to decrease transfer payments by \$2 billion.

Well, \$2 billion right now, that is what the Federal Budget has estimated. That is \$100 million for Manitoba approximately, if we get a pro-rated share of that \$2 billion - and what do they say? They say, that's okay. That seems fair to us. Well, you know, that's the way things are. Things are tough in Ottawa. We'll accept that. They take that \$100 million, sweep it off the table and say, well, that's no problem, and have never discussed it since, except to say that it is not a big problem.

Mr. Chairman, your leader was quoted as saying, he was not disturbed by transfer payment reductions of \$100 million and yet he has spent hours in this Legislature, talking - and I'm not going to talk about strawberries - but he was talking about a couple of million dollars of advertising. Well, you were quoted as saying that in the Free Press the day after the Budget. You said, it was a fair Budget, Mr. Chairman, and I'm quoting from the Free Press, I believe it is Page 2. "Filmon said he was not disturbed by transfer payment reductions." He went on and said he wanted to see them done fairly. He said he was not concerned about transfer payment reductions - \$2 billion, that's \$100 million to this province and you walk away and say, no problem. You think you can keep the health care system in place, doing that, cutting the health and education levy by more than \$100 million, increasing spending all over the place? You say you have policies?

The member who just spoke said he had policies, not a single policy came forward. He talks about Limestone, the member talked about Limestone. Well, he says, who's going to pay for it? We all know that with or without the NSP agreement, we would have to build within the next several years. Without the NSP agreement, we would not have an assured fixed sale. Mr. Chairman, Peter Warren said it very well, I think it was this morning, when he said the Tories are grasping at straws when they're attacking Limestone; that's what

Peter Warren said on the air this morning. It's needed anyway; it's going to lower the cost to Manitobans.

We're demonstrating that right now with the project and the contracts that are coming in and our Minister has negotiated contracts for things like turbines and generators where we get a job in Manitoba for every job created outside. That has never happened by any other government in the history of this province. We're very proud of what we've been doing; we'd be delighted to continue debating this until you're ready to quit.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we had a sort of an interesting demonstration of nothing tonight from the Minister of Finance. It sort of typifies the way he approaches some of the problems he's facing. He approaches them with baffle-gab; he approaches them with distortions in facts and outbursts and screams and hollers and cries.

You know, Mr. Chairman, he's been Minister of Finance now for four years in the Province of Manitoba. He's making reference, of course, he's dredging up '77 to '81 when the province had good government. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance made some reference, — (Interjection) — you know the Minister of Finance objected to his allegation, he heard a colleague of mine describe him as a liar and he just described a colleague over here as a liar from his seat. So I hope it made him feel good.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance of this province talked about the deficit and our efforts while we were government to control expenditures and bring the deficit into line. What, of course, this Minister of Finance will never discuss and may not understand, is that when we inherited the Schreyer finances, we inherited a financial system which there was no quarterly reporting. At the time of the 1977 election, we couldn't even get from the Schreyer administration what the deficit was going to be and, Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Finance likes to say that things were fine in 1977 in the Schreyer administration. The truth is that the Schreyer administration were afraid to tell the people of Manitoba how large the deficit was in 1977. It came in at \$228 million and we had to put some spending controls on it and we brought it down to, I think, \$191 million in the first year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and you know the gentleman, the Government House Leader, that has trouble speaking truthfully to his constituents from a public platform, just informed the House that we had to combine the Capital and the Current Account. That's right. Mr. Chairman, that is something that was recommended to the Schreyer administration, but they didn't want to do it because it would actually show the people of Manitoba in a truthful way, how bad an administration they were and how wasteful they were.

Mr. Chairman, we combined it and had we run - I've made this point before and I'll repeat it just briefly for the Minister of Finance because he lacks the understanding of it - had we continued to account the way Schreyer had to account, we would have had surplus budgets in at least two years, had we continued to account along the Schreyer lines. Mr. Chairman, I give members of the government that were in opposition against us from 1977 to 1981 full credit for distorting the health care in particular, and making out that things

were going to hell in a hand basket, to put it bluntly, in the health care field. We had a number of members.

Now we hear absolutely nothing about the fact that elective surgery is backed up in Brandon for several months; we hear nothing about diagnostic services being four, six, eight week expenditures; we hear nothing about the fact that this government has stopped people from going down to the Mayo Clinic and won't cover their costs down there. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that's phony. That's exactly the policy that he's put in place within the last six months. So, Mr. Chairman, the health care system is not as healthy as it was in 1981 when this government took over. You know, the First Minister promised they were going to restore it. They've exercised further cutbacks and restraints in the health care system.

The Minister of Finance has brought in user fees in the health care field that weren't there in 1981; he's going to bring in more user fees in the health care field, because this Minister of Finance has gotten approval and will bring in next budget the ability to remove the property tax credit from institutionalized Manitobans. You know, the impact is several millions of dollars. These are all cutbacks that have occurred during the Pawley administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Minister of Finance, for his edification, that when he talks about how we raised the deficit in our term in office, that isn't exactly a factual statement, because in real dollars during the time of inflation, the deficit went down and went down dramatically. What it has done in four years of this Pawley administration is go up to add \$1.8 billion to the public debt of Manitoba. You know what Manitobans are more and more asking themselves? They recognize that there's \$1.8 billion more debt. They're asking themselves, what have we got to show for it? You know what, Mr. Chairman? They have no roads to show for it; they don't have any new facilities to show for it. Southern Manitoba has not had any expenditures by the government.

You know, there's nothing to show for \$1.8 billion in four years of Pawley debt except higher taxes, less employment, a poorer investment climate and a government that can't even decide where they want to take this province in the future. We have a government that has done nothing except raise taxes and the deficit together in four years; that has seen employment decline in the Province of Manitoba, because there are more unemployed in the Province of Manitoba than there ever has been in history.

So, Mr. Chairman, what is this government is now going to run an election on? They do not have a record that will stand the test of time. How many more millions of dollars have our Crown corporations lost in the last four years; \$84 million additional losses. We have seen all forms of taxes go up; there hasn't been one tax go down in this province in four years.

At the same time, the deficit has skyrocketed. Now, with a record like that, this government cannot go to the people and say, we lived up to our 1981 promises. The First Minister will be laughed out of Manitoba if he says that they're going to restore the health care system when he goes to the people in 1985 or 1986, because people know what his restoration means. They know it means the loss of personal care home beds in Brandon; lineups for service in Manitoba and

reductions in spending; and the promise of charges for meals and other areas that the Minister of Health is discussing - musing, he admits - but discussing, and we know it's coming.

Now, Mr. Chairman, given the dismal record of this administration - and one more point, the Minister of Finance tonight, started to baffle and explode in his verbiage and his animosity in his vitriolic way - but you know, Mr. Chairman, in the four years that we had a Finance Minister delivering the audited accounts of the Province of Manitoba, we never had one year when the Provincial Auditor refused to sign them as they did this incompetent Minister. That never happened to a Conservative Minister of Finance, but it happened to this one.

You know, the people of Manitoba ask themselves, under ordinary circumstances, a person whose auditor would not sign their financial statement probably would be taken to court by their shareholders, but when it's this Minister of Finance and this government, under Pawley, the people of Manitoba sort of expect that level of incompetence and they have come to believe that it is the best they can do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the Minister of Finance, and the Premier, that they have nothing to run on in terms of record of good government. They have divided the province on the language issue; they have squandered the financial resources of this province; they have raised every tax in this province; they have brought in bad legislation in this province. So, Mr. Chairman, what is their alternative as they are approaching an election? As they are approaching an election, what are they going to do? They are going to run against the Federal Government.

The Minister of Agriculture just sent out a letter - it arrived in some mailboxes today - where he is blaming everything on the Federal Government. It is the most highly political and most highly election-oriented letter that you'll ever see. And was it paid for, ladies and gentlemen, by the New Democratic Party in preparation of an election? Oh, of course not. The Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues don't have that kind of integrity. It was paid for on Minister of Agriculture's letterhead, his letter, the Minister of Agriculture's letter, and the postage was paid for by the people of Manitoba to deliver election propaganda campaign to the people of Manitoba on behalf of the New Democratic Party, paid for by the taxpayers. Mr. Chairman, it's not unusual, they've got about 200 paid hirelings on staff now cranking out propaganda and doing these letters for them on the word processors that they have put in this building.

Mr. Chairman, the people that receive them, some of their supporters may receive them and they may say, oh good, aren't these New Democrats good people, hooray! But the vast majority of the people that receive the Minister of Agriculture's letter this week do not agree with his policy, and they know that this Minister is abusing the tax system in a crass political way. You know, it may only be 60 cents or 70 cents for every person that receives that letter, it's a small amount, but it's demonstrative of the intellectual dishonesty of this government, a government that cannot determine right from wrong and what is proper in terms of public spending.

We have had the First Minister caught doing it; we have had the First Minister caught **sending out** letters

dealing with the French language issue to the municipalities across this province with a typographical error that didn't exactly have truly represented Section 23 of the 1870 Act. This Premier had to stand up and say it was a typographical error. Now that is the ultimate in intellectual dishonesty that you will ever see in the leader of a political party, and we see it daily with this Premier.

As I said on Monday night, Manitoba is represented by a Premier whose opinion is neither valued nor desired on the federal scene because he is not giving an opinion founded on any principle and any basis of integrity. This Minister is the most ridiculed First Minister this province has ever had. This First Minister is the most discredited, most unlistened to First Minister in Canada right now, and that's why we see the spectacle of the Minister of Finance and some of his other people standing up and defending him daily in this House. Daily in this House his Ministers have to defend his reputation because he cannot defend it himself. The most lacklustre, weakest leader this province has ever had, defended by one of the weakest and most lacklustre Cabinets in this province's history.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance tonight tried to put an image on his leader, his Premier, that Manitobans do not believe. Manitobans know that this First Minister is not a leader. They know that this First Minister cannot possibly lead the Province of Manitoba for one more term. The people of Manitoba are waiting to deliver that message to the poll that counts - to the MLA for Thompson - to the only poll that counts, and that's the election day poll. The sooner you screw up your courage and call the election, the better off the people of Manitoba will be.

If you want my original phrase that I coined on this, that is applicable only to this lack-lustre Premier, which is, "Call up your courage and screw up the election," is the way it goes for this First Minister because he is just not with it, Mr. Chairman. And to have a Minister of Finance stand up tonight with the bafflegab and try to make him look like a leader was humorous, Mr. Chairman, was humorous.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some of the comments of the Honourable Member for Pembina I guess were so low that he could walk under a grasshopper sitting in a field. That's how I would comment on some of his comments that he made about my leader and about some of the programs and some of the innuendo that he is spreading in this House.

Mr. Chairman, some of the comments made by honourable members about this government and our programs in terms of the farm community and rural Manitoba, in general, deserve some comment about what this government has done. Mr. Chairman, this government, this Premier and members on this side take no back seat to anyone on the work that we have done in support of Manitoba farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to relate some of our programs for the honourable members since the Member for Arthur doesn't recall some of our programs since he was a former Minister, that when he came into office decided to cut the spending in agriculture and, in fact,

the budget of agriculture was lowered from the previous year in his year in office. Mr. Chairman, he made much to-do that they had a \$40 million drought program, but then he had to admit that they paid out \$13 million to the farmers of Manitoba. Even as long as three years after they were out of government, he still had the audacity to come to this House and say "we had a \$40 million drought program". When we questioned him and corrected him, he said, oh yes, but we only spent \$13 million on that program but we had \$40 million there.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member made the allegation tonight that all our programs are in fact money that we are borrowing to the farmers. That's the allegation that he made today. Mr. Chairman, let me tell the honourable member, \$38 million into the beef industry; \$8 million to the hog industry; \$11 million in interest rate relief to the farmers of Manitoba, a saving to Manitoba farmers of \$18 million on the write down of interest rates from 17 percent - their interest rates - to 13 percent; \$6 million in a write down of interest rates to 8 percent this year.

Mr. Chairman, let's count up who has benefited: the beef program, 5,000 farmers; 1,000 farmers in the hog program; 1,250 farmers, interest rate relief; 3,500 farmers on the interest rate write-down; 650 farmers on the interest rate buy-down. Mr. Chairman, all those 12,000 farmers, more than half of the commercial farmers of this province, were directly assisted by programs of this government.

The Honourable Member for Arthur and his colleagues say we haven't helped the farm community. Mr. Chairman, had these programs not been in place, can you imagine the rural depopulation and the chaos we would have had in rural Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, they criticized us for closing a meat plant in Brandon. Today the meat plant is still open and killing more beef than they ever have in the past.

Mr. Chairman, capital gains for farmers - the first action we did when we came into government, we provided exemptions. Mr. Chairman, we brought in legislation. Many of the financial problems that are faced by many farmers in this Province of Manitoba were as a result of the competition that they faced from off-shore buyers and from speculative buyers in this province, Mr. Chairman.

And those gentlemen say they're going to do away with the legislation. Let them get on the hustings and say they will do it. Let them go out to Manitobans and say they will get rid of The Farm Lands Ownership Act. Let them tell the farmers that many of their neighbours got into trouble financially because they had to compete with the speculative lawyers and the off-shore buyers. Those are the kinds of policies they want.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of programs and what kind of criticisms do they bring on us in this Session? Mr. Chairman, what kind of criticism? Day in and day out, they criticized us - on what? - on mismanaging supply management. The one sure area that farmers of this province have insofar as guaranteed incomes on production, they attacked. Mr. Chairman, they attacked every supply-managed commodity. The Member for Pembina, the Member for Arthur, the Member for Emerson, that's all they did was attack supply management. Guaranteed incomes for farmers, they attacked, Mr. Chairman. That was their attack in this

Session. That's what they wanted to do, undermine the very stability of agriculture, Mr. Chairman, guaranteed incomes to farmers.

