

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 28 August, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE Cont'd

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: The Honourable Minister of Education has 16 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Morris - on a point of order?

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, before the Minister continues his grievance, I would ask you to review the Minister's words and determine whether or not he followed down the same path that I did about a month-and-a-half ago in debate when I was asked to retract several comments I made to the Member for Thompson when I used the words, "I pose the question as a rhetorical question"; when I used, for example, hypothetical situations.

I believe, Madam Speaker, during that time if you peruse Hansard, you'll see that you asked me to withdraw those remarks, as a matter of fact, on three occasions. I think it's only fair that you do so also to the Minister of Education.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will certainly take the honourable member's advice under consideration for review of Hansard, both the one the member is referring to and the Hansard for today when it arrives.

The Honourable Minister of Education has 16 minutes remaining.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have no intention of using up that 16 minutes. I want to conclude by saying categorically in deference to the concerns and the point of order raised by the Member for Brandon West that the remarks I made earlier with respect to the allegations that could be made and can be made of any member were used only to emphasize the point that it's very easy to make allegations; it's very easy to draw erroneous conclusions or put facts in such a way that erroneous conclusions can be drawn to the detriment of individuals, and those kinds of things should not be done or should be done only in circumstances where there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the conclusions that inevitably will be drawn.

The Member for Morris perhaps has raised an important point and without checking the record and, in fact, without checking the rules of the House thoroughly, I would certainly be prepared to withdraw those remarks. As I indicated to begin with, there was no intention of them representing an accurate portrayal of the situation or the motives of any of the people who I talked about.

I simply make the final point that allegations have been made in this House. The last incident we are familiar with, my colleague, the Member for Transcona, has been the victim of such allegations, and it is never the case that allegations should be made without due thought and consideration as has been the case too often in the past in this House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTION put; MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply (Interim Supply) to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: We are now in Interim Supply and we are considering Interim Supply (2). The resolution reads:

RESOLVED that a sum not exceeding \$1,200,705,125, being 35 percent of the total amount to be voted as set out in the Main Estimates, be granted to Her Majesty, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987.

A MEMBER: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's passed.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee 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 with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee of Ways and Means please come to order. The resolution before this Committee of Ways and Means reads as follows:

RESOLVED that toward making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenditures of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987, the sum of \$1,200,705,125, being 35 percent of the total amount to be voted as set out in the Main Estimates to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, to be granted out of the Consolidated Fund—pass.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Madam Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. E. KOSTYRA introduced, by leave, Bill No. 56, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1987 and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years, The Interim Appropriation Act, (2) 1986; Loi allouant à sa Majesté certaines sommes d'argent pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 Mars 1987, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes (2).

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 56 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986, (2)

HON. E. KOSTYRA presented Bill No. 56, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1987 and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years (2), the Interim Appropriation Act (2), 1986; Loi allouant à sa majesté certaines sommes d'argent pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 Mars 1987, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes (2) for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

Bill 56, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1986 (2) is required to provide additional interim spending and

commitment authority for the 1986-87 fiscal year pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1986.

Bill 56 will replace The Interim Appropriation Act, 1986, being Chapter 3 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1986, except for Section 14 of that act which provides authority to borrow 300 million in which authority does not lapse.

The amount of spending authority requested is \$2,630,796,675, being 75 percent of the total amount to be voted excluding statutory items as set forth in the Main Estimates of expenditures as follows: total general statutory appropriations, 361,878,000; total sums to be voted, 3,507,728,900 which adds up to the total Main Estimates of expenditure at 3,869,606,900.00.

The Interim Supply calculation is 75 percent of 3,507,728,900 sum to be voted which equals \$2,630,796,675.00.

Due to the late start of the Legislature in 1986, it was deemed appropriate to request an initial Interim Supply allotment of 40 percent of the amounts to be voted, or \$1,403,091,560.00. In accordance with recent experiences, was expected to provide spending authority until late August. The initial Interim Supply allotment is now expected to run out, as predicted, by the end of August. Since The Appropriation Act, 1986 has not yet been passed, it becomes necessary to secure additional spending and commitment authority by way of a Second Interim Supply bill to provide for the ongoing requirements of government.

Madam Speaker, the amount of future commitment authority has been increased in the Second Interim Supply bill to 300 million, an increase of 100 million from the initial Interim Supply bill, and represents 75 percent of the total forward commitment authority to be included in The Appropriation Act, 1986. This is representative of the increase in the full-year level of future commitment authority required in 1986-87 to provide for the financial obligations under the MPI lease arrangements. On reference from the Provincial Auditor, the Legislative Counsel has recommended that sufficient authority be included to cover long-term lease commitments under these agreements, approximately 150 million. The total 1986-87 forward commitment authority to be included in the Main Supply bill is estimated at 400 million, as opposed to 220 million provided for 1985-86.

Madam Speaker, Bill 56 is required to provide additional interim spending and a commitment authority to insure the continued operations of government. I'd like to request the cooperation of all members in passing Bill 56 through all stages of consideration, debate and approval, including Royal Assent at today's sitting of the House. When Bill 56 reaches the committee stage, I can provide members with a section-by-section explanation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I am glad that we have an opportunity to, once again, discuss a money bill. It affords us an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to address some of the major concerns that we have on this side, indeed we believe

all Manitobans have, with respect to financial matters in this province.

Madam Speaker, there could be no more fortuitous time for members opposite to be able to debate an Interim Supply bill than following the members opposite, some half-dozen or so, taking the opportunity to grieve this afternoon. Madam Speaker, we sat here and listened to members opposite grieving, in some respects, a very emotional way with respect to the dealings and the result of the inquiry pertaining to the Member for Transcona.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight, not officially using my grievance but, in a sense, rising to grieve on behalf of all Manitobans. This is again a very opportune time for members opposite to be able to address the government on financial matters related to the Interim Supply bill, but also in some way rebut some of the comments made by members opposite today as they stood in their place and exercised their opportunity to grieve.

Madam Speaker, what I will be putting on the record tonight, in my view, will not be self-serving to the Conservative Party of Manitoba. In my view, I grieve for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, in listening to members opposite debate this afternoon, I will concede at this early time that there were elements of reason within all the presentations that I heard. I can say that I could sympathize with some of the matters that they related to the members opposite.

Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, I couldn't help but understand or hear and see the frustration that was very much alive, very much embellished almost every one of their remarks. I think there's good reason for that, Madam Speaker, and part of that is tied into the fiscal reality of this province, is also tied into some of the very major thrusts of the Opposition has been able to direct towards the government over the space of the last six weeks.

In my view, Madam Speaker, some of the thrusts have been very meaningful, have caused the government not only great concern from a political standpoint, but it's also shown to all Manitobans and demonstrated very clearly that there are Crown corporations in place today that are not properly managed and are too far removed from the gravitational sphere of government decision-making.

So, Madam Speaker, again I say I feel fortunate that the members opposite have an opportunity to rebut some of the comments made by members opposite earlier today.

Let me say to the Member for Rossmere, in being here four years it was probably one of the finer presentations I have heard him make. I can say that I don't necessarily agree with the substance of his remarks, but it was the best delivered speech that I have heard him give in my tenure within this Assembly.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you that the speech offered by the Member for Kildonan, although some of us have chosen at times to ridicule him, I can say candidly there is some substance, in my view, to what he says; that it's incumbent upon the press and the media to show good judgment in how they report the activities of members, and indeed, activities in this Assembly.

I can also say to the Member for Flin Flon, the Minister of Education, that I, too, wanted to take his pleadings

that we be on better behaviour, that we demonstrate more maturity at times, seriously. But Madam Speaker, after I say that, to me it was sort of destroyed at 8:05 this evening when members opposite, in some salient fashion, began to revert right back to the same manners that we have been accustomed to over the period of the last three months.

Madam Speaker, I agree with members opposite when they say democracy is fragile - I believe it's fragile - and I can say that it must not be defiable, we could all perform better and we could all set better examples. But Madam Speaker, what I heard today in debate, to me, represented a political party that has had an awful lot of spotlight directed towards it, most of it negative in light, and today after being given some good news from their viewpoint, that they finally felt they could take a breath of fresh air and begin to fight back.

Madam Speaker, I must tell you, from my viewpoint, in spite of the fact that the speeches opposite were full of emotion and that there were some areas that we should all agree on; and yes, I agree we are all potential targets as we move into public life, but that will never change. And the pleadings of members opposite will never change it, Madam Speaker; and a conflict-of-interest bill will never change it. We are public figures.

So let's hope we never find ourselves in positions where members opposite can take some political opportunities and the press and the media, who like to sensationalize certain things, have an opportunity to do so. But, Madam Speaker, in spite of saying that, we know what will happen, and it will continue.

In spite of the members opposite trying to rise today and direct all those attacks, hurl attacks at an Opposition which this Session has done a very good job, Madam Speaker, in showing the weaknesses of the government and the mismanagement that has gone on in the government opposite, in spite of that, Madam Speaker, we will not be deterred. We know we've had a good Session. Everywhere we go people have told us that we've had a good Session, and the members opposite can try and belittle it and say that we've been muckraking and that we're out to destroy characters and that we're out to bring this debate and the Chamber down into the gutter level. Madam Speaker, they can use those charges, but we know we've had a good Session - we know we've had a good Session. Well, Madam Speaker, the Government House Leader says look at the words you've used on the record.

Madam Speaker, we didn't rise in our places and play tattletale to you every time we heard an indiscretion spoken. We didn't jump to our feet and tattle to you that we had heard members opposite use some words that are unparliamentary and should never be used in this forum, because they would have been on the record also.

But, Madam Speaker, there is a desperate government over here and we understand it, we really do. So I have no difficulty in understanding the members rising and engaging in an emotional debate like they did today. And, of course, that's their right. Madam Speaker, I can say, as I've said, one or two of those speeches were some of the better ones that I've heard their members give within the House, but it'll never change, Madam Speaker, we're public officials.

Madam Speaker, in my view the government has been hurt; the press in my view has turned on them to some

degree, but with good reason. You must remember who the press endorsed during the last election. You must remember we weren't given an opportunity to form government. But now, Madam Speaker, it's as if the people of Manitoba are a jilted lover. They've been let down, Madam Speaker. They've been let down by this government, in a fiscal sense, indeed, in a social policy sense, in a Crown corporation sense, Madam Speaker, and there's a backlash, and that's being manifested, in my view, in the attitude that the press and the media take towards this government.

Madam Speaker, we realize where we're at; the members opposite realize where they're at. So they've had a good day in a sense. They've had a good day in the sense that one of their members has been cleared by an inquiry. I can understand why they rejoice, because, Madam Speaker, they've had precious few over the last three months. So let them rise in their places. Let them rise in their places and let them come forward and tell us how it is the responsibility of each and every one of us to maintain decorum in the House and make democracy that fragile instrument of government, make it work better.

Madam Speaker, we can accept that. We have no difficulty listening to those words. I think we should all be pressured from time to time to be reminded of our place. But, Madam Speaker, if the members opposite think they're going to back off the Opposition by some of the commentary they used in their grievances today, if they think they're going to weaken our resolve by putting into, and as examples trying to bring forward hypothetical allegations as was done by the Minister of Education and try and scare us and I dare say - and maybe the word is unparliamentary - blackmail us into reducing our resolve, it won't occur. It will not occur, Madam Speaker, because I can tell you, this Opposition, it's real, it's united and it's going to work towards the defeat of the government opposite.

We know why the Premier's executive staff are leaving, are jumping ship, on a daily basis, Madam Speaker. They can see it; the ship is going down. Madam Speaker, what we are determined to do is to push that vote, that vote of confidence, as quickly as we can.

Madam Speaker, I heard a member the other day say that the people of Manitoba had decided to give the NDP another mandate, and how can one argue with that? They were given a mandate, Madam Speaker, by not a full one percent of the population. Madam Speaker, if one wants to look at the results, one can't help but notice that out of the 10 smallest constituencies in the Province of Manitoba, by rank, the NDP won eight of those seats, Madam Speaker, and we won two. Likewise, Madam Speaker, if you look at the 10 largest constituencies in the province, you can't help but notice, we won seven, the Liberals won one and the NDP won two.

So, Madam Speaker, if the members opposite think that defeat is hard to accept for members opposite or for myself, it is. I can tell you that. It's hard to accept and when I see the population and the people of Manitoba on a daily basis who I interface with, come forward and say that this government should not be in place, highlighted and underlined by the MTX affair and other government affairs, Madam Speaker, then I say to you, yes, we will continue our resolve and we will bring this government down at the first opportunity that we have.

