



**Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

31-32 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 17 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 2 MARCH, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	IND
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 2 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement that I'd like to make at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute between the Health Sciences Centre and the International Union of Operating Engineers is now in its second week. Yesterday, powerhouse and maintenance workers set up picket lines at Misericordia and Grace Hospitals after contract talks between the union and the hospital administration had failed. Historically, the position of the Manitoba Government in such disputes has been not to interfere with and to respect the collective bargaining process. This continues to be the position of this government.

As Minister of Health, I have been in close contact with all the parties involved since the beginning through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I have been monitoring the effects of the dispute on hospital operations and I've continued to receive complete assurances that necessary arrangements have taken place to ensure that the safety and health of the patients and the public are not being threatened.

The first priority of my government and myself is to make certain that the welfare of the public is at no time threatened by the current impasse. However, it is clear that lengthy disruptions to the normal operations of the health care system place considerable strain upon that system and are not in the best interests of either the public or the parties in dispute.

It is important therefore for the Province of Manitoba to take what steps it can to assist the respective parties in resolving their differences. Despite the best efforts of a provincial conciliator, negotiations are broken down. Therefore, today I will be contacting the hospital administrations and the union, strongly urging them to suspend their differences and to return to the bargaining table.

I will advise them that I'm asking my colleague, the Minister of Labour, the Honourable Mary Beth Dolin, to appoint a mediator who can help them arrive at a mutual settlement. It is hoped that as a result of these actions, discussions will resume as quickly as possible that can help resolve the current dispute.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his statement and assure him

that we on this side support every effort that he and his colleagues feel constrained to make in order to resolve the difficulty affecting the health delivery system in the province at the present time, specifically that related to the Health Sciences Centre and two other major hospital facilities in Greater Winnipeg.

Certainly we endorse any efforts undertaken to resolve that dispute. I would want to emphasize with the Minister, as he has done, that the paramount consideration here is patient care and safety and if the patient care and safety is in any way threatened, is in any way compromised, then of course it is government's responsibility to move to resolve such disputes and it is the opposition's responsibility to make that process possible.

My only other caveat, Mr. Speaker, would be that one would hope that in the instructions that go forward from the Minister to his colleague, or the advice that goes forward from the Minister to his colleague, the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the point is made that the settlement, which eventually is forthcoming, should be one that all Manitobans can live with and the considerations that go into the arrival at a contract settlement should be based on impact of ramifications for the whole economy and the relevant comparative positions of other Manitobans, taxpayers throughout the Manitoba community and their capacity to pay.

We would hope that a very reasonable approach is pursued by the government in terms of the economic effects that the resulting settlement will have on the attitude and the fiscal well-being of Manitobans in general.

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a return under Section 20 of The Public Officers' Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31, 1982.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach oral questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 52 students of Grade 5 standing of the O. V. Jewitt School. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Shaffer and Miss Moroz. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower.

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

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Also, before we reach oral questions, I have a Speaker's Ruling for the House.

On Monday, February 28, a disagreement arose between the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable First Minister regarding words spoken in debate by the Honourable Member for Pembina. I took the matter under advisement in order to review Hansard. The words objected to appear in Hansard on Page 384 as follows:

. . . now we have the Premier making some nonsensical statement this weekend about how Alberta is irresponsible in that they're not negotiating with Manitoba to take power and that they're going to build on the Slave River".

The Honourable First Minister rose in his place on a point of order to refute the statement and used the words, ". . . at no time this weekend did I discuss the Western Power Grid."

Beauchesne's Citation 362 appears to address the principle of a member's responsibility for the facts when it says in part: "It is the member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of parliament."

The Honourable Member for Pembina did not place before the House any facts to support his statement.

Beauchesne's Citation 322 says in part: "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself, and particularly within his own knowledge, must be accepted.

I therefore conclude that while the point raised by the Honourable First Minister did not constitute a technical breach of our rules, the Premier's correction was particularly within his own knowledge and must be accepted by the House.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Agreement with Native people

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of January, the Government of Manitoba and the All Chiefs' Budget Committee, on behalf of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, signed a memorandum of undertaking to examine jointly the nature of the fiscal relationship between the province and Indian people based, apparently, on a framework of principles recognizing and supporting Indians' aspirations regarding self-determination. Could the First Minister undertake, Mr. Speaker, to table a copy of that agreement in the House as soon as possible?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes.

**HON. S. LYON:** Later this month, the First Minister and others of the government will be attending a Federal-Provincial Conference along with representatives of the Native Bands across the nation concerning the Constitution, a meeting which was called

for at the time the proclamation of the Constitution and the Constitutional Agreement was arrived at. My question is to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not any arrangements have been made by the provinces and the Federal Government to have representatives of the opposition and representatives of municipalities attend that conference as observers?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The Attorney-General just returned from discussions with his counterpart re the forthcoming Constitutional Conference. I will ask the Attorney-General to respond to that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Arrangements have been made consensually, that is, as between all of the provinces and the Federal Government with respect to very limited space that is available and none of the provinces - I emphasize that word again - none of the provinces include in their delegations representatives of the opposition. Almost all of the provinces, and I use that word advisedly, I can't speak for quite all of them, certainly Saskatchewan is a notable example and Manitoba make a point of including in their official delegations representatives of the aboriginal people and we are at one with them on that basis.

This parallels the arrangement that has been made - indeed is mandated by Section 37 of The Constitution Act, 1982, wherein the Prime Minister is obligated to invite representatives of the aboriginal peoples to sit in, in a real meaningful way, as part of the proceedings. The Prime Minister of Canada will be issuing those invitations indeed as he has through the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Indian Affairs thus far to other Ministers in the preparatory work, but in no instance do any of the delegations contain, nor is there any precedent for official delegations containing members of the opposition. That is not being done anywhere.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Just so I can clear up what might be of some concern on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition is asking whether or not the government would consider observer status. I would be prepared to look at that and possibly have some further discussions with the Leader of the Opposition.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the First Minister for his response because he was responding to the question. The question was not in relation to members of the official delegation. Could the First Minister give some indication to the House whether this requires approval by the other provinces or not? This status of observer, I think, was conferred from time to time on members of his party when he was in opposition in this House - if my memory serves me - I am not totally accurate. I think the Minister of Mines and Energy on one occasion was an observer

at a conference. If that could be accomplished, I would think because of the nature of the conference and the importance of it for the future of Manitoba, and particularly if municipalities are to be included because of course they have more than peripheral interest with respect to a possibility of land claims which is another matter, then I think that would be a helpful venture for the delegation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister as well. Since the First Minister and his government have given their support to the Indian people of Manitoba in their quest to achieve self-determination and self-government, I would like to ask the First Minister whether or not his concept of self-determination and self-government embodies the concept that the Indian people have of their nations existing within Canada?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** An item on the agenda of the First Ministers' Conference, as that agenda was agreed on just yesterday, includes an item with respect to self-government. No province has yet to my knowledge fully determined what its position will be; indeed, the aboriginal people themselves have not yet tabled a position paper on exactly what that concept entails. All parties have recognized that there already exist some elements of self-government within the Canadian system. It's a question of the expansion of those elements of self-government to some extent. We have accepted in principle, as indeed to my knowledge all governments have, the principle - that it's one thing to accept the principle. It's quite another thing, Mr. Speaker, to just see exactly what is being suggested. It is also clear with respect to the development of elements of self-government within the Canadian Constitution that the position will vary considerably as between the aboriginal people themselves.

The ICNI, the Inuit Committee on National Issues, is backing one concept which in fact the Federal Government has already accepted in principle with respect to parts of the Northwest Territories. The aboriginal people have somewhat different concepts, but they're not clear what they are. The Native Council of Canada has yet another concept, so these concepts will take some considerable time. I do not expect that at the First Ministers' Conference, in fact, there will be much elaboration on that point.

I would simply conclude this answer by stating that the Government of Canada, in a paper tabled yesterday, has accepted the principle that the aboriginal peoples be entitled to various institutions of self-government within the Canadian Confederation. This, let me say, doesn't go nearly as far as a statement made in an analogous context by the President of the United States on January 24, 1983, who pledges himself much further with respect to tribal self-government. It's interesting that that government has talked about the Federal Government must move away from the surrogate role which undermines the concept of self-government. I

think that principle is generally accepted in North America where the aboriginal people were not a conquered people, but people whom we treated as sovereign people when we came here as their friends.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose had I wished to question the position of the President or of the Government of the United States, I could have contacted someone in the United States and asked them for their position. What I'm interested in, Mr. Speaker, is the position of the Government of Manitoba, because the Government of Manitoba has made a statement that says the following: "The Manitoba Government recognizes the aspirations of the Indian people to achieve self-determination and will support the evolutionary process of Indian self-government within the Canadian Constitution." I am assuming that the government knows what they're doing in making this statement.

The First Nations Assembly Constitutional Conference held in Ottawa, April 28 to May 1, 1980, outlined a statement of principles for self-determination and self-government for the Indian people of Canada. One of those principles is that the first peoples are nations. My question to the First Minister was, does this government recognize that principle?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has dealt very well with that question. We support indeed, as is the case of all governments in Canada, the principle of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week, it is my view and the view of my government that the sooner the Indian people of Canada can move away from a dependence upon the Department of Indian Affairs, upon a dependence upon the Federal Government insofar as their own decision making, insofar as developing their own destinies as to where they wish to travel as people, the better. I think every effort should be undertaken, over a period of time, to encourage and to assist the Indian people of Canada to move towards more and more self-governing insofar as their own particular affairs are concerned in their own communities.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, those are the sorts of general assurances from the First Minister that largely everyone can agree to, but the First Minister has said that he and his government support the efforts of the Indian people to achieve self-determination and self-government. To the Indian people that means something very definite, and the Indian people have outlined that. It is in writing, Sir, and one of things is that they consider themselves to be nations and they consider that there is a higher Constitutional Indian law that applies to those nations.

My question is to the First Minister, does he support the principles of nationhood for the Indian people and does he support the principle of higher Indian Constitutional law?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** It's interesting that the Opposition House Leader has to go back to statements of 1980. He would be better advised to go to current statements to understand what the position is. The fact that the Assembly of First Nations, the NCC, the ICNI, representatives of the aboriginal people are attending a Constitutional Conference is their recognition of the fact that they are working within the framework of the Constitution.

The Section 37 Conference is a conference called under the Canadian Constitution. It has a specific mandate to identify and define aboriginal rights within the Canadian Constitution. These peoples have made it clear that what they are exploring in a variety of ways is within the Canadian Constitution. What is being confused in the question is the notion of nationhood and the notionhood of a state.

The Indian peoples do constitute a series of nations in the generic sense of that term. There is the Cree Nation, the Salteaux Nation, the Ojibway Nation, these are ethnically nations. They are not asking for statehood, they are not asking to exist as a separate Constitutional entity within the framework of the Canadian Constitution. That much is clear. If that isn't clear to the member, then let me just make it clear. It is not the position of the Government of Manitoba; it is not the position of the Government of Canada. It is, to my knowledge, not the position of any other government that what we are about is to define some state within a state. That is not what the exercise is about, if that satisfies him; if not, I'll answer any other pertinent questions.

### **Ambulance Transport to Health Sciences Centre**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him that in view of the fact that in my capacity as health critic for the opposition which is a job that I attempt to fulfill responsibly, I have now received another grievance from another family, relative to ambulance transport to the Health Sciences Centre since the strike by the operating engineers began. I would like to ask the Minister whether he can advise this House whether the difficulties that Winnipeggers/Manitobans are having in having their relatives transported by ambulance to the Health Sciences Centre are related in any way to the strike by the operating engineers? Leaving the question of picket lines or rhetorical picket lines out of it, are those difficulties related in any way to the strike by the operating engineers?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to the honourable member that to investigate that I should have the particulars. I would ask him the same thing that I asked the other day - give me the information and I'll make sure that I'll report to the House as soon as possible.

### **CAE - assistance re job creation**

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

**MR. J. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Economic Development. In 1979, the previous government was responsible for obtaining work or quotes that CAE were able to quote on, which CAE were successful in getting, and investment was put into Manitoba and more jobs were created at CAE. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what efforts have been made through the Department of Economic Development to help CAE obtain more work so that they won't have to close in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I am meeting this afternoon with a group from the aerospace group in Manitoba to see if there is anything can be done with the current crisis situation. But casting back to the time when they first came to Winnipeg, they came on the promise from the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, that they would be given an amount of work to do to employ 1,000 people. At the current level of operation they are down to 78 employees. Mr. Speaker, they have successfully completed a case against the Federal Government and been awarded a \$4.2 million settlement which the Federal Government is now appealing. Throughout that period, Mr. Speaker, the department officials, under the previous Minister and under my Minister, have been pressing the case of not only CAE but all the aerospace group here in Manitoba with the Federal Government and will continue to do so. If the member opposite has any approaches or ideas to contribute to that process, I'd certainly be happy to hear them.