What have they said about the 4-cent-a-litre increase in fuel tax from the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman? What have they said? Nothing. Talk about a promise that was neglected.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with health programs as well. The Honourable Member for Arthur said they didn't cut health programs. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, in my own riding, two tenders were let before the election and they were killed. They were stopped. The tenders were let; the contractors were notified, and they were killed, Mr. Chairman. Do you know what happened? It . . . by Lyon and his cohorts, Mr. Chairman. It cost the taxpayers of this province double the money, twice as much money when we re-let those tenders for those nursing homes in Ashern and in Eriksdale. We spent twice as much money as a result of those programs, Mr. Chairman.

Talk about actions on the international scene. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Arthur said tonight that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture were forced to act on the hog issue. Mr. Chairman, who moved to ban chloramphenicol? Mr. Chairman, who moved to talk to the U.S. governors and opened the doors for the movement of Manitoba hogs if it was financially advantageous to Manitoba producers? Who pressed the Federal Government for action as a result of inaction?

Now let's contrast that, Mr. Chairman, with what happened at the federal side. Who criticized Manitoba for banning chloramphenicol, Mr. Chairman? Your colleagues. Mr. Chairman, who told Manitoba farmers to sue the Americans? Your colleagues in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, who didn't reveal that they were told a year ago that there would be problems with chloramphenicol? Your colleagues, Mr. Chairman, in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, who banned chloramphenicol weeks after the Manitoba Government did? Mr. Chairman, who sold out western Canadian beef farmers for blueberries, honey and maple syrup?

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you, your friends, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, do you know what they called that action, and I quote from their press release? "This action of outright deceit will not soon be forgotten by the dwindling number of cattlemen in this nation." That's the Canadian Cattlemen's Association about the actions of the European beef that they brought in. "Outright deceit," that's what they called the Tories, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard a word from the honourable members opposite about alternative programs. We have put more programs and more money into the farm community than any government in the history of this province. Sir, we recognize that the farm community have been going through difficult times, but it is time that the Federal Government lived up to their responsibility of co-operative programming. Mr. Chairman, we will criticize the Federal Government at every turn when they neglect rural Canada and rural Manitoba in particular, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, the members opposite can rant and rave all they like about all the

things they have done, but I would just like to take a few moments to put on the record what the NDP are saying to their own people. The Swan River Report on June 24th had an editorial page, and this is a member of the ND Party - I would just like to quote: "Government indecisive. Manitoba Premier, Howard Pawley, told his supporters in Swan River . . . Although I personally do favour more freedom of opportunity for ordinary working people to get ahead, the essence of social democracy, regrettably I could not force myself to listen to the Premier in Swan River."

Then he goes on to say: "Our Premier is not a bad fellow. The Report had been pleased to cover his public appearances in the valley from the time long ago in the Schreyer Government when he opened a sewer improvement in Minitonas. But now I cannot really offer him my support, and that really bothers me, so to reduce the disappointment, I don't really even want to see him." This is the editor of the Swan River Report talking about the Premier. "Any government has policies with which a person will agree and others with which he will disagree, so too with the Pawley Government." And it goes on, "On the whole I identify with those who normally and logically should be the backbone of NDP support, but something is missing. That said, I cannot help shake the feeling that our government, through internal division, indecisiveness and perhaps inability just simply cannot offer the hope of greater opportunities to ordinary working people; there seems no calm and competent direction. It hurts to say this, but the NDP desperately needs time away from government to get its mind in order." Seriously, this is coming from one of your own supporters. This is by the Swan River Report. The Member for The Pas knows this individual, I'm sure, and I'm sure he has read this article.

The Minister of the Environment said I skipped out a part. In essence of time, I didn't want to take the time to read it all, so I'd better fill in the part that I missed. The part that I missed — (Interjection) — Do you think I should read the whole thing in now? Well, I won't go to that extent to read the whole thing in, but I wouldn't want to leave the impression on the record that I purposely missed out a couple of paragraphs because it would change the context of the article.

The two paragraphs that I missed out: "NDP support should logically come from working people, from the intellectual community and from people who feel themselves powerless and disadvantaged in the face of major societal and economic forces. The Conservative support should logically come from the big business, senior civil servants and major farmers." So those are the two paragraphs that I missed out.

The members opposite, and especially the Premier lately, have been glowing over the fact that he apparently feels that the polls are really working in his favour. Perhaps he is right, but I would just like to say that I don't have any concerns about the polls in the Swan River constituency; I don't have any concerns about the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. GOURLAY: Earlier today, the Minister of Housing, on the Critical Home Repair had the gall to say that he only had . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Housing had the gall in question period this afternoon to say that he had only received my letter regarding a critical home repair situation some two weeks ago.

In that letter I had mentioned to the Minister that I had contacted his office. I had talked to his executive assistant - I think it was on the last day of May - with this problem. I heard absolutely nothing. The day I contacted the Minister's office was the day the Critical Home Repair inspector cancelled Mrs. Rieben's application because she wouldn't take the different colored siding on the house, so the inspector cancelled her application. I got in touch with the Minister's office; I talked to his executive assistant, I explained exactly

Do you want to hear this or don't you? If you don't want to hear it, get the hell out.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Okay, so the Minister says that he received the letter on July 25th. I presume . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: It may be funny to you, but it is not funny to the senior citizen in Kenville.

Okay, the Minister of Housing says that he received the letter on July 25th. I presume he means June 25th, but I can't help that. I wrote it and mailed it on the 19th of June from this building. So the fact is, I contacted your office, I contacted your executive assistant in the end of May so I don't know where your communication is with your staff. I would say, when you have a complaint of this nature, that surely to goodness the complaint does go to the bottom of the pile. You said you had a lot of applications on housing and I expect that, but I would think that there should be some priority given to an application that has been cancelled, under the circumstances that was brought to the Minister's attention back at the end of May, and then followed up by a letter which was written on the 19th and sent out on the 19th of June. I talked to the Minister on Monday or Tuesday of this week to see if he couldn't speed the thing up. So I took the opportunity today to ask a question because it was my last opportunity to get some immediate action on this problem.

So, I'll leave that situation with the Minister of Housing, that this is the kind of socialist bureaucracy and response that we get for the people of this province by this government.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to make these few comments at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Well, this, the end of the Session, allows us an opportunity to rise in our place from time to time and try to put into perspective, not only what is happening in this Chamber and what has happened in this Chamber over the past number of months, but also allows us an opportunity to put into perspective some of the issues that concern us as members of the Legislative Assembly and representatives of the general public.

The member who just rose in his seat, the Member for Swan River, takes out a newspaper article, and he quotes a newspaper article that is somewhat critical of the government and tries to build a case, on that newspaper article, that our political fortune is failing or that the general public is critical of us. Well, Mr. Chairperson, we on this side have been talking to thousands of Manitobans over the past couple of months and contrary to what one newspaper article, one editorial writer has to say, they are telling us that this government has served them well. Further to that, they are telling us that this government is going to continue to serve them well for many years to come.

We've seen a spectacle over the past number of months of the Leader of the Opposition coming into this Chamber and saying, time after time after time again, call an election. Remember that? Several months ago, when we first started this Session, every time he stood on his feet it was almost as if somebody was pulling one of those strings on a doll that records and it says, call an election, call an election. He probably had good reason to say that at that time. I watched him. He was enthusiastic about it. He was sincere about it. He really wanted an election.

Why did he want that election? Because he was watching the polls, Mr. Chairperson. Now I don't particularly think that the polls should give us any solace, whether we're ahead or behind in the polls at any given time. I think what is important is what the people are saying to us when we talk to them on the street corner and in their homes and at meetings, and when we discuss the issues with them. That's what I think is important.

But obviously, the members opposite put a bit more faith in the polls, so they were yelling day after day. Every one of them at one time or another rose in their places and they said call an election, and they wanted that election. There was a lust in their voices. They wanted the election, because they thought they would win it.

Now about a month ago, maybe six weeks ago, the tenor and the tone of the call changed - not the words - still call an election. But it was less frequent, and it was not so ringed with sincerity as it was with hope. They were confident before. Six weeks ago, they started to sound less confident in those pleas.

What do they sound like now? Well, they have yelled it across the floor enough times. Every time we talk about the polls they say, we're still two points ahead. We're two percentage points ahead. The Leader of the Opposition is shaking his head no. and perhaps he'll take time to correct the record when he stands to speak.

But that's what he's been saying; that's what the members opposite have been saying. Now that call for an election is not sincere. It's not even one of hope anymore. It is pure bravado and bluster because they know that, when that election is called, they have blown

the lead and they are going to lose the election and they are going to sit on that side of the House, not four years more but many, many more years as opposition.

You know, it was funny the other day to watch the Leader of the Opposition when we on this side said, but where do you stand? We would say, but where do you stand? It didn't matter what issue. He would stand up and he said, call an election. You'll find out. But where do you stand on this issue? Call an election, you'll find out. But where do you stand on this issue? Call an election, you'll find out.

They, throughout this Session, have consistently refused to answer the question that Manitobans want them to answer and expect of them and, as an opposition, they would be prepared to answer. That is, where do you stand on the issues of importance to Manitobans? Not where do you stand on strawberry washing, not where do you stand on the issue of a house in a particular community - those are all important issues, but they're not what Manitobans want to hear. Manitobans want to hear where they stand on the issues of importance to them, the economy, jobs, social services, the maintenance of them and the enhancement of them.

They refuse to say where they stand on any of those issues, and they refuse to say so for only one of a couple possible reasons: (1) they don't know where they stand, that could be a possibility; (2) they know where they stand and they're not confident of it, and they don't want people out there to know where they stand. That's possible really, because maybe they stand in different places all throughout their caucus. Maybe their caucus meeting is a group here, a group there, a group here, a group here, and a group there, and the Leader of the Opposition tries to herd them all together every once in a while. That's a possibility. Or maybe they really do stand on all sides of the issues, and that's a possibility.

But the fact is they have a responsibility to tell the people of this province where they stand. If they don't, the people will find out anyway before the election. When we asked the Leader of the Opposition early in the Session where he stood on Limestone, do you know what he said? I'm paraphrasing, I may be misquoting him directly, but I am giving you the intent. He said, we will do what we have to do when we're the government. Well, they're not going to have the opportunity to do that as government, so they might as well take the chance now to tell us what they're going to do.

But what they will do by their silence is tell the people by default where they stand. How will the people find out? Well, they'll look to the Conservatives in Ottawa, because they're all the same party and they're all the same stripe, and they all have the same intent in governing. They will see what the Conservative Government in Ottawa has done to this country, and they will say, we don't want that to happen here in Manitoba. So they'll find out in that way.

They'll look at the de-indexation; they'll look at the cutbacks; they'll look at the way in which they've approached governing and they'll say that we don't want that here in Manitoba. Or perhaps, if they don't look to Ottawa, they'll look at Conservative Governments across the country, and they'll see what

is happening in places like B.C. and the havoc that is being wreaked on that province because of Conservative ideology and the way in which it's being implemented. They'll say, we won't have that in Manitoba either.

So that's the choice they have, to let people by default realize what it is that they intend to do, to let their silence betray them, or to finally take the opportunity tonight for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and put clearly on the record where he stands about the issues of importance to Manitobans.

If he fails to do that, then it will be only one more condemnation of their inability to have the courage to speak their minds, to tell the people where they stand, that flows among a number of contradictions that have been seen throughout this particular Session. They have failed this Session. They have failed the people of Manitoba and, for that reason, Mr. Chairperson, they will not have the opportunity to govern because no one can trust those who have been so incompetent, so inept, and refused to tell the general public where it stands on issues of importance to them.

Where do you stand? Where do you stand, Gary?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to speak to this, the final bill on Supply to the House, in the final stages of this Session; pleased, as well, to be able to follow the Minister of Co-op Development who rarely speaks in the House these days.

When he was in opposition, you know, he put volumes and volumes and volumes on the record, volumes of nothing, because all of those fine sounding phrases that he made, all of those concerns that he expressed, you know, he joked about and he made light of questions about Dr. Frank Labella's comments on the potential for toxic sprays on strawberries to cause health injuries, he made light of that today. But when he was in government, Dr. Frank Labella was brought up as an expert on issue after issue on the environment as a toxicologist, the concerns here, he said that the environment must be protected, that people must be safeguarded from these things.

And this Minister, when he became the Minister of the Environment, became the biggest pussy cat in the world. All of a sudden, all of the things that he said about reducing the emissions at Fliin Flon, about reducing the emissions at Inco, about all of those things, he turned tail, put his tail between his legs, and he refused to act. He did absolutely nothing. He did all of the hand wringing and handholding, but nothing on the environment.

When he was in opposition he talked about bringing forward a hazardous waste disposal facility in this province. Mr. Chairman, we still haven't gotten beyond the talking stage; we still haven't gotten beyond the stage of plans and papers on all of these things, no action whatsoever. We are now four years since he took government and no action whatsoever, so I don't want to be told by that Minister that I should talk about all of the things we are going to do.