Madam Speaker, members opposite and the government for some period of time now have told anybody who wants to listen that the economy in this province and that the social changes that they have instituted and implemented are well accepted. They have told us over and over again that on an economic basis this province is doing well. Well, Madam Speaker, why do we have to continue to go to the market to borrow more and more money? Why do we have to do it if this province is doing so well? Well, Madam Speaker, this is some of the backlash that is in place. People aren't going to swallow that song and dance any more. They will not buy anything that the First Minister and members opposite have to say from any platform. We're into a new era. This government is doomed, Madam Speaker. — (Interjection) — Well, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Health says we've heard that since 1969. I wish we at times could administer truth serum to all of us. But, Madam Speaker, you might be surprised how many members opposite in private conversations will fully and readily admit that they're not going to come back after the next election and I won't name them, Madam Speaker. Those are private conversations.

But let me say, Madam Speaker, the members opposite, today they grieve, but I think Bill 56 and Loan Act 2, which we will discuss in due course give all Manitobans the right to grieve, and that's what is sort of being lost at this point in time.

Madam Speaker, we've made speeches ad infinitum over the last number of years, talking, talking about the state of economic affairs in this province. Quite frankly, the members opposite realize that the people in Manitoba really sort of tune out when you try and make those types of comments. They fought two election campaigns over it and they know that people really don't want to listen to some messages of sound, economic understanding.

Madam Speaker, here we are today debating this bill. Yet, the only way that the Opposition has of highlighting the circumstances related to mismanagement and loss is the MTX affair. Yet members opposite chastise us for dwelling upon it. Madam Speaker, surely they realize that's the vehicle that gives members opposite an opportunity to finally drive home to the people of Manitoba who want to listen to the message that we have serious economic problems within this province.

So, Madam Speaker, surely they can understand why we dwell on that issue and we will continue to do so for the days and the weeks and the months, if necessary ahead, until they give in to our requests and, indeed, our demands for an inquiry.

Madam Speaker, members opposite have been battered severely. I know today they take some solace and satisfaction in the fact that the Member for Transcona has been absolved of any conflict of interest with respect to certain allegations that were made. I say to them, by all means, have your day, but members opposite here will continue our successful attack and maintain it at even a higher level than we have over the past few weeks. All Manitobans must be brought to the realization that this government should not be here.

Madam Speaker, Interim Supply Bill No. 56 says to me that the government quite obviously is already out

of money. Madam Speaker, Bill 7, we just passed it roughly two months ago, requested spending authority of \$1.4 billion. This bill requests additional authority of \$1.2 billion.

Madam Speaker, there are many, many items that the Minister of Finance and other members in economic portfolios opposite have not addressed, not sincerely addressed. Although at times we're accused of not asking the right question, Madam Speaker, that was no more evident than question period today when the Minister of Finance, who members opposite, I think generally, have come to believe was forthright and was honourable and was a person to whom we did not have to direct the perfect question to elicit the truth. Today we find out, because my leader asked him if he had met somebody in the fall of some year and because the question said the fall and it didn't say the summer, the Minister of Finance felt that he had licence to say no to the question.

Madam Speaker, what the Minister of Finance doesn't realize in giving the answer that he did to my leader here a few days ago is that now when he tells us something in his sincere tones, we will be like a suspecting or an untrusting wife or husband. We won't really know whether or not the Minister is giving us the entire story, or the whole story.

Madam Speaker, the number of members opposite there that we had faith in, which could be counted on one hand, as a matter of fact, you might have been able to count it on three fingers. Today, we're down to two, because the Minister of Finance has shown me that unless we ask the very direct, the very specific courtroom question, we may not necessarily receive the whole answer.

Madam Speaker, we have a dichotomy here. We have the Minister of Education exhorting all members opposite to remember the history of democracy and the parliamentary system, and he did a fair job. I don't in many ways disagree with what the Minister of the Environment says. Yet, Madam Speaker, we have on the opposite pole the Attorney-General saying ask your question specifically and if you fail to do so, don't be disappointed with us if we don't give you the full answer. Madam Speaker, if that's in the democratic spirit, then I can tell you that we're in for trouble and that's where we are today. Madam Speaker, I'll ignore the remarks of the Attorney-General, who has chosen to — (Interjection) — talk about our . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris has the floor.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, when I look at this Interim Supply Bill, there are a lot of things that are not explained. I can't help notice, for instance, that The Interim Appropriation Act, 1986 doesn't indicate that the Main Estimates as laid before us, indeed for the same appropriations that we've been discussing in detail now for the best part of three months, did not show or demonstrate or display that fact that all the civil servants in the province are to receive a 2 percent increase. This bill didn't tell us, indeed the appropriations in the Main Estimates didn't tell us, that a directive was sent by the Minister of Finance to every department of government telling them to find from within the funds to satisfy that request.

Madam Speaker, every day in this House when we go through Estimates, we go through an Other Expenditure, and Supplementary Information provided by Ministers opposite gives the breakout of the Other Expenditures. In good faith, Madam Speaker, we sit through the Estimates process and pass, as we were elected to do, an appropriation called Other Expenditures, outside of Salaries, Madam Speaker. We pass those in good faith. Division, item-after-item, branch-after-branch, and yet when we do it, already two months beforehand, the Minister of Finance has told branch managers and division managers to glean from the Other Expenditures item 2 percent and direct it towards wages.

Madam Speaker, from where within would it be? If we have a "Salaries" component and we have "Other Expenditures," within a branch, from where else can it come? Well, Madam Speaker, I'll let the Minister of Finance - I'll let him explain from where else it might come. And yet, Madam Speaker, the Interim Supply Bill doesn't address that issue at all. Interim Supply doesn't address the fact that we have now a new Crown corporation which has been given licence now to construct buildings on behalf of the Government of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, do you remember two years ago when the then Minister of Finance brought in a bill telling us that we had to pass this legislation immediately before the Federal Government was about to cut off the tax loophole? The net effect of it would be to save the Province of Manitoba 4 percent borrowing. Of course, what we ended up doing was selling our buildings; selling them to investors who had some preferred tax — (Interjection) — well, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance says it wasn't true. But I just wish he would listen me out.

Two years ago the Minister of Finance came in this House and said it had to be done immediately; that Ottawa was about to shut off that loophole. Madam Speaker, the buildings were sold to the Manitoba Properties Inc. The shareholders of Manitoba Properties Inc. are investors. That's what I'm saying. And of course the Province of Manitoba has an opportunity when they wish to buy from the investors, to buy those stock certificates back.