**MR. J. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, we're all aware of the history of CAE in Manitoba and through the efforts of the Department of Economic Development the CAE were able to build the parts for the 215 Water Bomber in the Province of Manitoba. What efforts are being made to put more work into CAE at the present time by this government?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think I did answer that question. We do have an aerospace group in the department, in a large part the very same people that the previous Minister had, and their approaches to potential users of the services or the goods producing capacity of CAE. They've been continuing to be ardent advocates as we have politically when we meet with our colleagues in Ottawa. We all regret that we have not had results that have been sufficient to keep CAE alive and operating. Again, I ask the honourable member opposite if he has any different approach or particular angle on our efforts? I'd be more than happy to incorporate them into our department's activity.

### **Kimberly-Clark - assistance re operation**

**MR. J. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour has

reported on her efforts to keep the people that are working at Kimberly-Clark in Manitoba in some sort of jobs in Manitoba. She reports that there has been no success in keeping Kimberly-Clark operating in Manitoba. Is it only the Minister of Labour that's working with Kimberly-Clark or is the Department of Economic Development going to work with her?

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

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Of course, there is an interdepartmental co-operation in these efforts. I often meet with employee groups to talk about alternatives, to talk about their perceptions of the situation in which they find themselves. The Minister of Economic Development meets with the companies. We sometimes both meet with both groups. It's a concerted effort on all of our parts to keep these companies going if they are viable, to find alternative employment for the employees if they are not.

### Manitoba Archives - theft

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I have a question for the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources.

In light of the thefts from the Provincial Archives of thousands of dollars of valuable coins, among other things, what steps has the Minister taken to ensure the protection of the remaining valuables in the Provincial Archives?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is ongoing and there has been recently a change in the security arrangements for government buildings, in particular, the Manitoba Archives. We're trusting that with the change in security that there will not be any reoccurrence of the thefts.

Unfortunately, no matter how tight a security system is, there may be situations from time to time, given human nature, when there are thefts taking place. That's unfortunate, but that does happen from time to time. We're certainly concerned about the thefts; they're the first ones that have happened at the Manitoba Archives and we're attempting to ensure that it does not happen again.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** A further question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister ordered a further inventory be taken to ensure that there are no other treasures of historical value missing from the Archives?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, no, I have not. There has been an inventory taken earlier this year, which was the one that uncovered the alleged thefts that were mentioned by the Member for Kirkfield Park. There is ongoing checking of the various artifacts in the Archives. That process is ongoing, so any further items that may be missing would be uncovered in that process.

### Red River Heritage Society meeting, Crookston, Minnesota

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he could provide members of the House with a copy of the speech he delivered last week in Crookston, Minnesota, to a meeting that was organized by the Red River Valley Heritage Society?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, when the Minister answers "no", does that mean that he is refusing to give to members of the House and to the people of Manitoba the text of his speech to the meeting in Crookston last week?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker, if I had known the honourable members of this House would have been concerned about the exact text, I would have had a written text. I delivered the speech extemporaneously.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, my supplementary question is that since the Minister is so good at ad libbing speeches, I wonder if the Minister could indicate that the criticisms that he leveled against cultural practices of United States farmers were derived merely by observations from an airplane some several thousands of feet in the air as he flew over the Red River Valley in the United States, or whether his criticisms were based on a valid and technical analysis that he read, studied and made comments from.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not criticize in any way, the cultural practices of American farmers. I did indicate my observations of portions of the Valley because the meeting was called to discuss issues facing the Red River Valley. I pointed out that two of the most fundamental resources we have in the Valley are water and soil. I observed from the aircraft and I'm sure the honourable member would have been able to have observed as well, that almost three out of every four fields in the area we flew over was summer fallow.

Given the nature of our soils in the Valley, and the fact that we will have wind erosion, I pointed out that modern farm practice indicated the necessity for having more cover on the fields and less summer fallow.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Natural Resources stems from his very acute observational abilities, in that flying over the Red River Valley he can detect with his perceptive mind and hawk-like eye that three out of four fields are summer fallowed and uncropped in the Red River Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I do take exception with the Minister's last answer, in which, and my question will follow - the Minister, Mr. Speaker, said he did not criticize.

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, that is clearly not a preamble to a question. The Honourable Member for Pembina was going on to say after his cute little comment about the Minister of Natural Resources, that I do take exception and began to tell us why he took exception. That is not a preamble to a question, nor is it a question. You have ruled in the last few days on this kind of procedure, and I would ask you to draw it to the attention - I would respectfully urge that you do to the member - what your rulings are in these circumstances.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the Honourable Attorney-General for those remarks. The Honourable Member for Pembina with a question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Natural Resources indicate whether the press report, saying that he admonished farmers for not protecting their land by employing windbreaks or leaving crop cover instead of summer fallowing, was a valid reporting of his criticism of United States agricultural practices?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't use the word "admonish". Certainly, the media are entitled to —(Interjection)— well, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says, lecture. That was the word that was suggested to me by the media and I pointed out that I was merely making observations. If the shoe fits, of course, you wear it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition ought to know that.

I was pointing out what was obvious to anyone that had any experience with farming. The great titters and roars over there about black soil, that kind of summer fallow, that's what we had in Western Canada during the Dirty Thirties; we had soil erosion; we had a terrible loss of fertile soil all throughout North America. For honourable members over there who suggest that they have some understanding of farming, to titter and laugh about soil erosion is appalling.

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

It's just been pointed out to me that it is not in order to question a Minister on the statement made outside the House.

### Manitoba Hydro rate structure

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines.

In view of the fact, that Manitoba Hydro presently has a rate structure which consists of four different levels of rates; whereas under this system, Thompson pays more for its electricity than Winnipeg, and many other northern and rural communities pay even more

again; and whereas another Crown Corporation MTS on the other hand has a constant rate structure throughout the province; I would like to ask the Minister whether he would undertake a review of the present rate structure of Hydro, with the view of changing that rate structure to make it a bit more equitable?

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I have asked Manitoba Hydro to undertake an analysis of their overall rate structure. There are a number of anomalies in the rate structure. One of the items that has been raised to me in addition to that raised by the Member for Thompson, has been the question of northern rates by northern residents. We will certainly look into it. I make no commitment as to whether in fact we will be able to make any changes, but certainly that matter will be looked at in due course and I will be reporting back either to this Session or to a subsequent Session.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Well, any review would be appreciated, Mr. Speaker, since northerners feels it's unfair to pay more for our own Hydro.

I also have another question for the same Minister; I was wondering, in view of the fact that the Thompson Improvement Projects with which the Minister's department was closely connected through the Mining Reserve Fund, in view of the fact that was nothing short of an unqualified success, whether the Minister is considering expanding the program in conjunction with the Minister of Labour and Manpower to other communities in Manitoba that might also benefit from a similar program.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the program in Thompson was indeed a success. In fact, one of the local administrators indicated that it was a program in which everyone was a winner. We are certainly using the results from that program and passing that on to the other Ministers of Mines in other provinces of Canada. We're passing on the results to the Federal Minister of Mines and Federal Provincial Mines Ministers. I have indicated that the Federal Government and other provinces should consider establishing a national community reserve fund, whereby funds could be allocated to deal with the big cycles that take place in the mining industry; to provide for funds that could stabilize communities and stabilize the work force so that during a period of depression or recession the work force could be maintained in that community, a community like Thompson, doing good work, keeping the morale of that work force up and keeping that work force located in the single enterprise community like Thompson so they are available, Mr. Speaker, to undertake productive work in the mines when the mining cycle turns up. So, we are using our good experiences in Thompson; we are allocating a bit more money for possible use in other northern centres that are affected by mine layoffs or mine closures.



## Northern Union Insurance Company

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the Minister or his office now notified directly all the policyholders of the Northern Union Insurance Company that their insurance coverage is no longer valid and that they may not be able to collect in full on any of the claims lodged against the policies which they hold?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the first things the provisional liquidator did upon assuming the responsibility for Northern Union, was to contact all the insurance agencies that the licence for Northern Union had been canceled. Subsequent to the liquidator going to the courts last Monday and receiving the go-ahead to wind down Northern Union, he will now be contacting all 35,000 policyholders informing them of the termination date of their policies.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This matter has gone on now since the 11th of February; it's now just about three weeks. I am aware of what actions the liquidator has taken. I have copies of his letters to the agents and I am concerned that there are people out there who are still not aware three weeks later. I want to know why the Minister has not taken that responsibility, in view of the fact that this is all consequent upon his action in canceling the licence of the company, why he has not taken the responsibility to notify these policyholders that they may not have coverage or they may not be able to collect on claims?

Since the Minister doesn't want to answer why he has not taken - the question was, why he has not personally taken the responsibility and notified these policyholders? We've now gone three weeks.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we know what the question is, I am prepared to respond to it. We have done everything that has been possible to notify the policyholders of what has transpired during the past two or three weeks. We, immediately upon canceling the licence, did have a press conference. We've had a subsequent news release. The liquidator has contacted all the agents. The Superintendent of Insurance has also taken steps to notify agents of the steps that have been taken. The liquidator now is in the process of amassing the information that is required to notify each policyholder of the cancellation and of the termination date for the policies.

I might indicate that there certainly has been a bit of a problem in that all the information with respect to names and addresses of policyholders is not to be found within the offices of Northern Union.

This information is at the level of some of the agencies and the liquidator is working as expeditiously as possible to put all this information together to get the notices out.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister will understand my concern about only the agents having been notified, since they were in the midst of their busiest time with Autopac and we're not in a position to necessarily notify these individual policyholders and that's why I believe the responsibility ought to rest on him. But, failing that, has the Minister or his office notified policyholders or do they intend to, by the method by which they might collect any unused portion of premiums which they have paid to Northern Union?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Thank you. That is something that is the responsibility of the provisional liquidator and I am quite sure that he is taking whatever steps are necessary to inform policyholders.

## Measure Canadian - fund raising dinner, Toronto

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, since Measure Canadian is holding a fund-raising dinner, Monday, March 7 in Toronto, and is looking for support from all Provincial Governments to block the federal mandatory metric laws that are being imposed on the people in this country, I am going to ask the First Minister if he'll support Premier Lougheed by dispatching a letter, a telex, to that communication and assure them that the people of this province will have the support of his office.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, no.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I regret that very much, Mr. Speaker. I regret that.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a question? Since, Mr. Speaker, consumer protection is the constitutional responsibility of Canada's provinces, is a responsibility of each and every individual province, can I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs if he will dispatch a telex or a letter to Measure Canadian at their dinner meeting in Toronto on Monday and offer the support of his office?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** I know this is such a burning issue spread over the past number of months. I have asked my staff to go through all the records to see what correspondence there existed between the previous administration and the Federal Government with respect to the metric system. I must admit I was very surprised to find there wasn't a single piece of documentation - nothing. Therefore, in answer to the question, will we be sending anything to Toronto? - the answer is no.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about the past today, I'm talking . . .

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** . . . about the present and a meeting that's being held in Toronto on Monday evening under the title of Measure Canadian. Can I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs if he's prepared to protect the consumer interests of all Manitobans who oppose mandatory metric laws at this particular time? Is he, as a Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, protecting the interests of those who oppose?

Mr. Speaker, I may ask him another question, would the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs agree with the statement that a voluntary approach seems to have been abandoned by the Government of Canada in favour of rigid and mandatory conversion to the metric system?

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister if he'd be prepared to come out in my constituency and discuss metric at some future occasion?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I would suggest it would be much more facilitating to the House if the member could restrict his questions to matters pertaining to jurisdiction within the Provincial Legislature, not matters pertaining to the federal jurisdiction and matters pertaining to the enforcement of federal laws.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 25, the Honourable Member for Morris asked a couple of questions. They both really deal with matters that will be covered by my Estimates and I think they'd be better dealt with there.

### Consumer protection re metric system

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister of this province, the Prime Minister, the Honourable Howard Pawley, if he will agree that consumer protection in this province is the constitutional right of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and his government right in this province?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I do have to ask the House Leader whether questions pertaining to law and pertaining to legal interpretation are within the ambit of this question period?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can help the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell out in his apparent confusion. There is a Consumer Protection Act in the Province of Manitoba which in no way deals

with the issue of metric. The metric legislation is federal. The enforcement of federal legislation is within the ambit of federal jurisdiction to the extent that it is enforced within the province. It is not even enforced through the Department of the Attorney-General; it is enforced through the Department of Justice local office and therefore is not within the jurisdiction of this province in any way.

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

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

### HANSARD CORRECTIONS

**MR. J. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a correction. After perusing yesterday's Hansard on Page 422 at the top of the second column, I said ". . . offset the \$1 million increased costs admitted by the Minister of Finance." I must say that it was not the Minister of Finance that made that admission regarding the janitor service in the Province of Manitoba, it was the Minister of Government Services or Highways at that time.

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record of the Hansard Office, some strange gentlemen by the name of J. McKenzie has been speaking in this House. I'm Wally McKenzie, I hope the record will be corrected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That will be duly noted. Order please, order please.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden, the Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin my remarks, I think I would like to follow the example that was shown by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, a member I have a great affinity for and a neighbourly association, when he mentioned the contribution that we presently have in this Chamber from our new Clerk. I also would like to recognize the new Clerk in this Assembly and I feel sure that from the limited acquaintanceship that I have had with him over the years, I'm sure he will serve you, Mr. Speaker, and this Assembly very well and I personally want to take this opportunity to welcome him here today.