Mr. Chairman, he talked about all of those things that he said should be done and did nothing - absolutely zero - and where he stands before us, a big zero. It has to be the biggest embarrassment in the world, Mr. Chairman, for this individual, this Minister of Co-op Development, this ideologue, this person who had so much promise, who had so much desire to act, to be able to stand up here with his tail between his legs and be reduced to saying, tell us where you stand. He had all of the answers, and when he became government he became a captive of the bureaucracy, presumably, or of his own caucus, because he failed to do anything. Now they have reduced him, Mr. Chairman, to becoming one of the lowest responsible Ministers in the whole government. He is a Minister with one of the smallest portfolios in terms of budget, with one of the smallest portfolios in terms of action in this administration because he is the Minister of talk and no action. And he is lecturing us? Not a chance, Mr. Chairman, not a chance.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister talks about members on this side not wanting to enter into any action, not taking any firm stands. It just happens that one of the papers that I still have left in my desk is the minutes of the Cabinet seminar of Thursday, September 15, 1983 of this Cabinet of this NDP administration. Here is a plan of forthright action . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of "muzzle" has now been allowed to speak, heckle from his chair. Isn't that nice? The Premier has allowed him to speak again - the Minister of "muzzle" who is often called the Minister of the Environment but isn't doing any more than his predecessor.

Mr. Chairman, here is the plan of action, that great pro-active administration that he is so proud of being a member of, here is their plan of action from this Cabinet document: that all new non-economic issues, programs and legislation, with the exception of outstanding election commitments which do not meet the test of importance to a key group, positive, non-controversial, be deferred three years. That's the action plan of this pro-active administration who had such great promise, who talked so much about all the great things that they could do - defer everything that was non-controversial, everything of any importance except for the window dressing, the window dressing that was led to create the perception that they were carrying out election promises and commitments.

No way did they carry out their election commitments. The bills that they passed in this Session to do with pay equity, to do with technological change, to do with business closure, were all things that were really just policy statements, that were things that had been done by other governments, that were totally lacking, totally didn't require bills they had to put in bill form just so that they could say to their supporters, their special interest supporters, that they had in fact carried out their promises. What a sad commentary on people who said that they would act and act positively, Mr. Chairman.

All this talks about, this whole document, a timetable for public announcements be set now for the next three years. For three years you set up a timetable of public announcements so that every week you've got something to come in. It's no wonder that the Free Press has taken to writing a weekend column in the Sunday newspaper that talks about their most ridiculous news releases because they have a three year plan of news releases to talk about anything and everything. A new name for bees or something like that, that they come up with, that's a subject of a news release, Mr. Chairman.

It is absolutely ridiculous that this Minister of Co-op Development has the audacity to talk about plans and action when all he has been responsible for is sitting back cowering and running the election strategy of this government. He is the Minister who is in charge of polling. He is the Minister who is in charge of the focus group sessions whereby they try and assess what the public reaction will be to something before they do it because they are so frightened to act without all of this business of the high priced cost of pre-testing concepts, pre-testing slogans, pre-testing themes, pre-testing ads, pre-testing all of the things to find out the acceptability of it and this Minister of Co-op Development is the Minister for all of that. That's his big role. Of course, when their campaign goes down the tube, he's the Minister and he's the member responsible. He will carry the can, Mr. Chairman.-(Interjection) — Not a chance, you won't live that long.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk . . . I had intended to talk very briefly.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Don't stop us now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, what is pathetic is the record of incompetence of this NDP administration, that's what is incompetent - and the facts are right here in the document that's been provided for us by their own administration; the analysis of their fourth year of their administration; all of the promise, all of the discussion about job creation, about youth employment, about all the opportunities of the future.

What this pro-active administration would do is contained in the sad story of a document that's been provided for us by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, the Member for Brandon East, called "Labour Force Statistics Report to June 1985." That's where it all comes down. Because now, Mr. Chairman, we have had four years to evaluate the real effects of their policies, practices and procedures; four years to know what this province can expect from an NDP administration in terms of the real key economic bread-and-butter issues - and here they are. Here is the sad commentary on this government's action, on this government's policies, where they have led this province in four years.

All you have to do is take a look at where we are June of 1985, Mr. Chairman, and let's take a look at the sad facts. Our numbers of unemployed in this province today are 41,000 people; that's 3,000 more

than they were a year ago today, 3,000 more. But that's 15,000 more than when they took government in 1981, 15,000 more people unemployed; the stories of misery, the stories of heartache, the stories of NDP misdirected priorities over the past four years are contained in the lives of these 41,000 unemployed people today in Manitoba - 15,000 more than were unemployed when they took government in 1981.

Mr. Chairman, take a look though at how that compares; how their action over the past year, June of '85 to June of '84 compares with what's happening in the rest of the country. Whereas we are up in unemployed, we are up by 3,000 over last year in the numbers of unemployed, the rest of the country as a whole is down in unemployed by 69,000; a sad commentary on the only NDP administration in this country of ours today. These people who talk in glowing terms about their commitment to job creation, have led us down the garden path and led us down the tubes to more and more and more unemployment than we have had in the past before they took government and more unemployed this year than we had a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, here's another factor. Whereas in the past year, we've had 2,000 more jobs created in this province, June of '85 over June of '84, the rest of the country has had 308,000 more jobs created in that one year period. What a sad commentary on this failed NDP administration, and this Premier and his leadership; his leadership on economic issues, because they can talk all they want about caring and sharing and concern, and all those things are important, but they're translated into figures of misery that they have created for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at the percentages of unemployment in this country and in the past year from June of '84 to June of '85, this Manitoba province of ours has gone up in unemployed from 7.2 percent to 7.8 percent, when the country as a whole has had a reduction from 10.7 to 10 percent in unemployed rate. Mr. Chairman, we have gone from being the second — (Interjection) — I will read through the statistics. We will see where the drop is, Mr. Chairman. While the unemployment figures are going up when we are going from the second-best record in the country to the third-best record in the and heading for fourth or fifth, five other provinces have had an improvement in their unemployment figures, while Manitoba has dropped. Of course, the country as a whole has had a drop in unemployment figures, but ours have gone up in the past year.

Mr. Chairman, in the first half-year of this year versus the first half-year of last year, again, we've gone from second-best to third-best; again, we've increased from 8.6 percent to 8.9 percent - all as a result of the programs and policies for four years of this administration. The promise, the laudible objectives of these people telling us all the great things they'd do; how people would no longer have to worry about their jobs; how people would no longer have to worry about the economy and the future, is all turned to dark clouds and thunderstorms under this administration and this Premier.

Let's take a look, in particular, at the area that is on most people's minds, the area of youth unemployment. In the past year, the Province of Manitoba's unemployment in the age group of 15 to 24 has gone

from 12.4 percent to 13.9 percent, a full 1.5 percentage point increase in the unemployed youth of our province, Mr. Chairman. All of their promises are false; all of their hopes are false, because of this administration and its wrong-headed policies; its payroll tax, its labour legislation, all of the antibusiness attitude that it has brought here. All of this negative is happening in Manitoba for the youth unemployment at the same time as the country as a whole is having an improvement in the youth unemployment situation. The country as a whole has reduced youth unemployment from 17 percent to 16.2 percent, while our province has increased by 1.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, let's take a look industry-by-industry, sector-by-sector, where the problems are, and the problems are very evidently in the area of the long-term employment in the private sector because in the past year, from June of 1984 to June of 1985, we have had a reduction in manufacturing jobs from 62,000 to 57,000, a reduction of 5,000, almost 10 percent reduction in manufacturing jobs in this past year alone under this government's policies, platforms and procedures. That follows upon year upon year of reduction in manufacturing jobs in our economy because we are now up to almost a 15,000 reduction in manufacturing jobs under this administration.

They are proud of the fact that they say they've replaced jobs in other areas, and they've replaced jobs in the area of service - service jobs replacing manufacturing jobs. The average industrial wage of the manufacturing jobs is far higher, the ones that we have lost are far higher, than the service jobs that have replaced it, Mr. Chairman.

That is the litany of failures. That is the example of mismanagement and waste under the administration of this government, Mr. Chairman. It is all contained in the statistics of the labour force that have been put before us by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, Mr. Chairman.

It is a sad, sad tale of woe; a sad tale of misplaced priorities; a sad tale of mistaken opportunities by this administration and it all falls on the shoulders of this Premier, this Premier who doesn't know what is going on, who talks in glowing terms about reports in magazines and people who tell him that he is doing well, but he doesn't understand that the real answers are contained in the statistics that prove the example of where his government has been misplacing their priorities and where their actions have led to total and abject failure.

When he talks about the opportunities for youth, he is totally misleading them. He is telling them a story that is not in keeping with the facts. It is not in keeping with the actions of his administration, and he cannot get out from under these statistics because they prove the wrong-headedness, the mismanagement, the misplaced priorities of his administration better than anything I could say, better than anyone I can quote. There are many people who could give us that support, Mr. Chairman, but I don't have to. I am taking it right from the facts and figures, and I want to know what the Premier can tell us about these statistics.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton: The Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Would the Leader of the Opposition submit to a question?

The basic question to the Leader of the Opposition after that speech is, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, the people of Manitoba want to know, where do you stand? Where do you stand on any issue? Where?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we will have an opportunity issue-by-issue, policy-by-policy to debate our plans versus your plans, and we'll be happy to do it whenever you give us that opportunity. Issue the writ and call the election right now. Right now.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I assume that before the evening is out the Leader of the Opposition will again rise in his place and tell us where he does stand on the important issues confronting Manitobans, where for instance, he would reveal that labour legislation that he made reference to because Manitobans are expecting some answers from the Leader of the Opposition. Where does he stand? Because Manitobans experienced last year a series of great public relations flurry on the part of the present Prime Minister; they've now had nine months of bitter experience of the Conservative Prime Minister in Ottawa, a Conservative Prime Minister who avoided telling the people of Canada where he stood.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the strategy on the part of the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber to be silent, to avoid telling Manitobans where he stands will not wash because Canadians, and particularly Manitobans, have been hit, have been bitten by a Conservative leader who avoided telling them where he stood. They've had nine months of bitter experience. Manitobans are not about to forgive that bitter experience on the part of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a rather strange Session, I must say. From December of last year until March of this year, there were daily cries from the Leader of the Opposition, joined by some of his cohorts across the way, bring on the Session, bring on the Session. We have great things that we want to debate with this government. We want to bring this government to task. We have issues that we have to expose. What do we end up with as the most important issue today during question period, the final day of the Session? Strawberries in the Province of Manitoba. Strawberries from the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Session will go down as the strawberry session because we have a strawberry opposition.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, just so the Leader of the Opposition could add a little flavour to his flurry, some flurry to his rhetoric, he talked about going down the garden path. Well, I know the Leader of the Opposition has a guilt complex because his original theory was, avoid telling Manitobans where we stand, see if I can sneak into office through the back door like the Prime Minister snuck in through the back door last September 4th because I'm not going to enter through the front door and tells Manitobans where I stand on anything,

anything whatsoever. So I understand the Leader of the Opposition's comments about walking down the garden path in his fantasizing a few moments ago about the garden path. The Leader of the Opposition, indeed, is walking down the garden path, he is walking down the garden path to oblivion, to political oblivion.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the strawberries and the garden paths, there was a moment of bleakness on the part of the opposition's comments, because he talked about the dark clouds in the Province of Manitoba. That reminded me of a comment by another Finance Minister during the Lyon administration, not the Member for Turtle Mountain, because the Member for Turtle Mountain is altogether to careful to make such a statement such as this, that talked not about dark clouds but, in the Budget of 1980, said blue skies are just ahead; blue skies, Manitobans, are just ahead.

Mr. Chairman, we ended up four years of Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba, a Conservative administration led by the Member for Charleswood, in which the present Leader of the Opposition sat on the Treasury Board, that led us down the garden path into a situation by which we had the lowest economic indicators that this province has ever experienced and any other province in Canada.

Mr. Leader of the Opposition, let me warn you Manitobans will not forget 1977-81, when they were told there are blue skies just ahead, Manitobans. Rest easy, there are blue skies, and there weren't dark clouds, Mr. Chairman. We had a thunderstorm of unemployment and recession and collapse in our economic indicators during the time, not of recession, but in a time prior to recession when the rest of the country was doing well. Manitobans, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, members of the opposition will not forget your deeds, your negligence, when you had an opportunity to provide leadership in the Province of Manitoba, you fouled it up.

Mr. Chairman, again let me return to the time just prior — (Interjection) — we'll be coming to that - just prior, Mr. Chairman, to this Session, repeated cries on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, just let me into the Session, I'm going to go at the government. He beat his breast and my, we thought he was loaded for bear, because every opportunity he had from every public platform, in every press conference, he said I want to go at the government. I want the Session, I'm going to go at them.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition said: "We deserve an opportunity for debate," he said, "and conscientious discussion." Those were the Leader of the Opposition's words but five months ago, just five months ago. He couldn't wait for the Session to start, wanted debate and conscientious discussion, said the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I must tell you we are still waiting, on this side of the House, for that debate and that conscientious discussion. If there has been a tragic failure of this Session, it has been a failure on the part of the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the opposition; it has been the Conservative Party's inability in this Chamber to carry the debate, to carry the fights, and to ensure that they would carry the fights outside their caucus room into this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, it's generally thought, within our parliamentary system, that an opposition will be critical,

be judgmental, will be ridiculing from time to time, but it is not expected that their wrath will be directed at each other; it's generally thought it will be directed at the government. They wanted back into the Chamber; they had questions, they said, that they had to ask; points that they had to make; contributions they had to make to the province.

Well four-and-a-half months later, and they have done none of these. They have been inept; they have been silly; they have put on an absurd performance in this Legislature; they have done a disservice to Manitobans as a whole and, as of now, we have seen a political disaster on the part of the opposition and their leader during this Session.