But, Madam Speaker, when that bill was brought in, no mention was made that this new Crown corporation, Manitoba Properties Inc. was going to go into the business of developing buildings; two years later. Now we find out that duty of government, covered within the main appropriation, covered and shown within the Main Estimates, now was going to be removed. Now Manitoba Properties Inc. is going to be given its own loan authority.

Madam Speaker, no different than Manfor, no different than Manitoba Development Corporation, no different than any other of the Crown corporations. It now will construct buildings on behalf of the people of Manitoba out of the scrutiny of the main appropriation. Madam Speaker, the Interim Supply Bill does not mention anything about that. And yet members opposite wonder why we continue to attack the weakest link of their Crown corporation batting order.

The Minister of Finance has not given us a full explanation of the first-quarter results of this Province of Manitoba; the first-quarter financial results. We've

asked for it. But when one considers the variation in expenditure versus planned expenditure, in terms of the last five years, the variation is close to \$50 million. For the last four years actual has fallen below planned by some \$20 million.

This year that trend has been reversed. It's now some \$27 million greater. Madam Speaker, that deserves an explanation from the Minister of Finance. He says it's a matter of timing. Madam Speaker, that begs the question, why wasn't the matter of timing involved and why didn't it explain away the differences to the positive side of the results for the four years previous? Madam Speaker, it's incumbent upon the Minister of Finance, in my view, to stand in his place and tell us in much more detail why the first quarterly results were so dismal.

Madam Speaker, Interim Supply, Bill No. 56 doesn't at all tell us why the government would not support the private member's bill brought forward by the Member for St. Norbert requesting that this government give consideration to putting into statute, or amending the statute, under which the government has to report financial dealings in a specified time frame.

Madam Speaker, all we know is that one day when it was called for considerations, and the vote was called on second reading, the members opposite said no, we're not going to support the bill without explanation, none whatsoever.

Madam Speaker, Bill 56, Interim Supply, doesn't say anything about our falling credit rating. The Minister did not disclose that within his Estimates. Of course the members opposite have been badgering me to make some comment with respect to the Saskatchewan credit rating that has fallen rather drastically over the last two years.

Do members opposite realize how many billions of dollars went into the Saskatchewan agricultural community this year? Do members opposite realize that there's a program there where every cultivatable acre in that province was eligible for \$25 an acre operating loan, and that the uptake under that program was roughly 90 percent, I am told? If you put that over 50 million acres of cultivatable land in Saskatchewan, can you wonder why that province is running a major deficit? Well, that's part of the reason.

Yet the members opposite don't tell us about Quebec, they don't indicate that the Quebec credit rating was upgraded by Moody's. Do you know why, Madam Speaker? For three very basic reasons and that is, they began selling off Crown corporations; they controlled expenditures; they moderated their borrowings and they decreased their deficit by 8 percent. Madam Speaker, those three actions from a province, I must say, which is almost as dependent upon transfer payments from the Federal Government as the Province of Manitoba — (Interjection) — well, Madam Speaker, the Minister of the Environment says, which was cut. Madam Speaker, Quebec had their's seriously curtailed, too. But in spite of that, that province somehow was able to upgrade their credit rating.

So, Madam Speaker, it can be done if one has the political will to do it. It can be done, Madam Speaker. Well, Madam Speaker, I've told the members opposite

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. All members who wish to participate in debate will have an opportunity.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, the members opposite wish to taunt me with respect to the Prime Minister's expenditures within his own constituency — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, I think the Member for Inkster would like to rise and ask me a question but before he does, I'd like to indicate I think my time is running out, and I'd like to continue some of my presentation.

Madam Speaker, I'll say for the record - and I've said it before - I too will be as critical as anybody when I see federal officials directing large sums of money toward their own constituency in fields - in fields, Madam Speaker, in areas of government responsibility, that is truly a provincial responsibility, and I'll share in that criticism. I have no difficulty in doing that because, to me, the Western Canadian problem that's in existence today, not only in Manitoba but in all provinces of Western Canada, is very real and it's one that must be dealt with almost on a regional basis.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm not wearing my strong PC stamp in the middle of my forehead when it comes to dealing with some of those matters; and yet members opposite know fully well I've defended their Federal Government in their attempts to bring the deficit into some type of proper balance. — (Interjection) — Well, Madam Speaker, the Minister opposite says, "By taxation." What other way is there if you're not going to cut expenditures? So, Madam Speaker, what other way is there?

Madam Speaker, I'm only trying to point out Quebec has done it because they freed private enterprise. They brought new mining royalties into place that has caused a tremendous boon within that industry.

Madam Speaker, the Interim Supply Bill doesn't tell us; it doesn't give us any indication whether the budgetary estimate or forecast of year-end deficit of \$489 million still stands. — (Interjection) — well, Madam Speaker, all I've got for the word of it is the Minister of Urban Affairs. He says that it'll stand. Madam Speaker, I've heard in the past that the word of the Minister of Urban Affairs can't always be trusted. Madam Speaker, I've heard that from very close sources, so I won't take it as the gospel on this issue, with due respect to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Madam Speaker, where will the deficit be, the \$489 million? We're now five months into this fiscal year, Madam Speaker, and yet I don't hear the Minister of Finance standing in his place and indicating whether that figure will still stand. We know that he's desperately trying within every department of government to hold back spending. We know that they're holding off borrowing as long as they can. We know that interest costs in the Department of Finance were a significant reason for the fact that the overrun in expenditure, increased deficit, was \$27 million, Madam Speaker, but the Minister at no time rises in his place and tells us or gives us any indication whether the forecasted deficit will still be in the \$489 million range.

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance hasn't stood in his place, and we've been in the House now for four to four-and-one-half months, he hasn't stood in his place and told us how our economy is doing vis-a-vis other parts of Canada. Madam Speaker, the members

opposite read the back of a Royal Bank of Canada report forecasting how it is we might do — (Interjection) — the Royal Bank of Canada report, you know that bank that members opposite detest, but they use it when they think it's to their benefit.

But, Madam Speaker, they haven't told us that national growth is falling far below expectation. The economy, in a real sense, was expected to grow at 3.7 percent across this land. Madam Speaker, halfway through the calendar year, it's falling below 3. That will have significant impact upon Manitoba; indeed, Manitoba is part of that, and yet the Minister opposite won't stand in his place and tell us what impact that might have on revenues. We know, Madam Speaker, that there will be a significant impact.