When I'm taking part in this Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, two of the points that were put forward in the amendment - and it's the amendment that I'm speaking to - the first and second point raised by my Leader and I want to reread them to you.

". . . regrets that in passing its second Budget the government: (1) has failed to portray accurately and

clearly the financial affairs of the province; and, (2) in following a course of fiscal mismanagement that is potentially ruinous." I think those two points deserve a lot of consideration and examination.

I have looked at the figures that have been put forward by the Minister of Finance, and in assessing it you have to consider what the impact will be in this province, in this country and in the homes of the individual people, because what this Minister of Finance is trying to do is hopefully take a major portion of his revenue from the Federal Government. As far as I am able to ascertain at this point in time, he has no assurance whatsoever that he will get that type of participation from the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has said no, when he proposed a tax on gross income, and we have to be very thankful that the Federal Government did that. The Federal Government has said no to a 1.5 percent tax that they put on last year. I'm sure after listening to the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs last evening, I think the Federal Government might further reconsider their decisions of whether or not they would add any additional remuneration in federal-provincial cost-sharing. I don't believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs in any way enhanced the arguments of the Minister of Finance when he goes with his tin cup to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at a Budget you have to look at how it applies to the various sectors throughout the province. How does this Budget apply to the youth in this province and their endeavours to obtain a better education and job opportunities at the completion of that education? Certainly the government is making every effort to try and persuade people in this province that jobs are their number one concern.

I become concerned, Mr. Speaker, about what kind of jobs the government is going to offer to the young people and to the workers in this province. What is the nature of the jobs that the young person who is graduating from high school or college can look forward to as a result of the activities of this government? What kind of planning is this government doing to offer some encouragement to those young people to know that they will have job security and job opportunity in a thriving Manitoba business?

Mr. Speaker, in addressing that question and in looking at the future for the young people the answer has to be negative. It's very sad, Sir, to have to assess it in that way.

We heard the remarks of the Honourable Member for Thompson who praised to high heaven the Thompson Activity Project of 10 or 12 weeks duration. I think people need jobs longer than 10 or 12 weeks or 16 weeks, or maybe even 20 weeks - great project. But what future is there for a person who is applying for permanent work? That doesn't help him one bit. It doesn't encourage him one bit to have any confidence in the Member for Thompson who says it's a great program. He says, if that's the kind of leadership that we're going to get for the political direction of this province I'm going to have to say no thanks, buster, I need something better than that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, after we look at the youth, we have to take a look at the working man, the person who is on his first or second job or maybe his third or fourth job, because businesses are closing and he

has to relocate. What opportunities are there for him in this great Province of Manitoba, with the Budget that has been brought down by this government this year? I have to say again, Mr. Speaker, that there doesn't seem to be much future in any long-term jobs in any of the programs that have been enunciated so far by this government.

Then when we get to the field of the more mature person, the senior citizen, or the aged and the elderly, the problem becomes even worse, because they are people that have spent most of their lives producing to make this country and this province grow, only to find that now when they're tied to a fixed income that their costs are rising dramatically; that municipal taxes, provincial taxes, federal taxes are rising dramatically and they are being squeezed slowly. Again, the leadership that this government has shown in that field has to be negative.

One of the other points that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is in the field of the third level of government. I talked a bit about the first level or the national level and our Finance Minister wants more money out of them. On the provincial level he's wanting another - according to his figures - 16 percent out of the Manitoba economy at a time when the Gross Provincial Product is either going to be zero and possibly even negative this coming year. He wants another 16 percent, according to his figures, in revenue from that economy and what is he doing to encourage it? Again the answer is negative.

The field that concerns me the most, Mr. Speaker, is in the field of municipal government. Municipal governments, by and large, are the unsung heroes of the communities who work hard, honest endeavour, to try their best to do the things that are necessary in the community in which they live. They are the closest contact to the people of any level of government. How is this government treating municipal government in this Budget?

We heard a great speech from the Minister of Municipal Affairs last night, a great speech, but no hope in there for municipal government. I took a look at the detailed Estimates of Revenue of the Province of Manitoba and on Page 2, at the Department of the Attorney-General, it lists Municipalities Shared-Cost Receipts. The government expects to get in excess of 50 percent more from the municipalities this year than they got last year. That's just in the field of Municipal and it's in the Department of the Attorney-General. What is it in the field of the Attorney-General that municipalities cost-share? To my knowledge it has to be the police force. So I would assume from that, that the cost of policing is going to cost the municipalities in excess of 50 percent more this year than it did last year. I think that's a pretty healthy increase and shows the lack of concern of this government for the third level of government, that level that is closest to the people.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that it's not the Minister of Municipal Affairs that's doing this. I don't believe it's even the Minister of Finance, because he just puts down the figures that are given to him. It comes from the Minister who is our present Government House Leader, the Honourable Attorney-General. I think it indicates the true attitude of that particular member because it was only a few days ago in this House when the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, in addressing a

question to the Honourable First Minister about when he was going to screw up his courage and go to the people, and everyone in here heard the Honourable Attorney-General say, "The people will come to us".

Now that indicates an attitude of just one member on that side, but I think he's a fairly important member on that side, and he's a member who happens to be in charge of the police and justice in this province. He is the man who is saying to municipalities that your share of the cost of policing this year will go up in excess of 50 percent. I just tell you these things to put them in their perspective. It gives you an opportunity to see the true feeling and the true intent of a man who is placed in a fairly powerful position in this province. Now that's only one member's opinion, but how many people in that Cabinet is he able to influence? I would suggest that it's rather significant - and it may be sufficient to sway the Minister of Finance, even to sway the First Minister, although I'm sure he is firm and unshaken in his positions on most things.

We got the figures from the Budget on the projected deficit that was put forward by the Minister of Finance in which he says \$578.9 million. The number one point raised by my leader in his amendment says, "He has failed to portray accurately and clearly the financial affairs of the province." So I have to ask, is that \$578.9 million an accurate figure of the budgetary deficit of governments in this province? I suggest to you, Sir, that it's not; because this government has been very niggardly with its municipal governments.

Inadequate funding of school boards, inadequate funding of hospital boards, personal care homes, nursing homes, all will show, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, severe financial difficulty and in many cases will have deficits this year. So the deficit is not \$578 million. I suggest there could be another \$10 million, \$15 million or \$20 million of deficit forced on the people of Manitoba in the smaller communities by the approach this government has taken towards the third level of government, and that is the municipal, in this province, that part of government that is closest to the people and it will reflect in the attitude of people towards this government. It's showing very clearly in my constituency. It's showing very clearly in rural Manitoba and it's just a question of time until it shows very clearly in the urban area as well.

I've listened very carefully to the remarks of various members and it's a rather sad thing to see when you see Ministers, as we saw today, clearly showing no initiative, with no new ideas at all, pleading with members on this side to give them some ideas to carry forward the business that they are doing. We saw that from the Honourable Member for Dauphin. He said, "What would you do if you were government?" Many of them have done that, trying to draw attention away from their own inability to handle a problem that they themselves have created.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a farmer for many years and farmers have faced lean years and they have faced good years, and farmers know what to do when times are tough. They just don't spend money. I have seen farmers for many many years, and they learned their lessons well, and they learned it from their fathers and their grandfathers that when times are tough, you don't spend money. But we don't have to worry because this government is going to take over everything anyway.

I found it rather strange, Mr. Speaker, to read an article, last fall I guess it was, in the Winnipeg Free Press - and I suppose this is part of the propaganda machine that this government has set up intending to condition people for the upcoming Budget. We had a series of three articles in the Winnipeg Free Press on October 26th, October 27th and October 28th written by that great paragon of NDP principle, I guess, the head of the Economics Department, the University of Manitoba, and a former member of this Assembly, Mr. Cy Gonick - a great gentlemen, misguided maybe, certainly has different philosophies - a man who attempted, I think, or made an attempt to do some business in the business world and promptly retreated to the ivory towers again. But it is significant of what is happening today as compared to what he said should happen and this is what Mr. Gonick said on October 26th: "The absolute size of a deficit is of no particular concern no matter how big it is. It becomes an economic burden only if it is rising significantly as a portion of the Gross Provincial Product."

Now let's take a look. The Gross Provincial Product in this province was maybe at the maximum 1 percent in the last year and what was this increase in the size of the deficit at that same time? Do they bear any relationship? Did the deficit increase 1 percent? Did it increase 2 percent, 3 percent or 120 percent? So on that particular issue, I would think even Mr. Gonick should be concerned, but I don't think he is. He says, "It is undoubtedly greater than it has been in the previous few years but less than it was in the last period of sustained stagnation. In 1982 and 1983 the deficit will undoubtedly rise perhaps to 3 percent or 4 percent of GPP," but he says the size of it is really of no concern. Well, I can understand a socialist's belief in that philosophy but, Mr. Speaker, I'm a farmer and I'm a taxpayer and to me as a taxpayer in this province, it is a concern. It's a concern for me for many reasons because I have a son who is just starting to farm and the debt load that this province is handing on to him for many years to come will be one that I shudder to see how great it will be.

Mr. Speaker, I know I've taken a few moments of time to address the issues that were raised by my leader when he said that he regrets that in presenting its second Budget, the government has failed to portray accurately and clearly the financial affairs of this province and it is following a course of fiscal mismanagement that is potentially ruinous. I'm not going to deal with the other three points of that, Mr. Speaker. Those two points were the two that I wanted to deal with and I believe they are true. I believe this government is leading us down a path of social disaster that this country will take years and years to overcome.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to take part.

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin by saying I hope that you will have better co-operation this particular Session from members of the opposition and from members on all sides of the House to direct the affairs of this Chamber. I hope that it doesn't degenerate into the kind of level of activity that

we saw prior to Christmas, because I don't think that helps anybody and it certainly doesn't help the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking the last few days about the record of the Conservative Party, going back to the last election and carrying right on to this particular day. I think the word that comes to mind is "mega." It started with the mega election promises made by the Conservative Party in 1977; then we had the mega layoffs in their first term in office and then we had the mega cutbacks which occurred throughout the level of government services and then, finally in 1981 in election year, we had mega salary increases, which I want to deal with - mega projects promises which were rejected by the people of Manitoba and throughout that entire term in office, megalomania by their leader.

**A MEMBER:** You're not talking about horse races this time, Russ.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, we had megalomania by their leader on the Constitution, where he made a national spectacle of himself and in many other areas as well.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Lyon and Levesque.

**MR. R. DOERN:** As my colleague from Thompson says, Lyon and Levesque, and that was in fact the combination that worked together to block constitutional reform in Canada, much to the discredit of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing set of promises made by the Leader of the Opposition - and part of the Budget exercise has been to compare some of the things stated and promised by both political parties at election time and then compare them to their actions. Mr. Speaker, I find this quite astonishing to look back on the record as to what the Leader of the Official Opposition said he would do in regard to civil servants when responding to questions from the MGEA.

He was asked in September, 1977 in regard to his policy, in regard to working conditions and the number of civil servants employed by the government and this is what he said, "As a general principle, the Progressive Conservative Party believes that matters as between employer and employee are better adjusted through collective bargaining than determined by legislation." Well, that's what he said. He also said, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba will be prepared to enter into negotiations with the MGEA with the objective of providing public service status to long-term, term employees with the job security implicit in such status and he said that he would work to reduce the total number of government employees in some cases and these reductions in number would be achieved by attrition. Mr. Speaker, this is what he said he would do and we know, of course, that the record was that hundreds of civil servants were laid off - fired if you like.

He also said in another document called Contact, by the MGEA in 1981, he said, "The Progressive Conservative Party believes that the Public Service of this province is now operating efficiently and effectively and we see no reasons why the number of public servants should be reduced." Well, what happened?