As the Minister responsible for Co-ops indicated a few moments ago, their calls for election have grown feebler and shallower day by day as this Session progressed. I have never in my life, Mr. Chairman, seen a group of members that have been so out of touch with reality while Manitobans, from Churchill to Brandon are proud of the accomplishments on the part of Manitobans; while just about every economic indicator demonstrates that the Manitoba economy is doing strikingly well; while health, while education, while social services have been maintained and expanded in the Province of Manitoba, the Conservatives continue their cynical attack on Manitobans and on this government for the performance of people in this province. Their lack of depth, Mr. Chairman, their hypocrisy on issues, their callous opportunism have become unfortunately the trademarks of honourable members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, it is very very tempting, in fact, to write off the comments of honourable members across the way as the ramblings of incompetents; I cannot while they stand in this House and distort reality, while they distort the real issues. Mr. Chairman, they're obsessed with power; they are only obsessed with power. They feel it's necessary to tell Manitobans that this is a bad province to live in; that our economy is weak; that our future is bleak. We heard this tonight from the Leader of the Opposition about dark clouds, that this government has failed and that Manitobans have failed. This is the message that we've received of whining, of doom and gloom from members across the way. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The opposition has spent time criticizing the Jobs Fund. They have gone out of their way to suggest that this government's policies are out of step with that of the rest of the country, having a negative effect, they say, on the labour market. Mr. Chairman, they are absolutely wrong. We know that they're wrong; Manitobans know that they are wrong.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I made reference to the economic report of the Royal Bank of Canada. I'm going to read some comments from the Royal Bank of Canada Report for the information, for the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. In its June issue, the Royal Bank predicts that Manitoba's gross domestic product will continue to exceed the national average over the next two years. Where are the dark clouds? Where is the whining and the gloom on the part of the financial institutions?

The Royal Bank proceeds - despite what the Leader of the Opposition tried to leave as an impression in this Chamber - "We estimate that employment growth in Manitoba will likely accelerate to 2.8 percent from

the previous year's rate of 2.6 percent. The Manitoba Jobs Fund is no doubt a key factor contributing to the faster pace of job creation in the province."

What the opposition called a "fraud" fund, the Royal Bank of Canada calls a key factor in Manitoba's economic progress and development. The thousands of Manitobans working today because of the Jobs Fund call it good government; the opposition call it bad government; they call it a fraud fund.

What about the labour market? The members opposite tell Manitobans, as we've heard from the Leader of the Opposition just a few moments ago say that the New Democratic Party government has ruined the labour market, that we are out of step with the rest of the country.

Again, I quote from the Royal Bank's Economic Report, and I wish the Leader of the Opposition would listen to the Royal Bank report. — (Interjection) — Well, you might learn something, Mr. Member for Sturgeon Creek, if you would do some reading of what is taking place, what objective observations are of the progress of this province. The Royal Bank states: "One of the strongest aspects of the Manitoba economy is its labour market. We expect the province to continue to have the lowest . . ." Listen, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, this is good news and you should be delighted in hearing this good news. "We expect the province to continue to have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada throughout the forecast period." The Royal Bank of Canada. "That rate, predicts the Royal Bank of Canada, will be 3.3 percentage points lower than the national average."

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is accusing me of using selective statistics. Well, I am again going to quote from the Royal Bank of Canada some statistics that aren't very favourable as far as Manitoba is concerned. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to listen to these remarks by the Royal Bank of Canada. "Personal disposable income in Manitoba will likely grow at a more moderate pace in the next two than in 1984. The factors contributing to this view include the adverse impact on Manitoba's economy of lower federal equalization payments as a result of recent changes in intergovernmental fiscal arrangements."

Now they are happy. Mr. Chairman, members of the opposition who are supposed to be loyal Manitobans may smile, may laugh at the fact that Manitobans are confronted with a \$100 million cut in transfer payments. They may smile and they may laugh, but Manitobans aren't smiling and laughing at the impact being registered upon them by a cold-hearted Federal Government prepared to cut into the transfer payments to the Province of Manitoba, and they will not take their smiles kindly.

"This also," states the Royal Bank, "will lead to a reduction in the pace of consumer spending." Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt about that. When we watch the news these days and see how the Federal Government, by way of its 10 percent sales tax, is cutting into drugs for diabetics, for asthma victims, for the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, we passed a resolution in this House damning the de-indexation on the part of the Federal Government. I only wish that we had included this dastardly move to hike up the prices of drugs insofar

as the elderly and the ill are concerned in this province, a more dastardly move, in fact, than the de-indexation was. I'm glad the elderly people are speaking out from one end of this country to the other.

The Royal Bank says no. There are not dark clouds, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. The people of Manitoba do not think so, and I believe the members of the opposition really do not think so in their hearts. They are putting on a front in this Chamber because of political necessity on their part. They are trying by their actions, their banging, their shouts, their yelling this evening, to put a very strong face on a very, very weak case.

Mr. Chairman, this government has worked with Manitobans to create jobs. We have a long distance to go, and I want to acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, there are many who are unemployed that this government is working towards ensuring that they be employed, and we, unlike honourable members across the way, will not be content until every Manitoban who wants to work is given an opportunity to work.

Mr. Chairman, what have we heard from the opposition? Members on this side have been asking the Leader of the Opposition where he stands on issue after issue after issue and the Leader of the Opposition smiles and feels he is doing a cute little stunt - a cute little stunt - by avoiding the telling of Manitobans where he stands. Mr. Chairman, they are only interested in political power as a group of opportunists, as a group of ideologists.

I want to read to the Leader of the Opposition one further quote. John Kenneth Galbraith best described their shameless lust for power when he said — (Interjection) — the modern Conservatives . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleagues have a very difficult time refraining from laughter every time they look at this incompetent, inept group of opposition members across the way that have no direction, no focus, know not where they are going.

Galbraith said, "The modern Conservative is engaged in one of man's oldest exercises in moral philosophy, that is the search for a superior moral justification for selfishness. It is," he said, "an exercise which always involves a certain number of internal contradictions and even a few absurdities. The conspicuously wealthy turn up urging the character building value of privation for the poor."

That, Sir, is the driving force behind the Conservative members of this Legislature, a selfish pursuit of power. Rule for the rich, privation of the poor.

Let me warn the Leader of the Opposition that politics is no longer that gentle art of getting votes from the poor and campaign funds from the rich by promising to protect each other. Manitobans do not like to pick up their newspapers as they've been doing and read that the Leader of the Opposition as saying one thing and then saying a different thing to the President of the Chamber of Commerce. The people of Manitoba do not like to hear the Leader of the Opposition take one position on an issue, while the majority of his caucus vote the other way. The people of Manitoba do not like

to hear the Leader of the Opposition at the 6:00 o'clock news broadcast, tell them that he and his party support a principle and just two days' later, introduce an amendment in the Legislature that ignores that principle.

Mr. Chairman, I'm growing tired of saying this, but honourable members of the Opposition can't have it both ways. They cannot, Mr. Chairman, pretend to speak on behalf of Manitoba farmers, then apologize, as they have been doing at every turn - the Member for Arthur, the Member for Morris, the Member for Emerson - apologizing for the disastrous agricultural policies and the cuts that have been announced by the Federal Conservatives in Ottawa.

You cannot call for increased fiscal restraint and then at every turn demand increased government expenditures. You've been doing that day by day during the Session denouncing the government for lack of fiscal responsibility, and on the other hand, day by day the cash register rings up with additional dollar demands on the part of your members, one by one by one, in this Chamber.

You cannot stand in this House and pledge yourselves to the healing of wounds, as the Leader of the Opposition did, and then upon finding that you're plunging in the polls, which the Leader of the Opposition discovered just the last few weeks, then use every opportunity to once again trying to revive the issue in order that he can again divide the province. You cannot get away with that. The people of Manitoba will not, and according to the polls, have not tolerated the stunted vision, outrageous partisanship, the convoluted logic, that we have heard from those benches since March 7th.

It is time that the Opposition started listening to the people of Manitoba. It is time you started to talk about the real issues that are important to Manitobans. It is time you put away your hate, bitterness and you commenced, as members of the Opposition, to work on behalf of Manitobans.

Over the past several months, I have had the opportunity to visit thousands of Manitobans where they live, where they work. I've been listening very carefully to what they are talking about; what their concerns are; what they're feeling about Manitoba; how they feel about the government. I can tell you that the message up and down Main Street, Manitoba, is far different from the message we receive from the benches across the way. The people of Manitoba aren't talking about strawberries, they're talking about jobs, about health care, about agricultural policies, about social programs and support for the family farm.

These are the issues that count; these are the issues that Manitobans are calling for their representatives to discuss, to recognize and they are recognizing that their government has done quite well on these issues. But they know, Mr. Chairman, as well, that the progress we made in the last three and a half years is tenuous, is fragile. They know, Mr. Chairman, that they could not risk that group of incompetent, inept members across the way to have any opportunity to assume government in this province and take the risk of the return to those days of 1977-1981 when Manitoba was at the back of the pack by way of every economic indicator in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the Member for Swan River were here because he made some comments about a

reporter writing an article in his Swan River paper. — (Interjection) — I did have a very successful banquet, I must advise the Member for Swan River and I know his sensitivity because the New Democratic Party in the constituency of Swan River, according to the advice I was given that evening had the best turnout, the best response, that local activists in Swan River can ever recall, so I can understand the sensitivity of the Member for Swan River.

The Member for Swan River has told the Minister responsible for housing about a case. I'd like to tell the Member for Swan River that I came with a pack of case problems not dealt with the Member for Swan River. That's right. I know, Mr. Chairman, that it's very, very difficult for honourable members to return to their constituencies after this Session. I know that they are concerned about facing the voters in their constituency and explaining to their constituents their support for the Mulroney government some nine months ago, the failure of the Mulroney government and trying to defend what has been taking place.

It must be equally difficult, Mr. Chairman, for them to defend a government which they joined with members on this side some three weeks ago condemning them for the impact of their Budget upon the senior citizens of this country.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it must be very difficult for honourable members across the way and I feel for their plight at this particular point. I know what Conservatives are now saying to each other. I know the difficulties they are confronted with. Manitobans know the difficulty they are now confronted with, Mr. Chairman. I realize that it's difficult for the handful of you across the way that still vote with your leader and support your leader, to explain why the majority of your caucus would vote against him on an important matter like the teachers' pension bill.

I realize that when you're visiting community centres, that it's pretty difficult for you to explain to community centre leaders your denunciation of the Jobs Fund as a "fraud" fund when the monies from the Jobs Fund went to assist the community centres in your own constituencies.

I realize it must be terribly difficult for honourable members across the way to explain why you support the Federal Conservatives while they hack away at agricultural services and agricultural programs. I know, Mr. Chairman, it must be very difficult for you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, to explain to your fellow Conservatives how you had squandered some 20 points in the opinion polls from the beginning of the Session to the end of the Session. The Globe and Mail described it "as the most dramatic shift in public opinion that has been seen for a long time in the Province of Manitoba in such a short period of time" - the Toronto Globe and Mail this past Saturday.

Four months ago, Mr. Chairman, they couldn't wait to get into the House, they demanded an election.

Sir, I wish we could keep them here a little longer. Mr. Chairman, during this Session, when we've had the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues on public display, we have made more progress by way of gaining public support than any other time in the last three-and-a-half months. I wish we could keep them here a little longer.

A MEMBER: Call an election.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we want to wait just a little bit longer because, with the momentum, we might get them down to about 10 or 15 seats the way it's going.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to find out where they stand on basic issues. If we could keep them here a little longer, maybe we could force the Leader of the Opposition to tell us where he stands on at least one important issue outside of strawberries; we might be able to find out where the Leader of the Opposition stands.

For instance, I am very interested and I know the Minister of Health would be very interested, in discovering where they stand on the issue of privatization of the health care system that is currently being proposed by Manitoba Conservatives in the person of the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa, Mr. Jake Epp; and also, of course, by the former Deputy Leader of their party across the way, the former Bud Sherman, in this House, both of them advocating privatization of health care. Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? Is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to tell us where he stands? I challenge him to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Energy is still waiting for the Leader of the Opposition to tell us where he stands on Limestone. I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition has made up his mind yet, along with most of his colleagues, where he stands on Limestone.

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that one member of that caucus has made it very clear where he stands on Limestone; the Deputy Leader, the Member for Turtle Mountain, has made it very clear where he stands on Limestone. He indicated just a few months ago that, if the Conservatives were elected to government in this province, they would have to consider stopping Limestone even if construction had started.

But where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? Would he stop construction? Would he cancel out the contracts? Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? Does he stand with the Deputy Leader, or does he stand in opposition to the Deputy Leader? Can we hear from the Leader of the Opposition where he stands?

Mr. Chairman, where do they stand on pay equity? I wonder if this is going to be an issue of them voting for something because they feel it's the thing they must do, the popular thing and the opportune thing, even though it runs counter to their Conservative philosophy, but they don't really believe in it.

Does the Member for Turtle Mountain, for example, finally understand what pay equity is? Two months ago he told the Minister of Labour in this Chamber that it was a concept that no one understood. Did the members of his caucus that voted for pay equity explain to the Member for Turtle Mountain exactly what pay equity was? And then there is the Leader of the Opposition. Does he, or does he not, believe that bill should have been extended to the private sector? There is a huge question mark still up there, because it depends who the Leader of the Opposition has spoken to.

Does he or does he not believe that bill should have been extended to the private sector? Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? Where does he stand?

Mr. Chairman, I don't expect that we will ever get the answer to these questions. We haven't managed to get the answers to these questions in the House. I don't expect to get answers from the Leader of the Opposition after we leave this House, and I don't expect to get answers from the Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign.

Manitobans have learned the hard way that what Conservatives promise in elections bears little or no resemblance to what Conservatives intend to do. The Conservative election motto could easily be, tell what they want to hear, and then do what we feel is best for them.