Madam Speaker, the Minister hasn't stood in his place and told us about foreign exchange losses. He hasn't told us that the Japanese yen has lost over \$200 million, our borrowing in the Japanese yen. Madam Speaker, I see my light is flashing, it's time to close, but let me say that it's incumbent upon the Minister of Finance, in the debate on Interim Supply, to give us some further explanation of these items that I have just mentioned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Madam Speaker, with leave, I wonder if the Member for Morris would entertain a couple of questions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. Two questions: (1) Does he have leave to answer a question; and (2) does he wish to answer a question?

MR. D. SCOTT: Sure he will. Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if my honourable friend, the Member for Morris, when he mentioned the increasing probability of the economy in Quebec, if he recognizes how much he attributes that increase in investment and the increase in the borrowing credibility and capability, at least, of the Government of Quebec in their credit rate, how much of that is due to policies that were implemented by the previous government over a number of years in Quebec, based on increasing the amount of public investment to build up the public infrastructure in the Province of Quebec, especially in hydro?

How much, as well, was due to the introduction of an innovative program on stock options to encourage Quebecers to invest in Quebec-based companies? How much money has that put into the Quebec economy? How much impact, as well, has the steady effect of over the last at least 10 years to the point now where Quebec has probably the highest number of business graduates of any province in Canada, how much of that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order. I think that the honourable member had leave to ask a question.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, in that checklist, am I to use an X or a correction mark for the right

answer, because the member opposite has tried to answer his own question.

Madam Speaker, there have been some innovative approaches in an attempt by the former government there to cause private citizens within Quebec to become more involved in investing and more involved directly in production in goods and services within that province. I give him that, Madam Speaker.

But, Madam Speaker, this is exactly what Moody's had to say. One of the reasons why they dropped the credit rating was that the new Premier pledged to reduce the public sector's role in the economy over the medium term in order to help improve their province's competitive position amongst its trading partners. Madam Speaker, that's the single most important issue.

If one looks at their Budget at a glance, you can't help notice that in Quebec social expenditures increased 4.4 percent, development costs - 3.4 percent, government expenditures - 2.2 percent. What were our expenditures increased here, Madam Speaker? How many percent? Was it 5 or was it 6 or was it 8 percent? The provincial debt there increased 23.5 percent; not like in Manitoba where it increased upwards of 40 percent, Madam Speaker.

Income taxes, a 3.9 percent increase on the revenue side. Madam Speaker, we're at a level at or above that. Sales tax - 10.8. Madam Speaker, what does our Quarterly Report tell us about sales tax? Well, I'm sure you want to know this, Madam Speaker. I mean this is reading it out of our document, unaudited, the First Quarter Report, the retail sales tax, Madam Speaker, well, it didn't even hit the \$80 million it was supposed to. It was half-a-million dollars below forecast, so we're falling behind in that area, but the main area, Madam Speaker, is transfers from Ottawa. Quebec received no percent increase in transfers. This province did, and finally, Madam Speaker, as you're looking at me in a fashion which indicates to me that you wonder whether or not I'm addressing the question and I can assure you that I am, that borrowing, Madam Speaker, is down 4.8 percent. Yet, in this province we borrow, we go to the market for \$1.4 billion this year, compared to under \$1 billion last year.

So, Madam Speaker, if the member opposite wants to talk about Quebec and say it's because of some changes that have caused that province to have its credit rating upgraded, I remind him that this government also has the power, if it wishes to exercise it, it has the power to do some of those same things and also reduce the deficit for my children and his child, I understand, born yesterday.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? (Agreed)

Could the member confirm that the Royal Bank of Canada contributed in the calendar year 1985, \$6,000 to the Provincial Conservative Party and is that the reason why he's opposing The Farm Aid Bill No. 4?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. When we have order, I will recognize the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I can't confirm that. I haven't seen the list of donors to the Conservative Party. I'll accept the member's word, who obviously has a listing, because I saw him running down to the Premier in question period like a little shoeshine boy trying to get it on the record, Madam Speaker, so I know he has a copy of the list. I don't, Madam Speaker, but I accept what he's telling me.

Madam Speaker, but I can confirm, now that I have the NDP list in front of me, I can confirm that Bob Adams, in charge of our free trade negotiations for the Province of Manitoba, made two contributions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Realizing that the House has granted leave to carry on, could we please do it orderly?

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, like I was saying to the member opposite, I can't confirm it; I don't have the list, but I can confirm, for the benefit of the member who is interested in donations, that I do have a list of NDP contributors and that I'd like to read him that Mr. Adams contributed \$1,033 to the NDP Party, plus another \$500, two contributions totalling \$1,500, Madam Speaker. We don't have the dates here, but maybe the second one came after a promise of some sort.

Madam Speaker, I also a Mr. Bruce Buckley made a contribution of \$1,600 and I've just made it to the "B's" Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind the honourable member that the question that was asked, which the member had leave to answer was, did a certain donation affect his stand on a certain bill?

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, the question was very general in nature; it dealt with the whole area of contributions and, Madam Speaker, I will answer in a like answer, if I can.

I'd like to address . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Could we have some order please? This is not question period. The rules of debate apply to the process that we are now in. The rules of debate are that members can agree to answer questions based on clarification of the remarks that they have made in debate.

Order please, order please. The honourable member's question had to deal with the Member for Morris' stand on Bill No. 4 and whether it was influenced by a certain donation. That was the question for clarification.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I find it strange that you'd mention Bill No. 4. I haven't heard Bill No. 4 mentioned at all, because I certainly, when I was speaking on Bill No. 56, I don't remember mentioning Bill No. 4 when I was addressing Bill No. 56. — (Interjection) — Oh, I see, so he was mentioning Bill No. 4 on Bill No. 56.

Madam Speaker, let me answer the question. I'm a member of a caisse populaire, a member of La Salle Credit Union. I'm also a member, a depositor with the Toronto-Dominion Bank, and so when the member

asked the question whether or not - and I think he's trying to somehow cast an aspersion that maybe the argument I'm taking with respect to Bill No. 4 is somehow influenced by the fact that the Royal Bank of Canada has given a donation to the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, members opposite love to have fun trivializing those of us who are farmers and I'm sure all of us have accounts with the major banking institutions and, indeed, also with credit unions. Madam Speaker, they find something offensive in the fact that we have deposits, loans - and many of us have loans - with the major banks of this country.