What happened from the time that these statements were made, to the term of the Conservative Party in office? What happened in terms of what they believe and in terms of the actions that they indicated would take place? They obviously had a dramatic change of heart from warm-hearted to hard-hearted or heartless or cold-hearted, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I find one of the most fascinating debates in this Chamber took place yesterday during the question period, during the debate that followed between the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Premier and in the speech made by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, when the Conservative Party, which has prided itself on being efficient businessman, hard-headed businessmen, fiscal responsibility, the people who manage the economy and so on. Well, we've heard all of this, we heard about this. We heard how they were holding the line and cutting off the fat and cutting out this and getting down to brass tacks and so on and so on. We heard about that; we saw their record in office; we saw the layoffs; we saw the cutbacks, we saw the kind of settlements they made and this went along from 1977 to 1980. That was their policy. They were tough; they did wield an axe; they did swing an axe in this particular building and then all of a sudden they collapsed in 1981 because that was "panic city," election year and they knew that they were in big trouble. So they started pulling all these rabbits out of a hat and I knew, Mr. Speaker, when one ad appeared in the newspapers, when I saw that ad, I knew that they were running scared and that they were in danger of being defeated and that was that famous ad, full page, paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, "You're sitting on a goldmine." Nobody, even the miners up North who were desperate for employment, nobody would believe that particular advertisement. That was a mega promise that did the Tories in, advertised, paid for by the people of Manitoba and the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, then they started to panic; then they pushed the panic button; they knew, I think, from polls. It would be very interesting to know what happened inside the Conservative Party as to whether they should go in '81 in the spring or go in the fall of '81 or push it off until 1982. It would be very interesting to know the debate that took place at that particular time. They obviously knew that if they didn't go before these mega promises had to be developed, it would be then demonstrated that they couldn't deliver the projects and therefore they'd better go at a time before the public was on to them. So they went with the promises rather than with the contracts or with something that they could physically show to the people of Manitoba as evidence of their business ability.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting debate that's taken place in the last short while is a comparison of the kind of contracts that they signed when they were the government, and you know this is a very difficult area to deal in, Mr. Speaker, because we heard all this talk, ad nauseam, from the Conservatives about going back over our record. They spend all their time dealing with our pamphlets from 1981, but they don't want to talk about their pamphlets in 1981; they don't want to talk about their actions in 1981, and they sure don't want to talk about the contracts that they signed in 1981. Now we've heard they signed when they were the government, and you know this is a very difficult area

to deal in, Mr. Speaker, because we heard all this talk, ad nauseam, from the Conservatives about going back over our record. They spend all their time dealing with our pamphlets from 1981, but they don't want to talk about their pamphlets in 1981; they don't want to talk about their actions in 1981, and they sure don't want to talk about the contracts that they signed in 1981. Now we've heard these debates between the First Minister and the Leader of the Official Opposition and various members on this side and that, about 18-month contracts and reopenings and 30-month contracts and the whole bit, but I would like to go over this again, in terms of taking it on their terms, so that we're trying not to talk about apples and oranges because that's part of the problem. They are arguing, Mr. Speaker, that the contracts that were signed by this government, the reopened contract with the MGEA, is not a good deal and, Mr. Speaker, I say that it's a better deal than a lot of the contracts that they sign, if not all of the contracts. If we look at some of the contracts that they signed, comparison proves that this was in fact an excellent agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Cultural Affairs dealt with the doctors. In 1980, the doctors were given a 12.3 percent settlement by the government. The next year, they were given a 15.5 percent contract by the government; add that up, 27.8 over 24 months, compared to what they like to talk about, 27.5 percent over 30 months. But the dollars, that's the point, the dollars are what really counts. They were told by the MHSC that they should not reopen that contract, that there was a possibility that the contract could be reopened if the cost of living went over 10 percent. They were told that figure had not been arrived at, but they decided to accept the argument of the MMA over the argument of the MHSC which looks after the public interest, which represents the taxpayers of Manitoba, which looks after the Medicare system of Manitoba. As a result, they took the MMA line, reopened the agreement and instead of an increase that should have been done, they boosted it to 15.5 percent, instead of a 8.9 percent increase in the original settlement. Now, that's called bargaining, that's tough bargaining, eh?

How much did they donate to the Conservative Party? I couldn't say, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection)— More than two arms. But the point is this, that the cost of that particular agreement meant that a total increase payment of \$17.6 million was given back to the doctors instead of \$10 million, which would have been the amount of the contract if it wasn't reopened, so they gave to the doctors an additional \$7.5 million. Compare that to the New Democratic Party reopening of an MGEA contract which took back \$10 or \$11 million. Who are the better bargainers? Who did a better job on behalf of the taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, how about the MGEA itself? The government dealt with the MGEA when they were in office - the Conservative Government. They had 11,700 employees that they were dealing with, and they are critical of this agreement on their grounds, that they like to quote, of 27.5 percent over 30 months. How much did they give to the employees in 1981 in terms of the agreement that they signed? - 23.5 percent in 24 months. Now, if you want to compare that on a 30-month basis, you surely can't say there would be a zero increase over the next six months. The

Conservatives didn't bargain a six-month period of a wage freeze or a deferral or anything like that; they gave almost 24 percent for 24 months. I think it's reasonable to assume that over a 30-month period that it is equivalent to 29.5 percent or 2 percent higher if you compound it.

Mr. Speaker, they also made an agreement with St. Boniface Hospital, 1,200 employees at St. Boniface Hospital. What was that agreement? How tough were they on that particular agreement? What did they bargain for over a 24-month period? —(Interjection)— No, not 10 percent, not 5 percent - 30 percent in 24 months.

**A MEMBER:** Was that a sweetheart deal?

**MR. R. DOERN:** That sure was. What a bunch of sweethearts!

Mr. Speaker, in a 24-month period they gave 30 percent, compared to what they are attacking; namely, a 27.5 percent increase over 30 months. Theirs is far higher, far richer than any agreement that they are comparing to. If you took that on a comparative basis, 30 percent for 24 months, it comes out - plus a COLA clause - that's equivalent to more than 37.5 percent plus a COLA clause over 30 months, and they're criticizing 27.5 percent. They gave up 37.5 percent, Mr. Speaker.

The union that's now on strike, the operating engineers, the IUOE, a hundred operating engineers at the Health Sciences Centre, what do you think they gave them for 24 months? —(Interjection)— Five percent, no, no. They didn't have 6 and 5 in those days. 31.5 percent, six times 6 percent. That's right, 6 X 5, not 6 and 5.

**A MEMBER:** They believe in 6 and 5.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** That's unbelievable.

**MR. R. DOERN:** You're right, they do believe in 6 and 5, but of a certain variety - multiplied. If you compared that settlement at the Health Sciences Centre, operating engineers, over a 30-month period, you're talking 39.5 percent over 30 months. Mr. Speaker, that's a staggering amount.

Then, let's take the one that really is the most staggering of all. Mr. Speaker, I recall going back years ago when Lester Pearson was Prime Minister of Canada, the attack made on him when he gave a settlement, I think, to the Great Lakes longshoremen or dock workers of over 40 percent. I remember that people said that really blew the lid off everything. Well, the Tories weren't quite as bad as that; they weren't quite as generous, but they gave 40 percent in two years. Mr. Speaker, depending on how you look at the MONA agreement that was signed on behalf of 5,000 nurses, depending upon how you look at it, you come up with either a figure of 38 percent over 24 months or on the end rates of 42 percent over 24 months. Mr. Speaker, 42 percent for 24 months translates into 52.5 percent over 30 months. So, they're attacking this government, the way they like to attack this government, that we're giving 27.5 percent over 30 months. They gave 52.5 percent over 30 months - almost double, not 2.5 to 1, 2 to 1.

So I would like to hear somebody on that side get up and defend those agreements while at the same time attacking the New Democratic Party for the renegotiated agreement that it made. Mr. Speaker, they don't have a leg to stand on. At best, I guess we could say maybe they had a leg to stand on or part of leg, a bunch of flamingos on that particular side. They certainly are blue flamingos.

If you look at these periods of agreement, you either get this 6 and 5 percent that they believe in, namely 6 times 5, or you get almost double the agreement that we signed. The most heavily criticized agreement they can come up with on our side using their figures, using their term of reference, is 27.5 percent and the comparable extreme agreement on their side comes out to 52.5 percent. So on what basis, Mr. Speaker, are they criticizing the government?

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are still obsessed with inflation. They think that the main problem facing society today is inflation and their whole approach is predicated on that particular amount. They don't seem to be concerned with unemployment. They don't seem to be concerned with the human misery that is being caused in our province and in our country. They're still concerned about inflation. They're still concerned about people who are clipping coupons. They're still concerned about certain rates of interest on loans, etc. It's Reaganomics. They're still fighting the dragon of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I must quote to them something which some of them may have seen and probably don't agree with, the report of the Conference of Catholic Bishops, who said, I think, completely correctly, that it was unemployment which is the main problem facing Canadian society today and that, "The rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits".

**MR. C. MANNES:** The trouble is, who's making profits?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I also want to read a very interesting section that the members opposite may have missed from the same document, Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis. It said this and this is a very interesting paragraph which I draw to the attention of the honourable members. I think they should sweat some tears of concern not only about their bodies, Mr. Speaker, but about their souls, because they seem to be unaware of some of this human misery. They seem to promise things which not only were rejected by the New Democratic Party, not only rejected by the people of Manitoba but also rejected, Mr. Speaker, by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops and that is this whole mega project nonsense.

Would you believe that there's a paragraph in this document which calls for new industrial strategies and I quote as follows on Page 6: "In recent years, people have begun to raise serious questions about the desirability of economic strategies based on mega projects."

**MR. C. MANNES:** Tell Newfoundland that.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very interesting statement, that the kind of approach

taken by the Conservative Party and considered in other provinces is not necessarily the way to go and in fact is probably not a desirable way to go. Yet that was the only way that the Conservative Party promised the people of Manitoba that they were going to revive the economy. They had the three so-called mega projects.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How are you going to do it?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing statements by members opposite and in particular the Member for Turtle Mountain on that.

Mr. Speaker, the other concern I have is for the future of the official opposition because in a short time, I suppose in the fall, they're going to go into a leadership convention. Mr. Speaker, if their Provincial Leadership Convention is anywhere like their Federal Leadership Convention, then I'm worried because at the very moment in Canadian history when the Conservative Party has an opportunity to take the Federal Liberals out, they're fumbling the ball. At a very moment in Canadian history when the Gallup Poll shows that they could easily win an election, they bungle their federal convention and knife their federal leader, Mr. Speaker.

The question is this: If you can't run a national convention, how can you run a national government? That is the question that is bothering a number of people. Mr. Speaker, if when the Conservatives go into their convention in the fall, if they bungle that, if they pick the wrong person, which they may do, then they might blow another opportunity and another election and face another four years with reduced numbers in the wilderness.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Sounds like you've written off '85 already.

**MR. R. DOERN:** That's what I'm concerned about, Mr. Speaker. I'm concerned that the rural Conservative portion of the official opposition will call the shots, will swing farther to the right, open up the centre even more than the New Democratic Party and strike out again. Instead of going with a Duff Roblin, I think they're going to go with another Weir and another Lyon. They're going to go with somebody from the right. They're going to hold down the progressive forces in their own particular party.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** They should go with Atilla the Hun next time, it would be more progressive.

**MR. R. DOERN:** You know, Mr. Speaker, it's really fascinating looking at the Federal Conservative Convention that was in Winnipeg. I think it was good that the convention was here. It was good for business and it's too bad that they didn't get the second half. I guess it was a double header; most political parties only have one convention but they had two.

**MR. C. MANNES:** So you can come back and enjoy yourself again?

**MR. R. DOERN:** They lost the first game in the double header, but now we're going to see whether they can get their act together. The danger is that they're going

to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. That's the danger that they have to face up to.

Mr. Speaker, the papers were absolutely full of disaster. If I read you all these articles and all these headlines in the papers about that convention, what a tale of woe. "Tories staggered by Clark's decision; 200 delegates denied the right to register." Mr. Speaker, it went on and on and on. "Don't fear Turner, Clark tells party."

The Free Press headlines or lead editorial on the Tory Convention, "A party without a brain." That's very unkind, Mr. Speaker.

Fred Cleverley, remember him? Remember Fred? — (Interjection)— No, he has two names, but this is the name he writes under. He also has a pen name. "Leadership review," he writes - Fred - a terrific Tory, a backer of the Lyon administration. Leadership review hurts the Tories, that's how he saw that particular convention.

Mr. Speaker, here is a picture of Joe Clark and his campaign manager Jake Epp. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that isn't going to help Jake Epp. If some of the members opposite, some of those leadership candidates - I see three of them sitting in the front row - if they're worried about Jake Epp, let me tell you, the "Jake and Joe Show" was a disaster and Jake is not going to be helped by the fact that he was the manager of Joe Clark. Here he is advising Joe on what to do. All you have to do, the three of you who are running in the front row, is run this picture and say Jake masterminded Joe's campaign, that's the end of Jake.

Mr. Speaker, the most incredible statement I think made - I don't know if some of you have read this - but this is in The Globe and Mail on Saturday, February 26. This is the most incredible political statement I ever read in my entire life made by Grant Devine. Remember him? One-term Premier, no sales tax, one-term Premier of Saskatchewan. I swear, Mr. Speaker, this is what it says, discussing his support for Joe Clark in the Conservative leadership race, "There's lemonade in every lemon and we're going for the lemonade." Well, with friends like that, who needs enemies? I mean that's Joe's best supporter.

Of course, you see, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Conservatives have an even harder job though, they're going to have to try to get blood out of the stones that are running for their particular leadership. That's going to be a difficult assignment as well. The cockiness of these delegates, Mr. Speaker, The Globe and Mail, Saturday, January 29, this is quite a statement. Doug Lewis, whoever he is, never heard of him, MP Doug Lewis, he said, "In the next election, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take no prisoners. We're going to win and win big."