The sweet success of this Session, as far as the government is concerned and the confidence and the optimism that has been instilled in Manitobans. I don't believe can be ignored by members in this Chamber, including honourable members across the way. The orderly, the competent advancement of Limestone; the continuing success of the Jobs Fund in the province; the dedication that exists on the part of this New Democratic Party Government to fighting unemployment has seen thousands of jobs created, thousands of Manitobans returned home from the callous, economic exile that was imposed upon them by the previous Conservative administration of Sterling Lyon between 1977 and 1981.

Manitobans have received a technology policy that will ensure Manitoba's competitiveness, a policy that puts people first. A labour relations record second to none though, Mr. Chairman, again I review the comments by the Leader of the Opposition just a few moments ago, he indicated that he would change The Labour Relations Act. I thought we had the second-best record of any province in the country insofar as hours lost to labour strikes right here in the Province of Manitoba, but the Leader of the Opposition tells us he is going to change The Labour Relations Act.

What sections of The Labour Relations Act does the Leader of the Opposition propose to change? What deletions does he propose? Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? Where does he stand? He runs around the province, indicating he is going to change The Labour Relations Act; he is going to ensure there are amendments to The Labour Relations Act, to Health and Safety, to Workers' Compensation. Let the Leader of the Opposition get up in his place and spell out exactly what he intends to do; let him not try to fool the working men and women in this province.

Mr. Chairman, we have proceeded with an agricultural policy that is based upon a belief in the family farm, not on partisan politics; loan relief for the farmers, as outlined by the Minister of Agriculture; support for the sugar beet growers in the Province of Manitoba, including long-term guarantees on the part of the Federal Government for sugar beet stabilization; successful support for the hog producers of this province, despite the tremendous odds that we've had to battle in face of the neglect by the Federal Conservatives in Ottawa; improved housing programs by the Minister of Housing directed at affordable, quality housing; unprecedented growth in the co-op section under the leadership of the Minister of Housing; improved school improvements, including an additional \$11.8 in grants for the school system in Manitoba; improvements impacting on the quality of education;

a major renovation of existing buildings in the school system; an increased emphasis on accessibility of training for all Manitobans; advancement of health care, including the banning by the Minister of Health insofar as extra billing is concerned; the successful negotiation of agreement with the province's doctors; an unmatched dedication to safeguarding health; the independence, the personal dignity of elderly Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, let me again make it clear that we are very pleased with the help that we were able to extend to senior citizens that waged a successful battle with the Federal Conservative Government over the de-indexation issue.

Pay equity legislation designed to bring greater fairness between men and women in the workplace in the Province of Manitoba. And that greater fairness, does anybody for a moment, despite the Conservatives giving vote and support to that measure in the House, does anyone for a moment think that if there had been a Conservative Government in the Province of Manitoba there would have been pay equity legislation introduced? No way. They would have turned tail and run at the very suggestion of pay equity legislation, but they didn't have the guts, Mr. Chairman, to stand up in their places and vote against the pay equity legislation though, in their hearts, they had no belief, no support, no conviction for pay equity. Manitobans know that; you haven't fooled anybody. I must say the Member for Turtle Mountain is much more courageous in his convictions than honourable members across the way.

The establishment of Canada's first nuclear weapons free zone - and what a battle we had to ensure that that resolution passed in this Chamber, an unbelievable battle. Every manoeuvre, every dodge on the part of members opposite to avoid declaring Manitoba a nuclear weapons free zone . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, the comments by the House Leader . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the remarks sputtered by the House Leader just now indicate that although members across the way rose in their places to vote finally after being pressed for the nuclear weapons free zone, they in their hearts were against that resolution. Against, Mr. Chairman. They just took a political position, and evidence is there from the very mouth of the House Leader of the Conservative Party in this Chamber. Hypocritical positions, Mr. Chairman, hypocritical positions.

Either there is no position on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, avoidance on his part of telling Manitobans where he stands or, on the other hand, when they join in votes with honourable members on this side of the Chamber, it's not because of conviction and principle but because they lack guts to stand up for what they believe in. They lack guts. And you are not fooling anybody. You aren't fooling anybody in this province.

Freedom of information legislation making Manitobans more confident and having open access to their government. Mr. Chairman, the past four months have been successful months for this government. We have been able to provide legislation that we are proud of; we have been able to advance programs that improve the human condition of Manitobans; we have put on display an inept, an incompetent opposition that constantly takes either no position or a hypocritical position in respect to issues in this Chamber. They have been truly exposed in the last four months.

Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that members of the government leave this Chamber fully confident as a result of the last four months of public display on the part of the opposition in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have listened carefully to the remarks of the Premier. I have listened to the innuendo; I have listened to the name calling, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say to this House, Mr. Chairman, and to the people of Manitoba, what we have heard is consistent with what this party has done in election campaigns like when they had gone to senior citizens

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . Mr. Chairman, senior citizens in personal care homes and told them that if the Conservatives are elected they will be evicted from their homes. That's the kind of innuendo, Mr. Chairman, the misleading statements, the kind of dirty campaigning that this party has done in the past and will continue to do when they call the election.

Are they going to go to the people, Mr. Chairman, and tell them how much public money this Premier has used in the Premier's office, increasing the expenses by 24 percent this year to hire political aides to run a politically tainted Premier's office? Mr. Chairman, his office has become so politically tainted we have all seen the direction that's come out of his office to civil servants from his communications director preparing NDP propaganda and sending it to civil servants. That's what they have done, Mr. Chairman.

And we know the September, 1983 decision of this government - defer all controversial decisions. Are they going to go to the people of Manitoba and expect to gain the trust and confidence of the people of Manitoba when it is public knowledge that they are deferring any controversial decisions, Mr. Chairman, until after the election?

Is the Minister of Finance going to come forward to the people and say he is going to raise the sales tax again to pay for their deficits, Mr. Chairman, increased by over \$2 billion, when in the first 112 years of Confederation of this province, this province only accumulated a deficit of \$1.3 billion, and in four years it's gone up by \$4 billion? Are they going to tell the

people of Manitoba what taxes are going to increase? Are they going to tell them how much the deficits are going to further accumulate if this party, the NDP party is given another four years in office? Are they going to tell them that? Is the Minister of Energy and Mines going to be forthright and tell the people of Manitoba how much higher the hydro rates are going to go in this province? No, Mr. Chairman. Is the Minister of Health going to continue this farce of operating the Health Department, and tell them how much further he's going to reduce health services in this province? I don't think so, Mr. Chairman, because they have deferred all controversial decisions. They're not going to tell the people, Mr. Chairman.

All those political advisors and communicators, that 80 percent increase in staff in aides and political apple polishers, for the last three years have been told to improve the image of the government. Are they going to try to justify that expenditure to people in this province, Mr. Chairman, whose services have been diminished while administration is being increased and social services have not been maintained?

Mr. Chairman, the Community Services Department has vastly increased communications and administration expenses. There has been no increase for a real problem like child abuse. That's the priority of this government, Mr. Chairman. Spend the money on advertising, on administration, on communications, on sending mail from the Premier's office, and don't deal with a child abuse problem. We saw today in this House, Mr. Chairman, a good example. I'll tell you, the social workers in this province know what's going on. They know that services have not been increased.

We have this incident today, one of many, at the Seven Oaks Centre, Mr. Chairman, where services have been diminished to such an extent that 10 children at risk are sent out with a junior staffperson and a STEP student, and a case of sexual abuse occurred.

That's the kind of priority this government has, Mr. Chairman. Despite all the rhetoric of this government, the people know that, and the staff and the social workers and the people who receive those services know it, and they'll judge for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, you know, we haven't seen one little bit in the Estimates about the Election Financing Program. When is this government going to tell the people of Manitoba that their hard-earned tax dollars are going to pay for the NDP election expenses? Mr. Chairman, we're going to tell them. We're going to repeal that act when we're elected, and you will pay your own expenses. So keep that in mind, because we're not going to allow for that, and the people of Manitoba are not going to allow for that.

The Minister of Labour, talking about labour legislation, is he going to tell them what they're planning to do after the next election? They proceeded a year ago, despite the objections of the private sector, when they said to that great economic summit in Portage la Prairie - remember that? - we're going to have a government of consensus and co-operation with the private sector. Then they proceed with their legislation contrary to the objections of the private sector, Mr. Chairman.

What do we get this Session just before the election, Mr. Chairman? Did they bring in their plant-closing legislation they promised in 1981? We were going to

have 12 months' notice or compensation to employees in the case of shutdowns. No, we get a mealy-mouthed little bill that sets out a procedure that we were using. They're a phony government, Mr. Chairman.

They promise one thing. They back off it. They decide not to bring in any controversial legislation. What are they going to do? What's the Minister of Labour going to bring in after the next election? Mr. Chairman, they can't be trusted. They talk about co-operation. They can't be trusted, Mr. Chairman.

In that crucial area, Mr. Chairman, what governments are elected for, the prime responsibility, to manage the fiscal affairs of this province, we have a government led by a Finance Minister who the auditor has to tell is misleading the deficit to the people of Manitoba. That's unprecedented, Mr. Chairman. The auditor has to tell the Finance Minister that he's misleading the people of Manitoba by trying to hide the government's true deficit.

Has any government in the history of Canada had two credit reductions, two reductions in its credit rating in one term? Mr. Chairman, that says a lot about this government.

Mr. Chairman, what is he going to tell the people of Manitoba about the deficits that Crown corporations have run up? Under this incompetent administration, \$85 million in deficits that the people of Manitoba have had to put up to pay for this government's incompetence, \$85 million. They say we can't afford to provide facilities for wife abuse. We can't afford to spend \$100,000 to provide facilities for wife abuse. You can advertise, because that's part of the governmental strategy. Do a lot of advertising. Don't provide any service.

But can you imagine how many services could be provided to the people of Manitoba if the government had that \$85 million? You could do something in child abuse. You could do something in providing facilities for wife abuse. You could provide a lot of social programs, but they have squandered \$85 million right there with Crown corporations and the taxpayers are going to have to pay the interest on that. Aside from repaying the \$85 million, we're going to have to pay the interest, Mr. Chairman. That is the kind of legacy this government has left to the people of Manitoba, along with that increase of \$2 billion in the deficit. Two billion dollars in four years. It's unbelievable for the Province of Manitoba. What a legacy you're leaving to Manitoba. You expect to go to the people and be re-elected? Be my guest. Go as soon as you can.

You leave a legacy of a payroll tax, Mr. Chairman. You leave a legacy of an increase in the sales tax. You leave a legacy right now of a 23 percent or 24 percent increase in hydro rates which are going to double in a few years, Mr. Chairman, and who knows how much higher after that? That is the legacy you're leaving to the people of Manitoba. That is the legacy of the Workers' Compensation Board increase, that fiasco that you are responsible for. That's a fiasco. That is the legacy of this government, Mr. Chairman.

The loss of jobs in manufacturing, Mr. Chairman, are a direct responsibility of this government's actions, over 10,000 jobs lost in that industry. Every other province has increased and are above their pre-recession levels, so don't try to fool the people of Manitoba. Every other province has increased and gone back to those pre-

recession levels of employment. Why hasn't Manitoba? Because of this government's actions, and what you have done to the cost of doing business and to the climate of doing business in Manitoba. That's your legacy, Mr. Chairman. You have lost those jobs. You are responsible for them.

That Jobs Fund is a "fraud" fund without question. I say it, Mr. Chairman, and I voted against it. It's a "fraud" fund, Mr. Chairman, because it attempts to demonstrate to the people of Manitoba a commitment and an objective of providing jobs which you have not done. As my leader said today, Mr. Chairman, the unemployment rate in Manitoba is going up, whilst the Canada rate is going down. That indicates the complete failure, and I tell you, Mr. Premier, you'd better call the election quick, you'd better call the election quick. You'd better call it quick because these statistics are getting worse and worse; they are getting worse and worse. If you wait until the Spring of 1986, these figures are going to kill you. You are maybe going to try to fool the people in the Fall of 1985, but in the Spring of 1986, the message will clearly have come home because the trend is there.

Your policies are a failure, a complete failure, and this province is going nowhere with your policies, Mr. Chairman; they have to be changed. Now you'll try to fool the people with all the advertising, all of the political aids you have, and you'll run a typical dirty campaign that the NDP have done in the past and you'll bring in every NDP hack from across the country because this is the last . . .

A MEMBER: You've got them all here now.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . that you haven't already hired, Mr. Chairman, because this is their last refuge. This is their last chance for a high-paying job and you've made sure enough of them have got those high-paying jobs in this Civil Service, no matter how incompetent they are, Mr. Chairman. So they'll come here from across Canada and it'll be a dirty campaign and you'll attempt to mislead the people of Manitoba, and you'll attempt to mislead these kind of statistics, Mr. Chairman. But I have confidence in the people of Manitoba, they know better, Mr. Chairman, that whenever you call it, you're going to be defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Bill No. 49, as a whole, bill by bill? Title—pass; Preamble—pass.

Bill be reported.

Bill No. 56, what is the will of the committee, bill by bill?

Bill by bill: Title—pass; Preamble—pass.

Bill be reported.

That completes the business of the Committee of Ways and Means.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 49, The Appropriation Act, 1985; and Bill No. 56, The Loan Act, 1985, and has agreed to report the same without amendments.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING

Bills No. 56, 49, by leave, were each read a third time and passed.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the members on the other side have reduced the level of this House in the evening tonight in their shenanigans and their great display, their display of theatrics and everything else.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to comment upon that, we've seen all of the display of childish actions. We've seen the Premier's prepared statement that he reads after it is prepared for him by his writers, that he has difficulty with some of the phraseology and with some of the words, he sends his members into stitches.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I am disappointed that the Premier did not even attempt to address the statistics, the bad evidence of his misadministration and mismanagement of this province; he didn't even address it whatsoever. He ignored totally the facts, and instead, found some reports that had projections based on some of the wishful thinking — (Interjection) — no, based on the wishful thinking of the Minister of Finance in his budget.