I can tell you it's a privilege to be able to borrow money from a major bank. I can tell the members opposite my father, when he got into farming, couldn't do it. I'll tell the members opposite that the farm I now own was owned by a trust company, taken over by them in the 1930's, held by them until 1945, sold to my grandfather. To this day, Madam Speaker, that trust company hasn't put in one new dollar into lending in support of new farm loans, not one dollar. Osler, Hammond and Nanton was the name of that trust company, Madam Speaker.

The banks today and starting some 25 years ago when new liberal-minded bankers like my colleague, the Member for Minnedosa, came forward and understood that you lend money on a cash flow basis, Madam Speaker. When you do that today - and agriculture responded to that, Madam Speaker. So the members opposite, if they're trying to embarrass us for being borrowing clients of the bank, Madam Speaker, they're going to fail, because we understand what it is that the banks, all of them, have done for agriculture.

If the Royal Bank of Canada wishes to direct some funds, Madam Speaker, to the Conservative Party, obviously they realize how desperate and how bad this government is and how badly they should be replaced by a good one.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in my place today, and I guess I should be shaking in my boots. When I was leaving the Chamber at 5:30 p.m., the Member for Thompson - would you believe this, colleagues? - turned to me and said, you think you are the only guys who can play hardball? I went home and I said to my wife, Hazel, I don't know whether I want you to let me go back, Hazel, because I'm so afraid of this little fellow who's been telling me this for many, many years. So I'm only sorry, Madam Speaker, that I didn't warn my colleagues as well. It's really true.

I went home disturbed about the fact that this government has been so happy — (Interjection) — oh yes, I wasn't going to mention that. The Member for Ellice, I was walking down the hall, listening to music that I don't understand coming out the Caucus Room door of the NDP, and I said, is that what you people listen to? He said, we're celebrating. This was the day to dance, I guess. I don't know.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, my disappointment today certainly was mainly with the Member for Flin Flon, the

Minister of Education, who displayed - well, if the members agree with me over there, I'd agree with them, no question about that - who tried today - by example, if somebody wants to hear about the winery I represent, I don't mind the advertising. It's entirely up to you. It's against the law.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I saw and heard the Minister of Education, try by innuendo today, - or let's put it this way - making innuendo today on the basis of giving an example. You know, I don't really believe that is the way that members opposite or on this side of the House - if they have something to say, they should be man enough and do it straightforward without trying to give example by getting at another member. Because if that game is to be played, there are many of you over there who we could give examples of and that would start and continue forever.

It is unfortunate — (Interjection) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm probably one of the best at saying things across the House. If I indicate that I believe somebody is being hypocritical, I say it, because I believe it and I won't back off it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the honourable member says I practise it, that's his opinion, but I don't have any trouble doing it because I believe it.

The other disappointment today is the absolute decision within the caucus of the NDP Party to come out today and try to blame this side of the House for all of the happenings that went on with the Member for Transcona. He said that we were to blame for all of that, indications about my colleague for St. Norbert and my leader.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say this: the only thing that was said about the indication or the charges or the things that were brought forward by the papers about the Member for Transcona from this side was the member should probably resign. The member didn't resign, but the member did do the right thing by asking for a public hearing. We had a member resign once, the Honourable Mr. Steinkopf at the time, resigned, cleared himself and ran again. That's nothing wrong when that happens in the House, and the Member for Transcona did the right thing.

There's no question that he has reason to be very happy today because, when he did it, he possibly didn't know what was there that he might not have known about, and he had reason to be happy today. But when he resigned, he did it over a weekend. We weren't even here. The comment by my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, was made over a weekend, and the hearing was on when we came back to the House — (Interjection) — oh, we don't worry about what the Minister of Urban Affairs says. The hearing was on, and there was no discussion from us about it when there was a hearing requested.

We did make a point of saying the Minister used a tax scam which helped take money from the people of the Province of Manitoba after it had been criticized by this government. After it had been called everything on earth, this was done. The Minister in Ottawa, the Finance Minister, put an end to that probably in fiscal '84, I believe. In Christmas of '84, the Minister went out and bought it knowing what it would cost this province and he not only did it then, he did it again after and that's what we were criticizing the member for. He did not break the law, Sir, but he knowingly went out and did

something that he knew by being on the Treasury Bench would be harmful to the Province of Manitoba after it had been criticized by the Minister of Finance. And if you think this Opposition is going to sit back and let those go by, they've got another think coming.

You see, the Member for Kildonan sits in his chair when we pat our desks and he goes like this, come on boys. He seems to think it's humorous when we believe in something. I frankly think that the handclapping is childish - I would prefer that you beat your desk - but it's childish.

Many, many years ago when Mr. Schreyer first came into office, the first Throne Speech said, we will get rid of old dogmas and we'll change traditions within the system of this Legislature. Well, the buffalo — (Interjection) — I know that they want to joke about that, but if they want to take a look at the literature in front of them, they'll find there's two legs of the buffalo that aren't joined, and that's just the way the NDP opposite operate; they're not joined; they're loose; they're falling apart. So I can understand why that would probably happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have another situation whereby we have, one especially, and three Ministers who have been responsible for MTX; who have not asked for any public inquiry. They have made statements in committee and statements in the House that have had to be corrected. We have found that they weren't completely involved. We know that they've met the sheik, the head of the other company - or the Member for St. James has - yet with all of this cloud, we have never had any one of them say, like the Member for Transcona, I would like a public inquiry to make sure that everything is brought out and known.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, — (Interjection) — my great disappointment is the Member for St. James, the Minister of Labour, who when I know him, if he thought there was any racial discrimination of any kind in any way, shape or form, that he was in charge of or a department of his was involved in, he would have stamped his feet and raised the devil so fast it wouldn't even be funny, but he has changed.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

I was either led down the garden path then or I say that there is some hypocrisy involved with the member. The member would never at any time have gone along with some of the things that I've seen him go along with, and especially in the last few days.

In fact, Madam Speaker, when the First Minister was elected in 1981, he left him out of the Cabinet.

A MEMBER: Yeah, because he's incompetent, that's why.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And the only way he got in was with representation from Saul Cherniack to fight for him on his behalf. The Premier was right. Unfortunately, he had his mind changed.

Now we have a situation where there have been the Member for Dauphin, the Member for Brandon East who have been told for three years, with the Member for St. James, what the problems are within the MTX. We have been told that this has been going on and we find out that these Ministers didn't do anything about it.