Then there's a cartoon from The Globe and Mail, January 29. Mr. Speaker, total chaos, banners, swords, people groaning and rolling on the floor, the whole place is being shot up and glasses are flying in the air, banners, balloons are bursting, hats are flying around, legs and arms, demons and maniacs, pandemonium, and here's the media over here with a TV camera and one guy saying to the other, "This is the unification part." That's where the party was coming together, stick around.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** That was our policy meeting.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't want to misconstrue. I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Fort Garry is right, it wasn't a leadership contest, it was a policy session.

**MR. P. FOX:** But there were no policies.

**MR. R. DOERN:** One of the best comments that came from the New Democrats on the Tories recently was from Ian Waddell, when at one point there was a question about Nielsen saying he could get the support of the entire 100-member Tory caucus for some new job creation endeavour that was being put out by the Federal Government - another one by Lloyd Axworthy - it says Nielsen said he could get support from the 101-member Tory caucus for such a move by Ottawa prompting New Democrat Ian Waddell to call out, they'll support anything except Joe Clark.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that given that, I want to revise some earlier predictions that I made in the Throne Speech and just give a few odds that have shifted, shifting odds, Mr. Speaker, fortunes rising up and down - just like the price of gold, some are improving and some are weakening.

I think that I'm going to have to shift the likeable Member for Fort Garry. I consider him the favourite in the race, but he is a man in the Roblin tradition, the red Tory — (Interjection)— right, in fact, no, I was going to say he's wearing a pink shirt, but no, he isn't. He just has a little pale red stripe. Mr. Speaker, he was the odds unfavoured in the fall, but I think he's now going to be not the favourite, but he's going to be close. He's in the top three, no question about it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that instead of 3 to 2 odds which I gave before, I have to put him to 3 to 1, because the Conservative block of MLAs in this Chamber will not support a progressive leader. They want a conservative leader in the cast of Weir and Lyon, that's what they want. Even if it means defeat, they want to go with a right-winger and I think, therefore, the Member for Fort Garry, he's in the running, he's going to be in the money, he might be first, he might be second, but he can't be considered a favourite at this time, the Member for Fort Garry.

I think the favourite, Mr. Speaker, at this time has to be considered the Member for Turtle Mountain. You don't get much money for betting on him, but he's a 3 to 2 favourite because of the support that he can muster in this Chamber . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Maybe Carroll would have a good chance after yesterday's speech.

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . and because of the fact that the Conservative Party wants a rural classical conservative leader. So, Mr. Speaker, I think he has to be considered the favourite.

Now that's not necessarily a good position, because if you're a favourite then you are going to be nipped at and people are going to be running behind you. It's never good in a race, Mr. Speaker, and I speak as a person who loves track and field, who knows track and field and has been to three Olympics. Do you remember Roger Bannister and John Lande in British Columbia in 1954? In the great mile and at the crucial point, and



I'm saying this as a warning to the Member for Turtle Mountain, John Lande, who was a beautiful runner, turned around and looked and saw that doctor or health critic coming up and the next thing you know he went by him. Roger Bannister went by and I'm just warning the Member for Turtle Mountain to watch the Health critic, the M.D. for Fort Garry at the important turning point in the race.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** See if you can make one reference to the Budget before you are ruled out of order.

**MR. R. DOERN:** I'll say the word "budget" just in case the honourable member isn't satisfied. I'm budgeting my time, Sir.

**A MEMBER:** What about Epp?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Well, I think Jake Epp has to be considered. I'm starting to hear stories. I mean I believe that he was ruined by the convention; he has a saintly look. I gave him 5 to 1 odds, but I think he has to be considered also, at this point in time only, temporarily 3 to 2. I think he's close.— (Interjection)— No? Oh, I'm sorry, 3 to 1. Okay, Mr. Speaker, with the advice and counsel of my colleagues I would make him a 3 to 1 shot along with the Member for Fort Garry.

The other people, Mr. Speaker, I think remain about the same. The Member for Tuxedo, I think, is still around 10 to 1. He's a long shot; he's a possibility. His speech wasn't very good the other day; his style was good. He had good style but no content.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** With Carroll's brains and his looks, he could go far.

**MR. R. DOERN:** The same thing with the Member for Lakeside.

**A MEMBER:** He's a dark horse.

**MR. R. DOERN:** He is a dark horse. He's an old war horse, an old dark horse. I gave him 30 to 1 and I stay with that prediction, Mr. Speaker, 30 to 1. He gave a good speech. I said, in his track record, just missed in last. You know, he's a professional —(Interjection)— Pembina has definitely moved up, Mr. Speaker, but the Member for Lakeside, 30 to 1, he did very well yesterday. He gave a fine speech and held the attention of the Assembly until the end and then he kind of fell apart.

**A MEMBER:** How about Clayton?

**MR. R. DOERN:** No, the Member for Morris, his appeal is based on his appearance. He looks like Grant Devine, and I don't think I'm going to handicap somebody just because they're pretty-looking, Mr. Speaker, or handsome would be more appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur, we can't rule him out. We can't rule the Member for Arthur out. He may be in there; he was 30 to 1. He could be moving up. I don't know what's happening out there; I didn't fly over the southwestern region. I could have told, if I was looking down, how the land lies for the Member for Arthur, Mr. Speaker. I'd say he's somewhere between

20 and 30 to 1, I'd give him 25 to 1, moving up, the Member for Arthur. I almost missed him. You know, he was away a few days. It was quieter in here and I sort of missed him until he came back. Then he asked a few questions and . . .

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina's coming up. He's improved a bit. He's not as mouthy as he was; he showed some sense of humour the other day. Although the things he corrected in his speech, that Hansard said he said, were better than what he said. You see, he's got this problem. If he could get the Hansard reporter to rewrite his speeches, he probably could do even better. He was 100 to 1, Mr. Speaker; I'm putting him at 30 to 1. He's far back, he's probably going to fall out in the first round, Mr. Speaker, and then he'll throw his support to somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, we're all looking forward . . .

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, let me conclude in two sentences and say that I just hope that the members of the Conservative Party do a better job provincially than they did at their federal convention.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will start my speech this afternoon not by commenting on the trivia that was just demonstrated by the Member for Elmwood, and I would only think that the comments that he had should be put in the proper file in this Chamber and that, of course, is File No. 13 that sits at the end of that bench, Mr. Speaker.

I want to, first of all, congratulate the new Clerk of the Assembly and welcome him to Manitoba. As well as that, I would like to compliment the work activity of the Deputy Clerk, who is now a permanent Deputy, and I am sure filled in, in a very capable way, while we were in the shortfall after the unfortunate passing of Jack Reeves. It certainly appears as if we have a very competent, capable team and look forward to their work in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it's, I think, a responsibility to stand in this Chamber and put forward positive comments, as positive as we can be at a time when the Manitoba community is, I would say, very nervous with the amount of capital debt, the amount of operating debt that this administration have placed over their shoulders. I think, Mr. Speaker, that each member of the caucus of which I come from, the Progressive Conservative caucus, have to be very proud indeed of their contribution that they have made because they are not putting forward light ideas or trying to make fun of the current situation in the Province of Manitoba.

I think that each and every one of us travels to this city or comes to this Chamber to try to put our best thoughts forward, to try and recommend the solutions that we, within our capacity, think is the best direction for the province to go. I don't think that I have seen any one of our members make light of the current situation of the difficulties that each and every one of us face. I know that it's not only, Mr. Speaker —

(Interjection)— I will get to that, and it's certainly more than what we will hear from the Member for Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I want to say that I have been somewhat disappointed in the responses that have come from the Members of the Treasury Bench, from the backbenchers on the government's side, what I feel is their responsibility to support the document that has been tabled by their Minister of Finance. I don't think that I have heard one individual - and yes, I did hear one last night - and he's not here right now, but he will be I'm sure, and that's the Member for Ste. Rose, who did in fact address the Budget closer than anyone I have heard in this Chamber. Not that I'm trying to compliment him in any way, but I do think that he addressed a few of the issues that are before us.

I guess probably I could sum up my comments on what the opposition has said when one of the members said, "If you can't support something, you don't speak on it or you speak very short on what you're speaking," and that apparently is what is coming out of the government. That is the approach that they're taking. I guess it could be more referred to, not as the "Schroeder Budget," but I think it's the book of the "Honourable Vic Schroeder in Wonderland" because I think he's wondering what kind of support he's going to get from the rest of the taxpayers of Canada to help, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba out of its economic difficulties. Because when you look at the senior level of government to do things for you, you're really asking the rest of the taxpayers of Canada to help you with the deficit that's burdening you or help pay the taxes, and there's really nothing magic about that.

The big problem is, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't any new wealth being generated by doing that. It is just taking it from other taxpayers to do those things that we are unable to have this government provide the climates in which we can do. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is basically the kind of theme that I want to deal with when I speak about the Budget and I will put forward some numbers and some ideas that I think could help the province to some recovery.

The Member for Dauphin - I have to smile - he suggests that he has all the answers. Well, with the heavy portfolio that he has, I am sure that he is certainly burdened and that's where he gets all his positive ideas from. I'm surprised that the kind of presentation that he made.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Lakeside last night, I think, made a presentation and tried to put it into perspective. He asked the members of the Treasury Bench, members of the government, the backbenchers, he said, "Just how far in debt is the right debts to go? How big a deficit do we need? How much debt-carrying charge do we really need?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you how much we need. We don't need any more debt incurred on the people of the Province of Manitoba by this group of people who have the trust of the taxpayers' money in the Province of Manitoba. That, Mr. Speaker, is how far we should have gone. We have gone far too far and it has to be stopped, Mr. Speaker.

I, Mr. Speaker, want to refer to some specific items that are in the Budget.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Why didn't you say that when you were over here?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as the agricultural critic, I think it's important that I point out to the people of Manitoba, as I did in question period yesterday, they introduced a \$100 million loan program through the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation - by the way the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation and those programs were put in place by a Conservative Government in 1958 in case they've got some airy-fairy ideas that they could conceive such an idea to support the farm community - they expanded a \$60,000 loan limit to \$125,000 loan limit on a comprehensive loan guarantee of which they're only going to support 12.5 percent of any bank that gets into the farm debt.

Here's the line that I have to put back into the record, Mr. Speaker, because I am not worried about telling the people of Manitoba what this government are doing. Here's yesterday's press release - pardon me, it's February 28th - and I'll quote from this press release of what this Premier said. Well, we'll have to check on the details and look at it. First of all, Mr. Speaker, here's the thing that will strike out the majority of any farmer that may qualify: "Guarantees will be strictly limited to operating credit and will not be used to cover existing loans in arrears". Mr. Speaker, what farmers do we have that don't owe money already? That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's the high interest rates they've had to deal with last year, the high inflation costs that this government helped put on them, because of high costs of government at the national level through the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Socialists. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's past debts that are the problem, it's not the future debt that they're going to incur.

Who would want to get into a business, Mr. Speaker, other than because they're dedicated food producers, to do it on a business basis, and I'll get to why a person would question why a person would want to get into the agriculture community. Mr. Speaker, this government is again trying to fool the farm community as they've tried to fool all the people in the Province of Manitoba with their airy-fairy ideas.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't one farmer - I would bet there isn't one farmer - under this program that would qualify. I challenge them to point out the farmer that they'll help with this program. There aren't farmers who are sitting there with - if they've got money of their own, it's for darn sure they're not going to go and borrow money in times of economic unrest and be unsure of paying it off. They're not going to go and invest and venture money into a community that's in the trust of a bunch of people like this. It would be the last place, Mr. Speaker, they would put their confidence. People have lost their trust, Mr. Speaker, not only in this government but in the Government in Ottawa for many many years now and we have to change that, Mr. Speaker, and we will.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the government, I challenge anyone on the Treasury Bench, the Minister of Finance, any one of them to stand and say that I am incorrect. They can't do it, Mr. Speaker. The program is a farce.

Mr. Speaker, let us again refer to one other part of the Budget, because I want to deal specifically with how I think agriculture ties in to this kind of a Budget and how the farm people and the people of the City of Winnipeg, Brandon and Thompson are going to suffer with the ill-conceived philosophy of a Socialist Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the great promotion of the Beef Income Assurance Program.

**A MEMBER:** It's a good program.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, they say it's a good program. Well, let them proceed to hang in there and stick with it. The response from the cattle producers - and I pay attention to what cattle producers say - the first response that I heard from the Cattle Producers Organization is that it was being mismanaged and that there was fraudulent activity taking place - fraudulent activity taking place. How can a Treasury Bench who are short of funds sit there, Mr. Speaker, and allow, if in fact it's taking place, fraudulent activity or mismanagement to take place? I haven't heard the Minister say that he is going to investigate it, that he's going to look into the misuse of taxpayers' funds. That's what their responsibility is, Mr. Speaker, and if there's fraudulence going on, then let's find out what it is, because I don't think that those kind of accusations should go unchecked. I think we should know where the problem is, if there is one.