Mr. Speaker, instead of addressing the facts of the labour problems, the high rate of unemployment, the increase in unemployment that is taking place in this province while the rest of the country is decreasing; the slow rate of job creation and job growth in this province while the rest of the country is having a rapid rate of job creation growth; the difficulties we're having in youth unemployment, as our youth unemployment increases by 1.5 percent while the rest of the country decreases. Mr. Speaker, all of those things the Premier totally and blithely ignores.

He said earlier this Session that he had been forced into the world of reality. Mr. Speaker, people in this province live and work in the world of reality every day. It's an embarrassment that their Premier has to be forced, kicking and screaming, into the world of reality to face the problems that they face every day as they go out to earn a living by working hard with the sweat of their brows in this province to keep paying the taxes to keep this government and its misspending and mismanagement policies going. He has to be forced, kicking and screaming, into the world of reality and they are working away to keep this province going.

He alluded to the confidence and optimism that's out there and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, you cannot crush the confidence and optimism, the native intelligence and optimism of the people of this province despite four years of cynical government that mismanages, that does the opposite to what they promise; that doesn't

carry through on the real bread-and-butter issues of this province; that doesn't work on the positive aspects of building the economy; that destroys confidence in the private sector; that comes forward with antibusiness policies time after time after time that poison the atmosphere such that head offices of major corporations find that they have to move out of this province.

We have seen it, Mr. Speaker, Inner-City Gas moving head office right out of this province; Tan Jay announcing head office will be moved out of this province; Citadel Life Insurance Company moving their head office out of this province; Monarch Life being sold to an eastern corporation and moving its head office out of this province. Time and time and time again, this government, led by the Premier who is not in the world of reality, sits blithely by and sifts through with all of its researchers, all of its writers, until it finds some reports that it thinks might give a positive tone to what's happening, and it quotes from them based on projections, and ignores the reality of the real statistics of what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible that this Premier would read from that prepared speech, that was probably done weeks ago in preparation for the end of the Session, and totally ignore the points that have been laid before him by members on this side in the debate tonight because he can't answer them, he can't respond to them. He has created an economic morass in this province and he can't answer for it. He doesn't know why it's happened; he doesn't know how he is going to change it. He just knows that what he has to do is stand up like a puppet and read the speech that's been prepared for him by his writers, page-by-page. He loses his place and he loses his speech; he has to start all over again, Mr. Speaker, it's unbelievable.

The reason we are in the economic difficulties that we are in because this administration spent the better part of its term of office off the public agenda. They were off on their own agenda of attempting to reorder social values and social responsibilities in Manitoba. At a time when people were fighting desperately to keep their homes, their farms, their businesses, their jobs, they were off on an agenda that said that we ought to reorder social responsibilities in this province, that we ought to bring in farmlands ownership legislation when the threat of farmlands being bought by foreigners had long since disappeared because the value of farmland had dropped and the potential income from farmland had dropped so dramatically, the viability had dropped, that nobody was coming in here to buy farmland, Mr. Speaker. The speculators were attempting to sell off the land and they were off on cloud nine attempting to deal with a problem that didn't exist.

When they were bringing in legislation on compulsory seat belts and helmets at a time when the public wanted jobs, wanted the people of this province to be employed, wanted their youth to have a future, they were talking about other things. They were bringing in first contract legislation and labour amendments at a time when people wanted economic opportunities, when people wanted investment. Mr. Speaker, they were bringing in a French language proposal at a time when people were desperately hoping for a revival in the economy. That's why we got into the problem. They compounded the problem by their spending orgies in the first two years of government.

The first year of government they increased the expenditures of this province between 18 percent and 19 percent. The second year of their administration, they increased the expenditures in the range of 14 percent to 15 percent. I remind you that those were the days when the Liberal Federal Government, who had the all time record of spending sprees, were talking 6 and 5. They were going off the scale in expenditure increases, ignoring the real economic problems of this province and burdening us with a debt the like of which this province has never seen, put on the backs of the ordinary people of Manitoba who they say they care about, burdening them and their children and their grandchildren with the debt of four years of NDP mismanagement and maladministration. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of thing that this government is responsible for; that's the real record of this administration that they will have to run with and they will have to face the people with.

In more than 100 years, this province had built up \$1.3 billion of deficit. They added, in four budgets, \$1.8 billion. The interest on those four budgets alone would be in excess of 3 percent added to the sales tax. That's the burden, that's the legacy that they are leaving to the young people of this province in addition to a legacy of unemployment that is greater than it has ever been in this province's history. That's the way this administration cares about the ordinary people; that's the way this administration treats the youth of our province, Mr. Speaker.

Less than half the people who are coming into our job market every month are able to find employment; that's the legacy of this administration, Mr. Speaker. Yet they continue to beef up the Civil Service with their own paid party people, their own special assistants, all of those extra people - those 132 positions that the President of MGEA calls apple polishers are the only important priority in this government's mind today and over the four years of their administration.

They put a noose around the neck of the young people of this province by virtue of the debt that they have to carry, by virtue of the lack of opportunity that they will have in this province's future.

A MEMBER: You don't believe in capital punishment but you're killing generations to come.

MR. G. FILMON: At the same time, Mr. Speaker, that they were burdening us with that debt, they were adding to every single tax and fee that they collect from the people of Manitoba.

The Minister of Education ought to hide her head in shame, because in this document a "Clear Choice for Manitobans," they promised to remove the burden of education from the property tax in Manitoba. They have added \$83 million in education taxes to the property taxes of this province. That represents an increase of between 45 percent and 50 percent in their term of government, Mr. Speaker. That is how they deal with removing the burden of property tax on the people of Manitoba and they talk about the elderly in this province. How many elderly people are being forced out of their homes because they have driven up the property taxes to the extent that these people can no longer pay to live in their homes. At the same time, they added 22

percent to the hydro rates in just three years, so that people living in their own homes can no longer afford to do so. These are the elderly with whom they have empathy, for whom they say they have compassion. Mr. Speaker, they have no compassion; they have no consideration whatsoever. They are destroying the viability of the elderly to live in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . spoken with many, many civil servants over the course of the last year, people in all departments of government, but particularly people in the social services area of this administration. The words that they say in reference to this administration, the words that keep being repeated are "cynicism" and "hypocrisy." They say that these people who wring their hands, who advertise themselves as people who are social democrats who have concerns and care and compassion for people are actually the most dangerous administration that's ever run this province of Manitoba. The sharing and the caring and the concern do not translate into actions that help people. They undercut the opportunity of people to live in economic security and decency in this province. They undercut the opportunity for these people to have optimism and confidence in the future. They make them more and more and more dependent on government policies and government programs to try and live in some sense of economic security in their retirement years, in their elderly years because they take away the viability from these people by the impositions of all these taxes and fees.

Even, Mr. Speaker, the 1.5 percent payroll tax, although they said it was an alternative to the sales tax which they also increased from 5 to 6 percent, they said that the payroll tax was an alternative that wouldn't impact on people, but every one of those senior citizens pays in the increased cost of services and goods that they have to buy in this province of ours because the payroll tax gets added into all of the prices of everything that they buy in this province.

Mr. Speaker, these people, though, with this cynicism, with this hypocrisy telling people that they're doing such a good job when the figures absolutely lay the lie to that statement, these people turn and take the alternative tack then; the only alternative that the Premier has; that the Minister of Finance has; that the Minister of Agriculture particularly has - fed bashing over and over again. The answer to any problem, to any question, if you have a concern about not having enough crisis shelter centres, they say it's the Federal Government's problem. If you have a question about unemployment in this province, unemployment, totally under the jurisdiction and control of this provincial administration, they say it's the fault of the feds. If you have a question even about aid to Ethiopia, they . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . turn it into an opportunity for fed bashing, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if they are so confident in their record, if they are so confident in the things that they have done for this province, why do they always turn to fed bashing every time somebody gives them a criticism or asks them a question? Fed bashing is the only response they have had for the length of this Session. Fed bashing. They take no responsibility for anything that happens in this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

If there are other members wishing to join the debate, they will have the opportunity to do so in due course. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, instead of dealing with the real issues, instead of dealing with the real concerns about the unemployment, the real labour statistics of this province, the facts that are here in their own government document that they haven't been able to refute, what do they do? They quote from magazines, business magazines in which they buy full-page ads so that they get favourable articles written about them. In fact, the articles are often drafted by members of the PR staff of this administration and they go into these magazines, Mr. Speaker.

They quote from selected reports like the Royal Bank, which is a projection of the future, not a statement of what is. Mr. Speaker, of course they're wrong. The projections that the Minister of Finance was quoting from for the last three years was the Conference Board. He went to the Manitoba Outlook Conference last fall and he made a speech about how good Manitoba's economy was. Five times he referred to the Conference Board projections because for last year it was in his favour. This year the Conference Board said we are going to have the lowest growth rate of any province in this country and, all of a sudden, he doesn't acknowledge it. He doesn't even mention it. He says that there are other references that we have to use and now he talks about the Royal Bank and the investment dealers and all of those other people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . and he totally ignores the information in the Conference Board Report which last year and the year before and the year before he said were objective observers, the most objective observers he said, but because they're calling us to have the lowest growth rate of any province in the country he has now eradicated the Conference Board from his speeches, from his mind, from his department and everything else.

Mr. Speaker, this Provincial Government hasn't fooled anybody. Just yesterday there was a speech given by the President of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce to the Winnipeg Rotary Club in which he said, "We do not like the payroll tax. We believe it is unfair, unjust and totally regressive. It is one of the major factors which causes entrepreneurs to discount Manitoba as a province in which to locate their business and it is

a fact that when major manufacturing organizations in Manitoba consider expansion, they are looking to other provinces or for space south of the 49th Parallel in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, that's the truth. That's what the people out there in the real world are saying about this administration. It's not the hype that comes out of the 132 PR people in this province's administration, not out of the PR and the speech writing for the Premier of this province, it comes out of the true words that are spoken by the people who are out there working in the real world. They know precisely what is happening.

When he says that manufacturing companies are going elsewhere, he probably knows about Pratt and Whitney who wanted to come to this province and then, when they evaluated this administration and the effects of the payroll tax, the effects of their labour legislation and, most of all, the effects of what they thought was a hostile business environment, they went to Nova Scotia. They went to Nova Scotia with 1,200 jobs, manufacturing, long-term, real opportunity for this province, they went elsewhere.

Superior Bus was driven out of this province by legislation from this government - driven out. Today, they are employing more than 500 people in Oklahoma. That is expected to rise up to 1,000 employees in manufacturing that we could have had and should have had, but don't have because of the moves and the policies of this NDP administration.

We were looking at the prospect of getting a glass plant in the Premier's constituency, a glass plant, and he was very very happy about that, very interested in it. He was ready to give them grants, so were the feds, everybody was offering them as much money as they could possibly put on the table to get them here. They did not come to this province because of the payroll tax, because of the hostile business environment and the labour legislation of this administration.

This Premier is suffering and he is not representing the people of his constituency because he can't attract business and job creation and economic growth and development, despite all of his rhetoric, despite all of his fine-sounding phrases and speeches, he cannot do it because his own ideology and his own maladministration has created the road blocks that prevent companies from locating here and expanding here.

We have the situation of CCIL, a company that was working here, that was operating here for many many years, that had up to 800 staff at one time in the manufacturing side; now it has been sold, and it has been taken over by a company that is no longer going to manufacture, just assemble, and we'll be lucky to have 300 to 500 jobs here at very best, a net loss of 300 to 500 jobs and, again, it is because of the environment. Even at that, with grants from this administration, they could barely overcome the negatives of the payroll tax and the labour legislation in coming here.

If you want to talk about what the people out there who want to invest in this province think about it, again, from the President of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, and I quote, "The Pawley Government's plan of action only focuses on the short term jobs and ignores the future." That's the litany and the legacy of this administration, Mr. Speaker.

You want to talk about what people think of this administration and what their plans and projections are for the future, look at the hard fact summary of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. These are the business people of this province, the small business people, the people who employ a handful of people, up to a maximum of 50 people, the people who are the greatest creators of jobs in this country of ours, because the statistics tell us that 70 percent of the jobs that are created in this province are created by businesses that were fewer than 20 people just 20 years ago, and most of them would fall in the category of being members of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Here's what their members have said in their response to a survey that's been done about this province: In real job growth they are expecting to have a net job loss of 2.2 percent. The only worse jurisdictions in this country of ours would be in the Yukon, British Columbia, Nova Scotia and P.E.I. Those are the only jurisdictions that would have a greater job loss, in terms of negative job growth, than this province, according to CFIB.

There are fewer numbers of firms who hired people than the national average, in this province during this past year; 16.4 percent of the firms added positions, compared to a national average of 21 percent of small business added to their staff. There are a greater number of firms laying off and decreasing their employment in this province than the national average, 18.3 percent in this province laying off or decreasing, compared to 17.1 percent in the country as a whole; their forecast of hiring optimism, based on their survey of the small businesses in this province and right across the country, fewer numbers of businesses are optimistic in this province than in the rest of the country.