You see, the Member for Dauphin, his only answer or defence that I've ever heard in my life is to blame somebody else, whether it's the Federal Government; or whether it's his colleagues; or whether it's us, which is a true indication of complete incompetence. If your only answer is to blame other people, you obviously don't know what you're doing yourself. Obviously, that's the way it is with him, because that's his record.

The Member for Brandon, at least he had the real fine distinction of handling and being in charge of McKenzie Seeds and look what happened. I've heard from the other side, it happened in our time.

Madam Speaker, I'll tell you what happened in our time. The then president came to the board, he said I have an interest in a particular building that we are considering renting. I would like to excuse myself from the discussion. That's what happened and there's nothing wrong with that. Mr. Moore did the right thing.

Mr. Moore did the wrong things when you fellows were in power. He didn't come to the board and didn't tell them anything, because it was your board, your people in place; he didn't think he had to because he was one of the most powerful men of the NDP in Brandon at that time.

Who let it happen? It had to be brought to attention. I just heard the member mention CFI, and I refer him to a book. In fact, the book is Hansard. When Mr. Schreyer stood up in that very chair with the head of CFI, the company, sitting up there and the people they were dealing with sitting up there and he said I am pleased to announce today, after only \$14 million had been spent up there - only 14, it's documented, it's in books, \$14 million - and Mr. Schreyer said I have just negotiated a brand new deal.

A MEMBER: Yeah, and Kasser just rubbed his hands.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The member is young. I refer him to a book written by Mr. Newman who has never been called wrong. He refers to the pages of Hansard, the letters, the documents of everything he writes, and it's called, "The Day Mr. Kasser Came to Northern Manitoba." I refer you to it.

The Member for St. James is mentioned in it. Who made the decision to walk in and do the takeover, and what have you, their plans to do it? Madam Speaker, it's all there. When that young member over there makes mention to me, remember I've been here 17 years, I know what happened.

Now, Madam Speaker, I say this business of MTX, what happened? Bell Canada and Bell International were going to work over in Saudi Arabia, came to the Manitoba Telephone System, came over to Alberta, and they asked for people to go over and work. They were absconded by Bell and paid by Bell.

In fact, I have two very good friends, one of them who has passed away now, one friend of the Member for St. James, Tommy Cousins, who is passed away now, went over there on that situation and, Madam Speaker, he well knows the situation that Tommy Cousins went over there for.

And I can tell you this, that was after this government was elected, that they were able to convince and go into business, illegally, in Saudi Arabia and then come along to the Cabinet later and get it approved. Who

approved it? Who brought it to Cabinet? It wasn't one of the three Ministers who were in charge of Telephones. The Order-in-Council is signed by the Deputy Premier and signed by the Premier of the province, and this government didn't really know what was happening? Do you mean to tell me that they signed the Order-in-Council, allowing this company to go into that kind of business, and then they sat down and said, "We won't worry about how they're doing it. We won't report . . ." —(Interjection) — I heard Alcan and I'll explain that too, good. "We won't have them report of their findings or what's going over in Saudi Arabia. We'll just let them run off by themselves," and they call that responsible Ministers and responsible Government? They weren't even listening when they were told that there was something going on, and you know, Madam Speaker, that has to be the most incompetent way of operation that I've ever seen in my life.

If the member wants to mention Alcan, Alcan was going to pay for — (Interjection) — oh, wait a minute, hold it, Madam Speaker, I heard him say, "Downey's land." Oh . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Who's man enough over there to stand up and admit to saying it?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I agree, who's man enough to stand up . . .

A MEMBER: It was the one who was going to play hard ball.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You're all sitting down now. You won't admit it on the record, will you? You cowards.

A MEMBER: It's the one who was going to play hard ball.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, this is the type of thing that the member over there would say, after the member stood up during the time we were having condolences for Don Craik, and told the whole story then and he told it before, and he never hid anything in his life. We have that low person over there make that type of a statement.

Madam Speaker, we have a situation at the present time where we really had it all told the other day when the Minister of Health got up on a grievance, and the Minister of Health while he was speaking - and I might say that the Minister of Health went through his usual discussion about democracy, but his type of democracy. His type of democracy is when the government is elected, the Opposition is not supposed to open their mouth.

Now, mind you, I will go through the many things that this government has fouled up, but we're not supposed to open our mouths. But he really said it all when a member - while he was speaking said, "You don't care about 20 million, do you? It's not our job to protect the public's right, it's yours." The Minister of Health said, "We don't care about 20 million." That says it all. You don't care about 20 million or the people's money.

You have squandered the people's money like playboys, and when I said that across the House one

day, do you know the answer I got from the previous Minister of Finance? - this - that's the answer I got - this. Then I said that we're nearly \$2 billion in debt since you people took over. You've had \$500 million of deficits for approximately three years, we're nearly \$2 billion in debt, and he smiles. He thinks that's just marvelous. We have a situation where the government says to us that we've got to have this money so we can have all the social allowances and everything that goes on. We've never argued that. In fact, during the election, we agreed with those particular programs. We didn't agree with losing \$100 million in Flyer.

You know, Flyer makes Saunders Aircraft look good. Saunders Aircraft, we thought, would never happen again in the Province of Manitoba, \$42 million lost - never going to happen again - and we just blew \$100 million. That company was \$16 million in debt when we came to government and it was \$16.00 (sic) in debt when we left. We did not increase that deficit to any great extent. We made that company start to pay and you people came back into government and within six years, five-and-one-half years, you put it into a situation where it lost \$100 million or the total is \$100 million by the time we have to give it away.

I can't fathom a government taking that lightly. I can't fathom a government that goes through an election hiding a \$57 million more deficit from the people of Manitoba. The Member for St. James would not be in the schmozzle he is today because if the people of St. James had known that, and I live there, he wouldn't be the member. He only won by 142 votes, he lost the polls where he used to be alderman; in fact, he lost the poll where he was born in and raised. Madam Speaker, I can tell you that he wouldn't be here under those circumstances.

The other situations that we have at the present time

MR. H. SMITH: How low can you go?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I can go just as low as I have to, my answer to the Member for Ellice. Madam Speaker, I very seldom ever forgive somebody that leads me down the garden path. The Minister of Health did it twice and that will never happen again, and the Member for St. James will never do it again either.