The great objective of this program was to increase the feedlot feeding of beef cattle in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a gross failure in my life. The beef feedlot industry in Manitoba is going down the drain. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Yes, Mr. Speaker, simply on the grounds that Saskatchewan and Quebec have a program that support their feedlot industry and they build into the cost of that animal the purchase price of those animals they feed. So they come to Manitoba, they bid up our feeder cattle, they put the feeder cattle in a price range that our local feedlot operators cannot competitively bid against and they would, if they did buy them, lock in an automatic loss. So our feedlot industry, Mr. Speaker, is being transported to Saskatchewan and is being transported to Quebec, losing the whole objective. We had no problem with the objective of increasing the feedlot activity in Manitoba in the packing house industry but, Mr. Speaker, it is failing.

I'll tell you one other problem, Mr. Speaker, because the people who have signed up in that program, signed up to pay a premium on the animal that they're selling, and I've got two problems with this premium, because as the animal - and I don't think it's wrong because I think the market should pay back what an animal is worth and to that producer, but when he sells that animal, and because of the outside pressure on those feeder cattle, which is good, but we should have a fair competition for our own people - when that animal is bid up, it puts them out of the stabilization range, but he is now paying 5 percent or 7 percent of the gross value of that animal into the government coffers that are being fraudulently handled or being mismanaged. That's farmers' money, Mr. Speaker, that is going in there and it has to be checked out as well.

When I understood this program was being introduced, that farmers were being told that the local auction marts could deduct those fees - but do you know what happens, Mr. Speaker? The farmer delivers his cattle and those cheques come to Winnipeg and there's a great bureaucracy hired to do all the deducting and the farmer gets back the little bit that is left that doesn't go into the program.

There's one other concern I have, Mr. Speaker, because as I understood it and I stand to be corrected, and if I'm wrong I want the Minister of Agriculture to correct me, that when farmers signed this program they agreed to pay one-half of 1 percent commission to operate the Manitoba Red Beef Commission, as my colleague from Swan River very properly named it, the Big Red Beef Commission. They are now paying 1 percent without having agreed to it or anything else, Mr. Speaker. That is taking the funds from farmers that they didn't think they would lose to operate the Big Red Beef Commission. As I say, I stand to be corrected, but I think that is pretty factual, that one-half of 1 percent was initially the figure they were told. That amounts, Mr. Speaker, to upwards of \$2.50 to \$5.00 per annum. That is a fairly substantial increase from when a person signed a contract to when the actual fact of what he had to pay hits him. Now those are things that I don't like. We continually said leave the producers to produce, give them a one-time grant, Mr. Speaker, and let the marketplace work with them and they'll recover.

Do you know what that would have cost the province? It wouldn't have cost us \$44 million last year and another \$10 million this year. That would have cost approximately \$12 to \$14 million in one shot. Yes, Mr. Speaker, so there could have possibly been a savings of several millions of dollars, so I am making some positive suggestions for those people across the way that can't recognize them when they hear them. Mr. Speaker, I think those were positive suggestions where you can save taxpayers money and help the farm community without imposing the big red beef commission on the backs of the farmers of Manitoba.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** You said there was a fraud. Where's the fraud?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the way in which we are seeing some, I would say, not really factual information being told to the public as was demonstrated last year, the fact that we saw such a terrible increase in the expenses of the province and a lower income which they received and that I am sure is hard to read as far as the income is concerned because of the fact that they didn't know where they were going with the payroll tax from the Federal Government. They have several impediments that they were inflicting upon themselves and, of course, the outcome was certainly very much proof in the pudding of how disastrous their projections were.

The approach of a New Democratic Party, the approach of this Socialist Government to curing the ills of the economy remind me of an animal that I once had with pneumonia. I had the veterinarian out to look at this animal and do you know what the veterinarian told me? He said, you keep giving it the same medicine that you're giving it until it dies and that's basically what we are getting with the Pierre Elliott Trudeau in Ottawa and the Socialist approach to economic recovery in Manitoba. They're going to keep giving us more of the same medicine until our economy is dead, Mr. Speaker. That's the approach that the Socialists are taking to the economic recovery of the Province of Manitoba. They're treating us with the same medicine

that will eventually kill us if we don't change the government that are administering, or the doctors that are giving us that kind of solutions. So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we lay out some alternatives.

The problems that are facing each and every Manitoban are that of tax increases, the fact that last year we saw the Minister of Finance who wouldn't increase the gasoline tax and I'll tell you the reasons why. This is what he stated last year. Here's what he said and this year, remember, he is increasing the gas tax by 1.5 cents a litre and by 5 cents a gallon. Here's the reason that he didn't do it last year, but I haven't been able to find in this year's Budget why he did it this year. This is the inconsistency of the kind of a government that we have. I'll quote from last year's Budget.

"Gasoline tax freeze," nice headlines, good political stuff so that he can gloss over and pick it up quickly when he's fooling the people of Manitoba. "The price of gasoline increased by about a third since early 1981." We all know gasoline was increasing mainly because of taxation at the federal and provincial levels. I don't back away from the fact that gasoline taxes went up when we were in office but there were some roads built with the tax money, too, something that isn't going to happen during this administration, I'm afraid.

This has caused particular problems for northern, rural and suburban Manitobans who must drive longer distances, Mr. Speaker. What are they now going to do, drive shorter distances so the 5 cents a gallon isn't going to hurt them? Is that what they're going to do, Mr. Speaker? All at once their problem has gone away because the Minister of Finance sees fit to increase the sales tax so that doesn't qualify this year. You either drive a shorter distance or you just forget what I said last year. Oh, how he wished they would forget but they won't.

I will continue on to quote, "I wish to announce that effective immediately the gasoline rate will be frozen at its current level until the end of this fiscal year. The new diesel tax fuel rates I announced earlier will also be fixed for the same period. As a result of the rate freeze, we estimate that Manitoba taxpayers will save \$6 million." A good approach. I agree with that approach. Let the taxpayers save some money.

There was an inkling of hope that maybe they were going to have the idea that if you didn't tax the people they might be able to do something.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** You didn't agree with it last year.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Save \$6 million on gas taxes, \$2.5 million on motive fuel which would otherwise be payable in the current year. That's all gone, Mr. Speaker. That's all gone because now he's come out with a gas tax, he's come out with a gas tax to do what? To pay for the kinds of programs that he and his government feel will help the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce put it very well when they said, "Because the Manitoba Government's spending is out of control the province faces an imminent crisis regarding the deficit." It's there, Mr. Speaker, in spades, it's there in spades. That's the end of the quote of the gasoline tax. But let us remember we're dealing with an economy, and I've

heard members of the government say as I've heard many of my colleagues say that the agriculture community is the backbone of the Manitoba economy. I don't think there is any argument in this House. They've put it in their Budget last year that the agricultural community has twice the impact on the Manitoba community as does agriculture on the Canadian community. So we do recognize it as a major impact.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have said and I don't think that there is any question when they look at the numbers that are available that over 50 percent of the people of Manitoba rely on agriculture whether they provide service to the farmers in the production of food, whether they actually produce it as farmers, or whether they service the farm community or the commodity that is produced after the fact, after the grains are produced in the combines. So 50 percent one way or another, whether they work on the railroads, or whether they produce iron for the machinery that's built at the Versatile Plant or the Co-Op Implements, 50 percent or better of the people rely on that industry and we haven't really put it in perspective the way we should have when we're talking about where we're at in wage settlements. Where are we at in the whole picture of incomes within this province?

It is quoted in last year's Budget, Mr. Speaker, and I will refer to it very briefly, "Agriculture" - and I wonder why they put it in because I guess they're trying to make the point that it was even tough in our times and we all know it was tough in our times - the figures show that at least the net income wasn't totally that bad but it wasn't that good either. "The third consecutive year," and I'm quoting from last year's Budget, "of decline in realized net farm impact, according to the estimate by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, realized net income declined by 8 percent. The net farm income for the third year in a row declined by 8 percent."

Let me, Mr. Speaker, refer to this year's Budget where in fact we have again the Minister of Agriculture who has not put anything in here that would take any pressure off the farm community in the form of tax reliefs. Mr. Speaker, I will quote from this year's Budget and this is the fourth year that we've had a farm community that have seen a decline in their net income. I'm not talking about a 6 and 5 percent increase or a 13 percent increase, I'm talking about a net decrease, that's what we have to pay attention to. This year, Mr. Speaker, we looked at a 6.1 percent decline. Yes, Mr. Speaker, people who rely on the farmers, half the people in the province, their base the people who produce what makes it all happen for those 50 percent are working under extremely difficult conditions. Four years in a row a net decline in income. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you there is little comfort in this document to help anyone in the farm community.

Where did all this start, Mr. Speaker? Why did we get to this? We got to the stage we're at because we followed some of the policies and some of the beliefs. Maybe you could tell me, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have left - for my speech, that is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 16 minutes remaining.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** 16 minutes, thank you. Mr. Speaker, why and how have we developed to this point where

we've seen a group in society like the farm community take reduced prices and net income. We've seen tremendous inflationary costs; we've seen fuel go at exorbitant prices; we have seen machinery costs go up. We've seen all the input costs go up. Drastically high incomes. I'll try and paint, Mr. Speaker, for the members opposite so they might be able to understand what their kind of philosophy gives us, is the kind of result that we have today.

In 1973, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Member for Ste. Rose for pointing out that period of time because that was really when a lot of the major problems started for the international community. The OPEC countries said, well, the United States and Canada and all those consuming countries really haven't got enough oil. Who has the oil production in the world? They said, yes, we have, they had the oil production capabilities and they were selling at pretty low prices. But without, Mr. Speaker, having any consideration for cost of production of that oil, fair return on investment for that oil, they said we will form a little group - and the members opposite say if you want to get yourself bettered in society you form a little group to get control of something. You get control of it and then what do you do? You make the other people pay. You organize, you organize to the point where you get complete control of it, no free market, nothing to do with cost of production, nothing to do with fair return, Mr. Speaker, but you hold up the rest of society for that commodity.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't work for the OPEC countries, did it? I could advocate, Mr. Speaker, for the farm community, that because there are a very few wheat exporting countries and we have control of the supply, why wouldn't the farm community say, let us form a grain cartel and let us put it to the rest of society. You know why it won't work, Mr. Speaker? Because of precisely what happened with the OPEC countries. They asked unreasonable prices. You can't fool the consuming public, they will not pay for value they're not getting, Mr. Speaker, they will not pay for value they're not getting. We have to return, Mr. Speaker, a dollar's worth of pay for a dollar's worth of goods or service and that's where we're headed, Mr. Speaker. But there are a couple of groups in society today that are having a little tough time getting into that kind of a mood. I can tell you, the farm community are into that kind of a mood because they've been forced into it because they've been receiving the costs on one side and the prices on the other.

Mr. Speaker, so we saw the inflationary oil prices. We saw Canada get involved. We saw the Government of Ottawa and Alberta put together an agreement to protect, yes to try and help increase the production in Canada, but to protect the consumers of oil. Yes, Mr. Speaker, members opposite said it's a great idea to form Petrocan because Petrocan will help us from letting that oil price go up. You know if we have a Petrocan station and a Petrocan Company then the oil prices will not increase so much and we'll pull up to our own little company and we'll get a little better deal. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is happening today? The oil prices are breaking in the world market and . . .

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Who said that? Who said that?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You did.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** . . . the United States is paying half-price for the gas and oil that we are because we have mostly tax on our oil and gas, which they subscribe to, which we use, Mr. Speaker. I will advocate to my colleagues and to the people of Manitoba that the direction that Alberta and Saskatchewan have gone with their gas taxes probably would be the most beneficial way to go when we have such a mobile society with Northern Manitobans and rural Manitobans and urban Manitobans. That's the kind of a direction we have to go. We have to take some of that tax off those people at a daily basis so they have a little bit of room to breathe.

Mr. Speaker, they were advocates of helping the price stay down by the purchasing of Petrocan and it didn't work when world prices were going up. Will they now be advocates, Mr. Speaker, because other world prices are going down, oil prices are going down in other jurisdictions? Possibly we should sell Petrocan so that the price of gas and oil in Canada should go down. Maybe we should, Mr. Speaker, start to sell Petrocan.

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** To whom, to whom?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's a very good question, the Member for St. Johns says to whom? Who would buy it when we paid twice as much money as we should? We're being raped, Mr. Speaker, at the pumps everytime we pull up to buy a company that has done nothing but harm to us, Mr. Speaker. That is the problem with this province and this country.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** What's your position?

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** To whom would you sell it? To Russia, to China?

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Would you sell it? No maybes, Downie. Would you sell it?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, they say, who would we sell it to? We have destroyed the private initiative and the private incentive for anyone to get into business, and that's what the socialists have done in Ottawa and in Manitoba.

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** That's right. Give it to Andropov.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** So let them advocate selling it so when the world oil prices are going down that ours can go down. Let it get out of the road, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Yes or no, take a position. Put it on the record.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The high oil prices - I'll take a position anytime and I'll stand up in any community or audience against you fellows and I'll defend it and I'll win.