They forecast a net increase in employment of 4.1 percent here in the small business sector, compared to 5.4 percent in the national average. Fewer firms are intending to hire than the national average, 25.3 percent, compared to 28.9 percent; and we have the largest number of firms of any province in the country that's expected to reduce jobs, right here in our province in the small business sector, Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Manitoba, in this same survey, has the largest number of firms forecast to reduce investment and liquidate assets. These are the business people, the small businesses, and we have the largest number of firms who are forecasting that they'll reduce investment and liquidate assets, because there's no future in this province; that's what they believe.

But Howard, blithely, pie-in-the-sky, our Premier says that we're going to have all sorts of growth forecast in this province, but the real people who create those jobs say, uh-uh, we're going to reduce our investment, we're going to liquidate our assets because we can't hack it under an NDP administration.

This is the hard facts from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business who you don't listen to because you don't care about. These are the people who fund your deficits every year by the sweat of their brow, by the employment of the people in this province; these are the people who fund all of your mismanagement and your job spending follies with all of the things that you've been doing; these are the people who really count in this province because they're

the movers and the shakers and the people who should give us confidence and optimism, but they reflect the concern of your administration, Mr. Premier; that's the problem that we have here.

Here's another one. Manitoba firms have the largest planned reductions in working capital and inventory. Here's another one, Mr. Speaker, because it fits right in with what is showing up in those statistics about the loss of manufacturing jobs. Manitoba and PEI businesses are the most likely to have part-time employees on minimum wage, compared to the rest of the country. We're most likely to have part-time employees on minimum wage, compared to the rest of the country. That's the kind of jobs that are replacing the manufacturing jobs; the higher income, long-term manufacturing jobs are being replaced by minimum wage, low paying jobs in this administration in the service sector as a result of the NDP policies. That's what the future holds for this province; that's what the future holds as a result of the maladministration of the NDP under this Premier.

The Premier spoke about the blue sky budget of 1980. He talked about the Honourable Don Craik, talking in 1980 about blue sky ahead; and indeed, what he ignores is the fact that 1981's growth rate for this province has not been matched or exceeded in all four years of his administration. 1981 was indeed blue skies; we had one of the best growth rates that we've had in a decade in this province, and that's the truth of it, not the way that it's been under his administration.

The Minister of Economic Security says, what happened after that? Well, what happened after that was very straightforward. His NDP administration was elected and everything hit the skids and we have been paying for it ever since.

And the Premier is laughing because he doesn't mind to have all of these negative economic statistics around his neck. He's not in the world of reality; he'll read whatever report comforts him, makes him feel good, and he'll ignore reality. So the Premier can laugh all he wants about the increases in unemployment and the job losses in his administration, but the people of the province won't be laughing when he calls the election. They will be looking for an alternative because they will not support him and his policies, Mr. Speaker.

He talks about members opposite not doing their job in this House in the question period. Mr. Speaker, how many times have we asked questions and been stonewalled - time and time and time again - and never gotten an answer from these people? Mr. Speaker, just the other day we asked questions about the settlement at Deer Lodge Hospital, and this Premier didn't know what it amounted to in a percent of the budget and a percent of the payroll for the workers, and his Minister of Finance tried to convince the people of Manitoba that by giving them a one-time signing bonus of \$300 each that was a zero cost to the people of Manitoba. That's the economic stupidity that characterizes this administration and this Premier and all of his Cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he spoke about and talked about things from the Royal Bank Report that is obviously out of date because the Royal Bank Report talked about loss of equalization payments, and that was before, of course, the Federal Government came through and gave the equalization payment to this administration - \$ 115

million. He is talking about a \$100 million cut now that is going to take place in 1989, Mr. Speaker, and he is trying to blame our economic difficulties today on what's going to take place in 1989. It's unbelievable. This Premier is in never-never land on some cloud outside this planet - a space cadet, as my kids would say.

Mr. Speaker, he is talking about health care and cutbacks in the administration of the former Conservative Government. Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, this administration is one that is cutting out personal care beds in Brandon. By next year there will be 50 fewer personal care beds in Brandon as a result of this administration.

He talks about concern for the elderly, and these are the people that put on per diem rates and user fees for the chronic care patients, most of whom are elderly in this province, in our health care institutions. This is the caring government that is talking about having people having to pay for their meals in health care institutions. These are problems that Manitoba is concerned about. They are concerned about the fact that you have so mismanaged the affairs of this province that you have driven us into such depths of debt that you are going to have to impose all sorts of taxes and user fees and costs that we have never countenanced before in this province in the past.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier talks about what people on Main Street, Manitoba are saying. Well, I can tell you. He said that they are talking about jobs but, Mr. Speaker, when they refer to this administration they are speaking of lack of jobs. He says they are talking about health care; when they speak about this administration they are speaking about cutbacks in health care because we are seeing it every turn and every time, Mr. Speaker.

He says that the opposition on this side of the House lacked the guts to tell people where they stand, but his very own Cabinet document said they do not intend to tell people where they stand because they do not intend to cover any controversial item in their last year and a half of government.

Mr. Speaker, when people talk about this administration they will say many things, but one of the things that they will not say about this administration is that they are competent. They will never say that they are competent, never, ever, Mr. Speaker, not with the financial mismanagement, not with the increase in the deficit, not with the mismanagement of the Crown corporations having lost \$40 million the previous fiscal year, \$27 million this fiscal year and projected to have an increase over this year, next year, in losses. They will never talk about competence and fiscal management with this government; they will talk about incompetence and mismanagement - always.

When they speak about this administration, Mr. Speaker, they will not talk about integrity; that's another word that they will never use with reference to this administration, not when we have the Premier's media secretary utilizing the paid staff of this province to engage in the NDP party's spring campaign. They will never talk about integrity in this administration, not when we have the Minister of Education staff as we did - this goes back throughout its administration - because two years ago the Minister of Education staff was handing out pamphlets through the Tourism office in this building for an NDP summer picnic, NDP Logan

Summer Picnic. They were doing that; that's paid staff of the people of Manitoba on the tax rolls of this province utilizing them for the political purposes of this administration.

Integrity will never be a word they use, not when they see the Premier's office being turned into the mailing headquarters of the NDP party of this province and have tens of thousands of pieces of mail churning out of this office and every other Minister's office. Last evening, we saw the the Minister of Housing, the Minister of Highways, signing thousands of letters to send out with NDP propaganda from their offices at taxpayers' expense on the backs of the people of Manitoba, a total abuse of the powers and the integrity of their office; totally, Mr. Speaker, a misuse of the authority of their offices and the powers of their offices. Integrity will never be a word they use about this administration.

Mr. Speaker, when the people of this province talk about respect, and respect for the role and the responsibilities of government, they will never use that word in talking about this administration, not when we have members of this administration attending at a demonstration where a U.S. flag is burned.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Let's have the flag burners stand up.

Mr. Speaker, when they talk about respect for the role and the responsibility of government in this administration, they will never talk about this administration in terms of respect.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I know it's getting late - or early - but I'm trying to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: They will not talk about respect for the office of government when they think about the Attorney-General refusing to press charges when criminal acts took place right on film at the Grenada demonstration. Instead they had an inquiry and put it under the carpet and performed what was the greatest miscarriage of justice that this province has seen in a long time. Mr. Speaker, they will never talk about respect for the office of government when they talk about this administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier talked about disunity in his speech and I want to just talk about the disunity on his side of the House. We have seen person after person after person leave this administration high and dry on various issues. We have seen them cross the floor from this administration because they couldn't bear to serve with this government, in its lack of integrity and lack of incompetence.

We have seen people in this caucus stand up, members of the Treasury Bench, and give grievance speeches to distance themselves from their Premier and their colleagues in government. If you want to talk about disunity, Mr. Speaker, that is the most blatant example of disunity that this province has ever seen, on the record. On the record.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of "muzzle," the Minister of Environment, has to go to the newspaper and tell people what he thinks because he can't talk in the House because his Premier has muzzled him; now that's

unity for you. These are the people who have torn apart the social fabric of this province. These are the people who have destroyed the economic opportunities of this province, who have destroyed the vision of the future that so many people deserve to have, the vision of confidence, of optimism, of jobs, has been destroyed totally by the economic policies of this administration and the mismanagement of this Premier and this government.

Mr. Speaker, we will be happy to fight an election campaign based on their record, not based on fed bashing, not based on what they think should be happening in Ottawa, but based on what has happened in four years of the Pawley administration in this province.

A MEMBER: So what about the strawberries?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was much to follow. I would indeed be inclined to speak for some time further, but really if we attempt to sort out the kernels from the chaff, there is very little to deal with but chaff in the comments by the Leader of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a story I once heard about a judge providing some advice to a lawyer as to how he ought to present a case. The lawyer said, when you've got a good case, when the law is with you, then you argue the law. Mr. Speaker, the judge also advised the young lawyer, when you've got a very poor case, you bang your desk and you scream and shout at the top of your voice. Mr. Speaker, that's what's happened to the Leader of the Opposition tonight. The Leader of the Opposition has no case, he has no evidence to substantiate his case and he has screamed in a hysterical fashion here for the last 45 minutes, uttering nothings in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, nothings.

Mr. Speaker, the grossest of falsehoods that we heard this evening was an attempt on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to belittle the intelligence of members of this Chamber. Members of this Chamber have some gems of wisdom; just like Manitobans, they will not be fooled by misrepresentations and untruths uttered by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for a moment with the statistics that the Leader of the Opposition made reference to, because if there is an example of what Disraeli once said about statistics - there are statistics and statistics and damn lies. And we saw that on the part of the utilization by the Leader of the Opposition this evening, insofar as statistics are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in the period from 1977 — (Interjection) — while the honourable members across the way - and I'm being very very generous to honourable members across the way - formed government in the Province of Manitoba from 1977 to 1981, the index of employment, Manitoba under the Conservatives showed that throughout that period, 1977 to 1981, fell far below the Canadian average of employment growth. I would

ask the page to accept this document and table this as evidence in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, just so that the Leader of the Opposition will be better informed as to what has happened under the New Democratic Party administration of job creation, 1981 to 1985, there is a turn in events. The Manitoba Index of Employment under the New Democratic Party Government of the Province of Manitoba now exceeds the Canadian average of growth in employment for each and every year, 1982, 1983, 1984, into 1985. Would the page please receive this document?

Mr. Speaker, during the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the First Minister would allow a very short question.

A MEMBER: Sure he would.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister just a few minutes ago was talking about statistics and damn lies. I would ask him now what he is quoting?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the Honourable Member answers, I would caution the members to watch their language and make sure that parliamentary expressions and words are not used in this Chamber. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the job creation average annual employment growth, 1978-1981, during the time that the Leader of the Opposition served on the Conservative Treasury Benches and the Member for Sturgeon Creek served, laughingly, as the Minister of Economic Development, when there was no economic development of any extent in the Province of Manitoba; Manitoba ranked No. 10, by way of employment growth in Canada; No. 1, Alberta; No. 2, British Columbia; Manitoba, No. 10, under Manitoba Conservative administration in which the Leader of the Opposition sat as a member of the Treasury Bench and the Member for Sturgeon Creek served as Minister of Economic Development in the Lyon administration, an abysmal failure by way of economic development and job creation in the Province of Manitoba.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, economic growth, real domestic product - and I'll table this document as well, 1970 to 1973, under the New Democratic Party Government of Ed Schreyer, real domestic product growth as a percentage of Canada, 80.2 percent; 1974-1977, 85.6; 1978-1981, again under the Lyon Conservative administration, in which the Leader of the Opposition served and the Member for Sturgeon Creek as the Minister of Economic Development, 51.9 percent. Under the New Democratic Party administration, 1982 to 1985, during the time of recession, during the time of dislocation job-wise across the country, we shot up

from 51.9 percent, under the Tory years in the Province of Manitoba, to 68.2 percent.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about Tan Jay, about some other companies, unhappy insofar as development is concerned in the Province of Manitoba, and I think he made some reference to Mr. Don Vernon, the President of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I ask why is it that by way of private investment growth, last year Manitoba was virtually tops in Canada insofar as total private investment growth. This year, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba, according to Statistics Canada, will rank No. 1 by way of private investment growth in Canada, ahead of any other province.

Mr. Speaker, I will table this as well for the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition might be a little better informed next time he rises in his place if he would study some of these documents. The population of Manitoba, gain or loss; interestingly, 1975, New Democratic Party years, Ed Schreyer, population increase; 1976, population increase; 1977; 1978, Tory year, Sterling Lyon, honourable members across the way, population loss, exodus from the Province of Manitoba; 1979, Tory years, further population decrease; 1980, the smallest kind of population increase during that Tory period. Mr. Speaker, through the period 1982 to '84, New Democratic years, substantial, significant population growth again in the Province of Manitoba.