So, Madam Speaker, the situation is that we have a government which laughs and jokes about the fact that we have this tremendous debt. They don't seem to care that our credit rating has dropped twice. — (Interjection) — Well the member over there, you know there's an old saying in the House when you get a young, inexperienced member making comments the way he does — (Interjection) — well an older, inexperienced member then. Quite frankly, when you get to be our age, you have the privilege of making a few more mistakes, but the jobs that he's talking about, Madam Speaker, there are a lot of service jobs in the province right now. There are jobs up North and we would question whether they're all Manitoban, the way they should be, but we will continue to monitor and look at that. There are jobs in the service industries as I mentioned. There are jobs in the construction industry, but the construction industry is moving and houses are selling, only because interest rates have come down and the Federal Government did it.

Your jobs are government money in the Core area projects. Your biggest job last year was Polo Park, which was private, I will admit, but your manufacturing in this province, private manufacturing investment has dropped 3.4.

Do you really believe that manufacturing can drop in this province, which is the basis for most of the jobs that we'll all ever have other than our agricultural industry, which is our No. 1 industry, when our manufacturing industry goes and our manufacturing shipments are down as well, or they may be up only .01 percent but following the rest of the country.

So, Madam Speaker, when he talks about jobs, he'd better start talking about the future jobs because when the farm economy in this province goes down and it's down and this government's doing nothing about it and your manufacturing is going down within this province, and your manufacturing shipments have only gone up by close to 1 percent while the other provinces have moved further up, you'd better start to take the smile off your face and start getting interested in what's happening.

Just remember this: You only are here by 503 votes.

A MEMBER: Five years, Frank, five more years.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You know, Madam Speaker, the only person that lost in this election is the Premier of the province. Our party gained seats; the Liberal Party gained seats. We didn't drop too much in the popular vote, the Liberal Party went up in the popular vote, but the NDP Party lost seats and lost in the popular vote. You may be government, but let me tell you, I hope . . .

You know, one of the other reasons they're probably there, one of the other reasons - I have an ad here from the election and my colleagues would be interested in this ad. It says, "Unite to stop the drive to the right." It advertises the Communist candidates. — (Interjection) - yes, I'm glad you cheered. We now know where you stand. Madam Speaker, at the bottom — (Interjection) - Hold it, hold it, hey, it gets better. It says at the bottom of the ad, after advertising the Communist candidates in all other constituencies, "Help defeat the right-wing parties by voting NDP."

I'll tell you what, Madam Speaker. They can have all the Communist votes that the Communists will give them. We don't want them. — (Interjection) - Hold it. The young Member for Thompson says McCarthyism. You know, the old story, when you corner a socialist, they start shouting McCarthyism, they start shouting everything.

Madam Speaker, all I did was read from an ad. I didn't write it; I read from it. You fellows phone them up and tell them you don't want their votes. — (Interjection) - the Communist Party's ad.

I don't think that we have ever had the opportunity to pick up the paper today and read what we read about this party. — (Interjection) - I'm not going to comment on Peter Warren. I want that on the record. The Member for Elmwood says Peter Warren is one of ours, and I'll see that he finds that out and that you said it.

Madam Speaker, this could have been written by Grade 11 students because it's so factual. There's a

list of things here that the government has done that are just close to appalling. I don't recall that any writer in the Province of Manitoba could have written that short article listing the things that this government has done that is harmful to the people of the Province of Manitoba in that short an article and list so many things. As a matter of fact, he probably could have gone on for two pages. If he had called us, we would have certainly been able to tell him of many things.

We can't have a group of people that hate banks. The Member for St. James, in his speech on Bill 14, and I'll be able to speak on that but I won't elaborate, the banks are the bad people. I never knew him to turn down an invitation when he was an alderman in the city of St. James-Assiniboia and dealt with the Royal Bank when we used to go to receptions up in their head office there. I never knew him to turn one of those down. You know, they really hate the banks.

Maybe, Madam Speaker, I should do it the way the Member for Thompson does it. What would happen if the Member for St. James happened to do that? Maybe I'll do it by putting it in that context. Madam Speaker, I will tell you this, that the hating of the banks, you all have to deal with banks. Banks all have pensioners' money in them, hard-working people's money in them, and they're charged by The Government of Canada Bank Act to see that the money is spent properly.

As my wife has often said to me during the crisis and criticism of banks, she said I hope the banks are tough; they've got my money. They haven't just gone mine, they've got your money and everybody else's, and yet every single one of you over there start to be critical of the banks. — (Interjection) — That's right. He keeps talking about the donation. I don't know what he's hollering about.

That list, if my colleague hasn't seen it, I've got one. By the way, Madam Speaker, I can tell you gentlemen that all you have to do is walk over to the office over in the corner, to the Manitoba Elections office, they're available to you, and if you'd like the Member for Elmwood to hang them on a pole in your constituency, you're welcome to it.

So we have a situation where the banks are the big bad guys in this country and they are critical of the people who have the responsibility of minding other people's money. You criticize the banks for minding other people's money, and the only reason you criticize them is because you guys have no idea how to mind other people's money. You don't have any more respect for the people's money that you take. You fellows spend that money just like water. You believe, because you're government, you can put all of the people in debt in

this province that you feel like. You take the attitude that governments, if we're short of money, we'll tax some more or we'll go in debt or we won't pay the debt; we'll just roll it over so we won't pay it now.

The Member for Inkster — and I see my light is flashing. The Member for Inkster who had a baby girl today — and I congratulate he and his wife, and I hope they're both doing well. I am glad it's a girl. I don't know if I could stand another one like the Member for Inkster. There's no question about that. But that child comes into the world today in a tremendous debt. Our grandchildren or my grandchildren who came into the world this year come in under a debt that you fellows don't care about. They find it funny.

I can go home and tell my daughter that this government finds it's funny that your children are in debt and they laugh about it — (Interjection) — I don't understand what the member is talking about as far as ball and chain but, if I knew what he was talking about, I'd explain it. But I don't — (Interjection) — yes.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't really know why this government — well, Madam Speaker, is the light flashing? Do you mean it's time, or do I have any more . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The light started flashing three minutes ago to give you three minutes warning, and your time has now expired.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'll be closing debate on Second Reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: There are other members standing.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Sorry, I've got to reword that. I'd like to adjourn debate, seconded by the Member for Riel.

Madame la présidente . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 p.m., I'm interrupting the honourable member. The honourable member, when this motion is again before the House, will have 39 3/4 minutes.

The hour being 10:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).