We, Mr. Speaker, saw high interest rates. First we saw high inflation because those individuals who are working in a mine or whatever they were doing, farming, or whether were working in a bakery, they had to go and buy a car. Before that inflation and those high oil prices hit them, Mr. Speaker, they could buy a car for \$5,000 to \$6,000 to \$7,000. Today it costs them \$15,000

to \$20,000 for the same car, so I don't blame them for wanting their unions to go for more money. I support that, Mr. Speaker, because they were forced to do it.

Farmers have mechanisms to force prices up through the marketing board structures, but they have to be fair, Mr. Speaker. The mechanism, whether it be a union for labour or a marketing board for farmers, has to be fair and that's what's going to happen in society. There is going to be a balance. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a government here that isn't allowing that to happen, because if you read recently what happened in the Schneider negotiations, the government couldn't resolve it because they were all on one side. But the company and the labour resolved it and I condemn this First Minister, Mr. Speaker, for speaking out and saying Schneiders didn't deal fairly. Who is he trying to fool, Mr. Speaker, when we see bullet holes go through union halls in this province, people upset enough to shoot into buildings? Mr. Speaker, that Treasury Bench and that government have to take the responsibility for that kind of action in a society - activist, Mr. Speaker, - and that's what they have given us.

Mr. Speaker, high interest rates - followed by inflation were high interest rates. My goodness, what do we have to put people through? High interest rates. Yes, Mr. Speaker, everyone in society is still suffering the effects of high interest rates.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** The last guy who sounded like that was Louis Riel.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did get inflation down, we got it down. Thanks, Mr. Speaker, to a lot of activity that took place not in Canada, but in the United States. What does this Minister of Agriculture do but stand up and blast the grain people of the United States saying, don't try and tell us to cut our production so we can help increase the world prices.

What does the Member for St. James do? He says to the farmers in North Dakota, "Plant trees and improve your farming practices." At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to move grain to Thunder Bay through the United States and nicely asked them to extend their Customs Office hours so we don't have to pay exorbitant prices; that's the kind of action we see from a socialist government in Manitoba. When are they going to get responsible?

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Take it easy on the furniture, you're going to be there for a long time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, we talked about high interest rates. I want to refer to some of the wage settlements that have taken place and I won't spend a lot of time on it because I'm speaking from around where a farm community have lost income for the last four years. I'm saying to the people of the Province of Manitoba, if they reduce some of the gas taxes; if they said to the homeowners - and here's a suggestion I'd like you to follow up on - rather than spend \$200 million to try and buy jobs that you can't even identify for us, take some of the interest off the income tax of people who want to own their own home. Have it as a tax deduction so that more homes are built, more jobs are created, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. V. SCROEDER:** Downey for leader.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, when we see a decline in farm income, at the same time the province is settling a wage settlement with the people who we are paying for, losing money every year for four years, they're increasing their wages. Increasing their wages, Mr. Speaker.

Why, Mr. Speaker - and I'll throw this out for a recommendation - don't they tie the wages of the people who have worked for the Province of Manitoba on the output of the Gross National Product of the province? Give them an incentive to help encourage the people to do some work. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are to that point in our society.

I was at the municipal meeting the other night and do you know what they recommended? They said, why doesn't the government get in step with the people? We have told our employees that we're going to settle for 6 percent and if this economy doesn't improve we're going to zero, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's where we should be going at this point in time. There is a lot of money that could be saved if we gave the people who worked for the province some tax breaks - I'm saying some tax breaks. It's a consideration that has to be given, Mr. Speaker, when you have all the municipal people saying they are prepared to do it in the longer term; I'm saying if this doesn't improve. You've haven't given us what you're going to do if it doesn't improve, other than bankruptcy, and that's what you're telling us you're giving us. You're wishing and hoping that the other taxpayers of Canada will bail us out. I don't trust the people in Ottawa to bail anybody out, Mr. Speaker, because it's like asking the arsonist to put out the fire. That's what they're asking, Mr. Speaker, and they aren't going to help.

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe that the Progressive Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba were showing leadership. I don't want to talk about mega projects but I'll talk about the oil industry in the southwest for a couple of minutes because, yes, the oil prices were going up and there was encouragement for the oil companies to come in and develop the oil reserves but the Premier Sterling Lyon Government in his time changed the climate so that those companies could come in and develop the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the projections, the revenue for oil industry in Manitoba has almost doubled in one year. That's the result of what I would say positive development in the private sector, not multinational corporations, not people who are irresponsible when you go to the gas pump, people who are trying to get a fair return. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is the other way does work. There is another way other than providing jobs through the government saying that we have to have the full responsibility as a government to employ people.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. I have a 10-year old child and I know there are a lot of people here that do have young people. You know what they see when they look at TV and radio today? They hear that it's the government's responsibility to provide employment. What kind of young people are we bringing up that it's the government's responsibility? Well, I guess they would be leaning towards government today with the

kind of sweetheart deals that you can get with government today, but let us remember who earns the money, Mr. Speaker. Let us remember that we were born into a country that's full of opportunity, full of resources.

The government has to realize that if you're going to allow individuals to promote themselves and promote those resources and develop them that you take the big heavy hand of government off. We have enough government in Canada for twice, four times the population that we have. What are they advocating? Giving us more, Mr. Speaker. My goodness, it's like treating a patient that's been poisoned and pouring more on him, Mr. Speaker. That's what they're doing to us.

I think even though we have members in this House who I don't have any problem with them, but are advocates of certain systems, they have come from certain jurisdictions where they've found that they couldn't change so they thought they would come and work on us. Mr. Speaker, I'm a Canadian and a Manitoban and I'm damn proud of it. I'll be here a long time after they're gone and so will my colleagues who believe in the free enterprise system and less government in their lives, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude my remarks today by saying that I think the rank and file in the labour unions are prepared to take less out of society because they realize we're all in tough economic conditions, but the government hasn't realized that, Mr. Speaker, and they had better. What they are doing is only fooling themselves and the people. I'm not going to get into what I would now call trivia that they got into before the last election, where they weren't going to allow anything to happen. I have to say in certain respects I'm glad that they can't do certain things with the power that they think they can. It would have scared me to think that they could have stopped, they could have done the things that they think they can do. It gives me a little bit of hope that we have a democracy, a country that the people can control the government. They believe opposite to that, they believe that the government should control the people. They believe in opposition. I think they're learning more about the role of government as we're coaxing them along this very delicate path.

There's a lot of people think we're on the verge of an economic recovery. I don't have that same feeling and that same confidence, Mr. Speaker. I have seen nothing in this Budget document that would tell me that I am going to get anything more in the next year than a 1 percent increase in sales tax; an increase in my hydro rates by 9.5 percent; an increase of all the Crown land leases. I can't for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, see any relief for anybody in the Province of Manitoba.

I will close, Mr. Speaker, by saying, I do have faith because I do believe the people of Manitoba will, in fact, do what is responsible when the next election is called by the Premier of the province. I wouldn't mind if he called it tomorrow. A lot of people say, well, it's a good time to be out of government. No, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a time where responsible people should be in government and I would really like to be there along with my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I am going to pledge to do that right here at this time.

Thank you.

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

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has time, I had a couple of questions I wanted to ask him, based on his remarks. I don't know if his time has expired.

He addressed the House with regard to Petrocan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired. If there is leave of the House, the questions can be asked. Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Honourable Member for Arthur to tell this House whether he would or would not sell Petrocan if it were in his power. He hedged and fudged all around that question. I'm wondering if he's like the other members on his side who won't take a position.

**A MEMBER:** Yes or no?

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** If it would reduce the cost to the taxpayers of Canada in a major way, which I believe it would, I think it would start by reducing the paying for Petrocan and Petrofina by four cents a litre, which is 20 cents a gallon, which would give you immediate relief at the gas pumps. Yes, I would sell it.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** That's all we wanted to know.

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin my remarks today by trying to set a calmer tone for debate in this House and a more rational tone for debate in this House following upon the comments of the Member for Arthur by reading from the recent publication of the Episcopal Commission for Social Affairs of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, an article entitled, "Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crises." I want to read that or a portion of that article because I believe that every member in this Chamber will agree that society today is in the midst of a crisis of economic proportions.

What the Catholic Bishops say, "Indeed, we recognize that serious economic challenges lie ahead for this country. If our society is going to face up to these challenges, people must meet and work together as a true community with vision and courage. In developing strategies for economic recovery, we firmly believe," - and that's the Catholic Bishops - "that the first priority must be given to the real victims of the current recession, namely, the unemployed, the welfare poor, the working poor, pensioners, Native people, women, young people, small farmers, fishermen, some factory workers and some small businessmen and women. This option calls for economic policies which realize that the needs of the poor have priority over the ones of the rich; that the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits; that the participation of marginalized groups has precedence over the preservation of a system which excludes them."

That is what the Catholic Bishops had to say in their ethical reflections on the economic crises. The value of work has long been known and recognized by everyone from ancient philosophers to the workers in the plants today, to the workers in small business today, to the owners of small business, to the farmers, to the fishermen, to the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops.

A fulfilling job can provide income. It can encourage a sense of self-worth. It can mean the difference between dignity and despair. At no time, Mr. Speaker, is the real value of a job more apparent than at a time when those jobs are not available to those people who would wish to have them. Unfortunately, those times, Sir, are these times. These are certainly times when jobs are needed, when they are badly needed. That is why this year's Budget so clearly targets job creation as the primary goal and objective of this Provincial Government. It is a goal that has to be put in the context of the economic storm which is widespread and a profound impact to all Provincial Governments, to Federal Governments, to governments in every jurisdiction.

That is why my colleague, the Minister of Finance, opened his Budget Address by stating, unemployment is the No. 1 problem in Canada. He said unemployment is the No. 1 problem in Manitoba. He also stated that creating jobs and saving jobs are the priorities of our New Democratic Government. That is an accurate reflection of both the problem and the solution.

This Budget is a major attack on unemployment in Manitoba. It is a part of the overall battle against joblessness and the destruction of wages on both individuals and societies because when you have unemployment, Sir, you have social violence. It follows it like night follows day.

Nowhere is that destruction more evident or more widespread than in Northern Manitoba, where extreme unemployment is not a new phenomenon, but it is both historic and structural. Community by community, unemployment rates in Northern Manitoba of 75 percent to 90 percent or above 90 percent, don't just crop up overnight. More likely they are the product of economic neglect of generations, combined of course, with structural inequities. Those problems, so longstanding and so systematic, demand extra efforts on the part of everyone if they are ever to be dealt with in an effective way. Those efforts, which are demanding, must as well be comprehensive and systematic. They must be a part of a long-term strategy that acknowledges both long-term problems and at the same time recognizes short-term realities.

This government, a New Democratic Government, has done both through its job creation programs in the remote communities where high levels of joblessness are both historic and structured. It is done so, as well, in the industrial communities where the worldwide recession has resulted in massive, but hopefully temporary layoffs. As well, the New Northern Development Agreement will direct hundreds of millions of dollars, both provincial and federal dollars, to the areas of greatest need in a co-ordinated and co-operated fashion.

Today, I want to speak to both the short-term and the long-term job creation efforts in Northern Manitoba, because they are both essential parts of the formula

for economic success and recovery not only in the North, but in this province as a whole.

During the past year, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Affairs has initiated two major job creation programs, both of which were limited in both time and scope. The record should be clear. They were too limited in time and in scope. They could only address a part of the problem for too short a period of the time. I personally, my government personally, and I'm certain members opposite would have preferred to do more. Accordingly, we have increased our efforts as a government in this regard over the past year, but the fact remains that still more needs to be done.

The previous Conservative Government has been, and probably still is opposed to these types of job creation programs and work projects. Their criticism has been voiced on numerous occasions but basically in two distinct ways. Firstly, they have said northerners do not want job creation programs; they have even hinted that they would prefer welfare over job creation programs. Secondly, they believe these projects are only short-term in nature and therefore can only add little value, if any value, to the economic well-being of the North. That is the Conservative approach to unemployment problems in Northern Manitoba, and if you doubt that you need only look at their record in government in respect to what they did not do, and you need only look to their comments both in government and in opposition in respect to job creation programs in Northern Manitoba.

The first premise of their argument is that the North is not in need and does not want job creation programs of this nature. It is totally unfounded and lacks basis and fact. If northern communities did not want these programs, why did almost every Northern Affairs community, a large number of reserve communities, and many northern industrial centres make applications for assistance under our most recent job creation program? If they don't want them, why do they do that? Well, the answer is obvious that they do want them and they do need them. If individual northerners, on the other hand, did not want these jobs, then the question that must be asked is why do we have over 600 workers involved in the Department of Northern Affairs Job Creation Program alone and hundreds of other workers involved in other programs which are ongoing at the present time.

If there was a widespread rejection of these types of programs which the Conservatives insist exist, then why are these workers adding to their personal incomes, bringing money into their communities, providing both capital and ongoing benefits to scores of communities where job creation programs are now working? If the Conservatives are right in their opinions, and I suggest they are not, then why are there continuing requests from individuals, from communities and from organizations for an expansion of these programs both in time and in scope? If they didn't want them, why are they asking for them in the first instance, why are they applying to be a part of them and why do they want more? The fact is that the Conservatives are wrong. They were wrong for four years in government and they are still wrong. These programs are wanted, these programs are accepted and these programs are necessary for the North.