So let the Leader of the Opposition know that no bluster, no hysterical shrieking in this Legislature is going to permit him to avoid dealing with the real issues and the real facts and the real data that's out there substantiating New Democratic Party success with Manitobans in building the economy of the Province of Manitoba, despite the difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk this evening about Limestone again for the honourable member, because Limestone would not be proceeding if we'd followed the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. It would not be taking place. There wouldn't be a job created in Northern Manitoba or energy development in Northern Manitoba if we accepted the recommendations of the Leader of the Opposition; irresponsible, reckless, opportunistic advice from the Leader of the Opposition, and threats from the Deputy Leader of his party that he would even stop Limestone once it started in the Province of Manitoba. And still no dissociation by the Leader of the Opposition, because he's afraid to take exception to the comments of the Deputy Leader of his party, insofar as stopping Limestone in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear so that there be no misunderstanding. Honourable members are very touchy and very sensitive about what they call federal bashing, Federal Government bashing. Were they concerned about fed bashing when the Liberals were in power under Pierre Elliot Trudeau? Mr. Speaker, let me advise honourable members across the way, they may be weak-kneed; they may be concerned about embarrassing their federal Conservative friends in Ottawa, but this New Democratic Party will stand up on behalf of Manitobans and Manitoba's interest. They may betray the farmers in the Province of Manitoba and the cattlemen and the hog producers, but this New Democratic Party administration will not. They may run

for cover; we will not; and they may describe all they like, proposed transfer payments.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, members are getting a little touchy, obviously. Let me tell the Member for Sturgeon Creek, because it was his Leader that talked about industrial development in Selkirk. Let me tell the Member for Sturgeon Creek, when he was Minister of Economic Development, three industries closed their doors in the Selkirk Industrial Park. Let his Leader not talk about Selkirk - utter and complete failure.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

If members can contain the exuberance of their enthusiasm, perhaps we can proceed and hear what is being said.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will make no apology on behalf of this government for defending the senior citizens in this province, when there are efforts under way to de-index their pensions, when there are efforts to impose a sales tax upon the drugs used by asthmatics and diabetics in the Province of Manitoba by the Federal Government. The Tories may call that fed bashing. I say it's standing up for Manitoba's senior citizens in this House.

Mr. Speaker, to return to transfer payments, two days after the Wilson Budget the Leader of the Opposition described that Budget as being fair, fair to Manitobans; and the Minister of Finance has demonstrated clearly, and the Leader of the Opposition will be forced, very reluctantly, to get onside as the public winds change, kicking and screaming, to support us in telling Ottawa that Manitoba should receive its fair share of transfer payments and should not be done in, insofar as transfer payments were held from post-secondary education.

Honourable members will have to decide whether they're going to place their partisan, opportunistic interests ahead of the interests of Manitobans, and the sand is running out, insofar as time for honourable members, as to where they stand. Manitobans want to know what they stand for. I mentioned earlier this evening that I've spoken to thousands of Manitobans and what I'm hearing over the past several months more and more and more is that there is no credible alternative being presented by way of the opposition in this Chamber; that the opposition have blown their credibility in this Chamber, outside this Chamber; that Manitobans don't know where they stand in any basic issue insofar as Manitobans are concerned. And they are, in fact, dismayed by the example that is being provided by the Federal Conservatives, they are saying no to any suggestion that Manitoba should follow the leadership of the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to go on, and honourable members haven't seen anything yet; they haven't seen anything yet and they will see it over the next few months.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on April 10, 1985.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Rules Committee with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. Order please. We are considering the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House. In the Journals of April 10, 1985, we're on Paragraph 3. What is the will of the Committee on how to proceed? Paragraph-by-paragraph; Page-by-page?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment for the second page of the report as it's proposed on Page 72 of the Journals for that day, paragraph 13 of the report. If you're dealing with the report page-by-page, we were on Page 2 the last time we debated this matter, and the amendment is on Page 2, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would move

THAT the Report from the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House presented on April 10, 1985, be amended by deleting the word "current" in clause A of paragraph 13 and replacing it with the word "next".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Report, as amended—pass.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just so that honourable members, at least on my side, understand the amendment that's before us, what that really means is that the rules respecting consideration of business in Private Members' Hour continue, in effect, on a trial basis for the duration of the next Session, instead of the present Session that was in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's not clear to me if the Opposition House Leader is passing just this amendment or the entire report.

MR. H. ENNS: Pass the entire report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The entire report, all right, as amended.

The report of the Committee is passed and accepted.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee has considered the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House and reports same with amendment.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines that this House concur in the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on April 10, 1985.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, by leave, that when the House adjourns today it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: This Government House Leader has introduced a new tradition into this Chamber by not proroguing the Chamber as those of us who have served for some time have been accustomed to. This, of course, leaves it in the hands of the government to call us back into Session at whatever time they choose. I raise this issue at the same time this was first done in the Manitoba Legislature last year. At that time, we had some reason perhaps to believe that maybe as a result of response to a Supreme Court decision, this government may well wish to call us back on short notice.

I assume in agreeing to this procedure that full and due notice would be given should this House Leader and this government choose to bring back the Session of the Legislature that members would be duly notified.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I wish to assure the Honourable Opposition House Leader and all members of the House on both sides that the purpose of this motion is the same as it has been in virtually all other Legislatures in Canada which have developed the use of it over the last 10-or-so years. It is used almost universally. Most Legislatures do not prorogue until the beginning of the next Session, to have the option available to call the House on notice, always proper notice - although there's

no set notice provision because of the nature of emergencies in situations. Some members who have been here far longer than myself are aware of those emergencies. I believe the Member for Lakeside will recall the last serious one in terms of an emergency sitting in 1966. Those things do occur but the standard notice requirement that has become a precedent in this House would be the expectation of the government.

There is no particular reason for not proroguing at this time other than keeping the Legislature technically in Session so that the opportunity for dealing with matters presents itself without having to go through a Throne Speech every time. I explained that last year. Our intent last year, although the honourable member asked at that time if it had anything to do with the possible Supreme Court decision - I said at that time we had no idea when we'd get the decision. It might present that opportunity but that was not the intent, nor is it the intent this year, Sir. We believe that this is the right way to proceed just as, with co-operation, Sir, we've managed to avoid Speed-up the last two years.

I think some things that have been traditions, we've tried to improve upon without in any way denigrating the tradition. I think that's positive. I would hope most members would agree with that.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member rising on a point of order? He has spoken in the debate.
Are you ready for the question?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will test the tenor of the House to rise on a point of order to make the . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: . . . to ascertain the information I'm trying to reach. On a point of order, we are establishing a new tradition in this House. I'm aware of when the House prorogues, there's a statutory procedure by which members are recalled. We receive registered letters. They have to be out in a certain time period in advance and we are notified of that. I would like to ask the House Leader whether or not the same requirements - I don't believe they exist under the arrangements that are now adjourning this House. I think that the House Leader can, under different conditions, recall us to resume the Session. That's the point that I'm trying to raise with the Honourable House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: To the same point or in answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure.

I can assure the honourable member, first of all, that there is no statutory requirement for notice whether we go back after a prorogation to start a new Session, or whether we go back after an adjournment because there's business that is of pressing necessity and requires the reconvening of the House.

There has been an established practice in this House and it is only that, an established practice; there is no specific notice provision with regard to the registered letters and notice and everything else and the time frame allowed. We have observed that practice as did the previous administration, the last four administrations of this province during the full time the Member for Lakeside has been a member of this House. We have no intention of deviating from that. We did it last year with regard to the notice of prorogation, the convening of the next Session. None of that changes but, Sir, it's not a statutory requirement for one simple reason, and that is because the call of an emergency Session would not be possible if it were a statutory requirement.

The normal notice, the registered letter, etc., would prevail except urgent pressing necessity. Although prorogation is changed there's no intent to change the way we actually operate in terms of calling the Sessions.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business, I believe. Her Honour will be attending presently.

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason): Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour Pearl McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour.

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:

- Bill 3 - An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil.
- Bill 5 - The Freedom of Information Act; Loi sur la liberté d'accès à l'information.
- Bill 8 - The Ambulance Services Act; Loi sur les services d'ambulance.
- Bill 12 - The Child and Family Services Act; Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille.
- Bill 14 - An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les garderies d'enfants.
- Bill 16 - The Heritage Resources Act; Loi sur le patrimoine.
- Bill 17 - The Transboundary Pollution Reciprocal Access Act; Loi sur les droits de recours réciproques contre la pollution transfrontalière.

- Bill 18 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; Loi modifiant le code de la route.
- Bill 19 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); Loi modifiant le code de la route (2).
- Bill 20 - An Act to amend The Engineering Profession Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les ingénieurs.
- Bill 28 - The Manitoba Habitat Heritage Act; Loi sur la protection du patrimoine écologique du Manitoba.
- Bill 36 - The Mortgage Dealers Act; Loi sur les courtiers d'hypothèques.
- Bill 37 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques.
- Bill 40 - The Workplace Innovation Centre Act; Loi sur le Centre d'innovation des lieux de travail.
- Bill 47 - The Infants' Estates Act; Loi sur les biens des mineurs.
- Bill 53 - The Pay Equity Act; Loi sur l'égalité des salaires.
- Bill 55 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la réglementation des alcools.
- Bill 57 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société du Barreau.
- Bill 58 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les hypothèques.
- Bill 59 - The Statute Law Amendment (Family Law) Act; Loi modifiant le droit statutaire concernant le droit de la famille.
- Bill 60 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1985); Loi de 1985 modifiant le droit statutaire.
- Bill 62 - The Charter Compliance Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin d'assurer le respect de la Charte.
- Bill 65 - The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1985); Loi de 1985 modifiant la législation relative à la fiscalité.
- Bill 66 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Niakwa Country Club"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation le "Niakwa Country Club".
- Bill 67 - An Act to amend The Registry Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'enregistrement foncier.
- Bill 68 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les limites municipales.
- Bill 69 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les municipalités.
- Bill 70 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la société du crédit agricole.
- Bill 71 - An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'administration financière.
- Bill 72 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants.
- Bill 73 - An Act to amend The Special Survey Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les arpentages spéciaux.
- Bill 74 - The Equal Rights Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le droit statutaire afin de favoriser l'égalité des droits.
- Bill 75 - An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act and Other Acts of the Legislature, Loi modifiant la loi sur de paiement des salaires et d'autres lois de la législature.
- Bill 76 - An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la pension de retraite.
- Bill 77 - An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les normes d'emploi.
- Bill 78 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les divertissements.
- Bill 81 - An Act to amend The Co-operatives Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les coopératives.
- Bill 82 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les biens réels.
- Bill 83 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'évaluation municipale et d'autres dispositions statutaires.
- Bill 84 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Finance Board Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Commission des finances des écoles publiques.
- Bill 85 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act (2); Loi modifiant la loi sur l'assurance-maladie (2).
- Bill 86 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la protection du consommateur.
- Bill 87 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "First Presbyterian Church Foundation"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation la "First Presbyterian Church Foundation".
- Bill 90 - An Act to amend The Ecological Reserves Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les réserves écologiques.
- Bill 92 - An Act to amend The Architects Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les architectes.
- Bill 93 - An Act to amend The Registered Respiratory Technologists Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les technologues en inhalothérapie.
- Bill 94 - An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société d'habitation et de renovation.
- Bill 95 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board."
- Bill 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba; Loi modifiant l'Acte pour incorporer Les Révérends Pères Oblats dans la Province de Manitoba.
- Bill 98 - An Act to Validate an Expropriation Under The Expropriation Act; Loi validant une expropriation effectuée en vertu de la loi sur l'expropriation.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's Name, Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these bills:

Bill 49 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1986 and to authorize Commitments to expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years, and to authorize the Borrowing of Funds to provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Appropriation Act 1985); Loi allouant à Sa Majesté certaines sommes d'argents pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 mars 1986, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années

subséquentes et à faire les emprunts requis pour subvenir à ses besoins de fonds (Loi de 1985 portant affectation de crédits).

Bill 56 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the Borrowing of the Same (The Loan Act 1985); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (Loi d'emprunt de 1985).

MR. CLERK: Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

Her Honour was then pleased to retire.

(GOD SAVE THE QUEEN WAS SUNG)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there is no further business to come before the House, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until future notice.



PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

The Manitoba Gazette

Vol. 115

Winnipeg, Saturday, February 22, 1986

No. 8

PROCLAMATIONS

"Pearl McGonigal"
Lieutenant-Governor.

CANADA— PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God of The United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories QUEEN, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

A PROCLAMATION

To our beloved and faithful the members elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of our Province of Manitoba, and to each and every of you — GREETING:

WHEREAS we have thought fit by and with the advice and consent of our Executive Council of Manitoba, to dissolve the present Legislative Assembly of our said Province.

NOW KNOW YE that we do for that end publish this, our proclamation, and do hereby dissolve the Legislative Assembly accordingly, and the members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, are discharged from further meeting and attendance in connection therewith.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Our Province of Manitoba to be hereunto affixed;

WITNESS, Her Honour Pearl McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of Our said Province of Manitoba:

AT OUR GOVERNMENT HOUSE, at Our City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, this eleventh day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighty-six, and in the thirty-fifth year of Our Reign.

BY COMMAND.

"ROLAND PENNER",
Attorney-General.

—8

"Pearl McGonigal"
Lieutenant-gouverneur

CANADA— PROVINCE DU MANITOBA

ELIZABETH DEUX, par la grâce de Dieu, REINE du Royaume-Uni, du Canada et de ses autres royaumes et territoires, Chef du Commonwealth, Défenseur de la Foi.

PROCLAMATION

A tous les fidèles et loyaux sujets de Sa Majesté, formant l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba, et à tous chacun d'entre vous, SALUT :

ATTENDU QUE nous estimons opportun, sur l'avis et du consentement du Conseil exécutif, de dissoudre l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba.

SACHEZ DONC MAINTENANT QUE nous déclarons et proclamons, par les présentes, la dissolution de l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba et que, par conséquent, les

membres de cette assemblée sont dispensés d'aassister à toute autre séance ou réunion de ladite assemblée.

EN FOI DE QUOI, Nous avons fait émettre Nos présentes lettres patentes et à icelles fait apposer le grand sceau de Notre province du Manitoba;

TEMOIN: L'Honorable Pearl McGonigal, lieutenant-gouverneur de Notre dite province du Manitoba:

EN LA RESIDENCE DE NOTRE LIEUTENANT-GOUVERNEUR, en Notre Ville de Winnipeg, dans la province du Manitoba, ce onzième jour de février en l'an de grâce mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six, le trente-cinquième de Notre règne.

PAR ORDRE,

"ROLAND PENNER",
Procureur-général.