The departmental program during the last year created over 8,500 work weeks for over 600 persons.



A total of \$1.9 million was spent by my department, but there were millions of dollars spent by other departments. In my department alone that was done in the context of nearly 80 projects, which means merely that many communities were benefiting by this program. These programs, coupled with the other government initiatives which have been brought forward and discussed during this Debate, have literally brought millions of dollars and thousands of jobs into Northern Manitoba. The record therefore is clear; these jobs are wanted, Sir, these jobs are needed.

There is another objection of the Conservatives both in and out of government that must be addressed. They say that these jobs are only - and I use their phrase - "make-work projects." They say that these jobs do not add to the infrastructure or the long-term economic viability and vitality of the province. Mr. Speaker, they should know better. Many of the projects are being used to develop infrastructure that will encourage economic activity on a continuing basis. For example, seven new fishing stations are being constructed throughout the North at a cost to the province of hundreds of thousands of dollars. It might also be added that these projects are bringing into Manitoba hundreds of thousands of federal dollars as well. So in this case, in respect to the fishing stations, which come under the program and which were a major component of the entire program, we have accomplished a number of objectives.

Firstly, we have provided jobs which were wanted and needed; secondly, we have created long-term infrastructure; thirdly, we have supported a traditional resource industry and a traditional economy; finally, fourthly, it brings hundreds of thousands of dollars of federal money to Manitoba.

Other projects throughout the North were not as comprehensive; however, all provided employment for the jobless. Many included long-term infrastructure as part of their programs. They supported traditional economies and natural resource economies where they could, and a number of them brought other funds from other levels of government into the province so that Manitobans could benefit in a national way by these projects. So the Conservatives in their longstanding opposition to job creation programs are wrong again.

This government, a New Democratic Government, knows that these efforts can only be a part of the total package. They are valuable, they are worthwhile. In certain circumstances they can address the structural and historic problems with unemployment in Northern Manitoba, not in all circumstances and not to the extent which other programs can, but in certain circumstances in certain ways they can do that. But we know, as a government, that there must be as well long-term and developmental programs which are developed for and suited to northern circumstances.

This government is approaching that development from a number of different perspectives, not the least of which is the implementation of the Northern Development Agreement. Before I go into the positive benefits of this agreement, I think it might be necessary to address some of the criticisms which the members opposite, the Conservatives, have put forward since this Northern Development Agreement has been signed between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. They have criticized this agreement and

complained that it contains a provision for a Northern office. They have criticized and complained about this government because it includes ongoing programming which previously existed and, by the way, was considered by most to be the most successful programs of the previous Northlands Agreement.

They have also criticized the length of time it took for a New Democratic Government to negotiate this multimillion dollar agreement. The fact is that these negotiations were completed within one year of the government assuming office. Certainly that is longer than I would have hoped it would have taken; certainly I would have preferred to have done it much sooner. If you will recall, we were constantly in the position of pushing the Federal Government to finalize the discussions, to sign the agreement and to get it into place and working. So we wanted it to be negotiated quicker than it was, but the reality of the fact is that it was negotiated over a period of time which was necessary to iron out many of the difficulties which were on the negotiating table when we assumed office.

**A MEMBER:** Who signed that for the feds?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Certainly it is longer than we would have liked. However, the other fact that has to be laid on the table is that the previous government was unable to renegotiate this agreement during years of negotiations. When they lost the government, deservedly so, Sir, we had to pick up the pieces and we had to do so in a way to ensure that the integrity of this original agreement which they had lost was maintained and that the new agreement address new issues which had come to the surface since the time of the first agreement.

Well, the member opposite says I am a liar from his seat. However, the case is I am not calling him on it, Sir, because he said it under his breath and he is certainly entitled to do that.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Say it on your feet.

**HON. J. COWAN:** However, if he wants to put it on the record I would welcome the chance to debate it because those are the facts. They had no agreement. We got an agreement and we got an agreement which we feel is the best agreement possible under the circumstances of the day. The fact is that no other province is getting agreements like that and if that bears testimony to the ability of this government to negotiate successfully with the Federal Government on issues of need, then so be it. It is accurate testimony and one which should be on the record. They would feel far more comfortable with their remarks if they could stand up and say they had agreement or they were near agreement but they can do neither. So the fact is, there is an agreement and let's talk about the agreement. Let's talk about the agreement.

Oh, by the way excuse me, Mr. Speaker, they did criticize two other components of the new Northern Development Agreement. They criticized two specific federal programs: one was the Community Regional Economic Development Planning Program and the other was the Evaluation and Consultation Program. According to them they thought, and I quote the

previous Minister of Northern Affairs when I say this, they thought those programs to be, "... perhaps a display of federal intrusion into provincial areas of responsibility for the purposes of giving political identity." Is it little wonder why they were not able to reach an agreement with the Federal Government? With statements like that, do you wonder very long why their negotiations failed and ours succeeded? Of course not, because they couldn't remove themselves from the political arena long enough to get an agreement which benefited in a practical way the residents of Northern Manitoba. Notwithstanding those dubious criticisms, I would suggest that the new Northern Development Agreement is an important part of a very necessary long-term strategy for economic development in both human and economic resources in Northern Manitoba.

Basically it is designed to firstly, develop locally based employment opportunities; secondly, increase participation of the Northern labour force and employment opportunities particularly in major resource sectors; thirdly, to facilitate increased participation of individuals in Northern developments by removing physical barriers to human and economic development. Now those are all worthy goals and objectives and, Sir, those are goals and objectives that will be met because we were able as a Provincial Government to, in the most co-operative way possible, negotiate an agreement which is of benefit to the residents of Northern Manitoba and for that reason a benefit to all of Manitoba and to all of Canada. We were able to convince the Federal Government of that, not by fed-bashing as they had done, but by speaking in reasoned terms as to what we hope to accomplish, how we hope to accomplish it and why it was necessary. So we have an agreement today which I am proud to put forward to this House and to the people of this province, an agreement of which I am proud and this government is proud to have been a part in negotiating.

Having said all that, I will say that it is not the best agreement in the world but it is a better agreement than nothing. It is a good agreement which has potential and if we can work well with the Northern communities and Northern individuals as a government and the Federal Government, we can put in place many substantial and substantive programs which will invaluablely assist the economic development of Northern Manitoba. As a result of this agreement job and income opportunities will be created by stimulating economic opportunities. Now that just makes common sense and it's a goal to which we should all subscribe.

Secondly, it will include skill training and support systems. These will be continued where appropriate and initiated where necessary, in fact we do have an ongoing program which existed before and new initiatives which are necessary to meet new situations. It will be designed to enable Northerners, particularly those in remote communities, a fair chance to participate in this increased economic opportunity. Think about that. What we are giving them is a fair chance. They ask for no more and they deserve no less. That's what the Conservatives denied them. So don't let them rant and rave about this agreement not serving the purposes for which it is intended, Sir. I commend it to you, I commend it to this House and I fully intend to see it implemented in the fullest way possible.

Thirdly, the Northern Development Agreement contains a component which will address many of the

existing disparities in regard to basic levels of service and transportation systems in Northern communities. So, soon it becomes obvious. The Northern Development Agreement is an essential part of the overall economic strategy of this government and will provide lasting value to the economy of the entire province.

I would like to speak today to the types of programs which were put in place in Thompson, Manitoba and other Northern mining communities that provided jobs to individuals when they were unemployed because of the effects of the world-wide recession reaching in to those communities in Northern Manitoba. I understand that the Minister of Labour and the Member for Thompson spoke to it previously.

Sir, I had an opportunity to visit many of those work sites with my leader, the Premier of the province and with the MLA for Thompson, while in that community a short while ago. We had the opportunity to meet with workers on the job. We had the opportunity to discuss with them not only the successes of that program but the failings of that program because no program is perfect. No program answers all needs. But this program, Sir, - and you need only look at the descriptions of them which are in the Press - this program was acceptable to those individuals whom it was designed to serve. For that reason it was acceptable to the community at large and to the province as a whole.

It is through able negotiations in a co-operative way again with the Federal Government that we were able to ensure that those programs were as comprehensive as is possible. I think that's to our credit as well. I think those who criticize those programs should take the time to talk to the workers who were a party to them; to take the time to talk to the individuals who were served by those programs because they will get a different picture than exists in their mind today because of their particular ideological approach to programs of that nature. They will see that those programs were necessary, that those programs worked and that those programs provided infrastructure and value to the Province of Manitoba that will exist long into the future in those areas where those programs were undertaken.

What more would one want to accomplish to keep people working, to keep them off the unemployment rolls, providing infrastructure and capital works to communities? Yet you will hear them not commend those programs but criticize those programs. You must ask yourself, why is it that they constantly carp and criticize programs which are providing the very values to this society to which we all should subscribe. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? I don't know the answer, that is why I ask the question. Well, it's been said that they don't have any alternatives; it's been said that they don't know the answer either. I think both are absolutely correct and there's probably a few more things that could be said at different places in different ways that might address the issue as well, but the fact is, that you will not hear them say, yes, we are pleased that people are working; you will not hear them say, yes, we are pleased that valuable infrastructure is being provided to Northern communities; you will not hear them say, yes, we are pleased that the economic well-being of this province is being promoted by the use of creative and imaginative ways. Instead, you will hear

them criticize and criticize and criticize, ad infinitum, ad absurdum. Now that's their function perhaps, or perhaps that is how they see their function. I know the Member for Dauphin addressed that issue yesterday. However, one has to question why it is that they are not coming up with alternatives if all they want to do is criticize. We have the alternatives; we have laid them on the table and they have worked, Sir.

I've addressed Northern Manitoba primarily in the initial parts of my speech.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I can dig out your speech.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain says he can dig out my speech where I refuse to give alternatives. I would ask him to dig out the speech where I encouraged him to sign, to negotiate successfully in Northern Development Agreement and that was an alternative and that's a reality today. So let him dig that speech out of his pile if he wishes to dig around in the speeches of days gone by because the advice I gave to him today was the advice this government took and implemented and for that reason Northern Manitoba is a better place today than it was when he was responsible for the negotiations.

He has deflected my attention from the other part of my speech because I didn't want to talk only about Northern Manitoba. Indeed it's important and indeed those facts should be on the record but I want to talk about the Budget in a global way.

This Budget is in the best keeping of the ethical reflections of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. I want to read again, in my closing moments, their six-point plan of action as outlined in the article which I read from earlier. I want to put that six-point plan of action, point by point, in the context of the activities of this government over the past year and through this Budget process.

First, the Canadian Catholic Bishops say, "Unemployment," and I quote, "rather than inflation should be recognized as the No. 1 problem to be tackled in overcoming the present crises." When my colleague, the Minister of Finance, gave his opening remarks and his closing remarks in respect to the Budget Debate, he talked about that very problem. He talked about unemployment; he didn't talk about inflation as they did for four years, but he talked about the impact that joblessness was having on the citizens of this province individually and collectively through social violence which is being impacted on every facet of society.

We, in fact, have addressed the first point of their plan. We agree that joblessness, unemployment, rather than inflation is a problem that must be confronted today and we are confronting it, \$200 million worth of job creation measures outlined in the Budget - not all of them new - but enough of them new to provide an impetus to society to get this economy going again and let it make its way through the worst sufferings of the economic storm which confronts all of us. We know, we understand that joblessness is the problem.

Secondly, the Catholic Bishops said, "An industrial strategy should be developed to create permanent and meaningful jobs for people in local communities. Strategy should be designed to both national and regional levels if it is to be effective."

An industrial strategy, where have you heard those words before, Mr. Speaker? From which party have you heard that very same phrase spoken about time and time again? At the federal level they have implored, they have asked, they have demanded that the Federal Government put in place an industrial strategy at the federal level that will encourage and enable this country to come out of the economic storm. It's the New Democratic Party that has put that proposal forward historically and will continue to do so.

The Catholic Bishops say in their third point that a more balanced and equitable program should be developed for reducing and stemming the rate of inflation. What do they attack? They attack wage controls. What government, what party in opposition, what Federal Government has undertaken that very same attack on wage controls because they are inequitable and they don't work? A New Democratic Party Government in opposition.

Fourth, the Catholic Bishops say, "Greater emphasis should be given to the goal of social responsibility in the current recession." They say that there should be special assistance for the unemployed, for welfare recipients, for the working poor and for one industry town suffering from plant shutdowns. And what did we talk about earlier? We talked about what this New Democratic Government did. This New Democratic Government in Thompson, Leaf Rapids and in other Northern communities did exactly that, put in place those types of programs which are designed to assist those workers in those communities during times when the plant is shut down.

Fifth, the Catholic Bishops asked that labour unions should be asked to play a more decisive and responsible role in developing strategies for economic recovery in employment.

Well, we've followed them pretty close up to this point, Mr. Speaker, but here we go beyond them. We didn't only ask the labour unions which have a role to play but we asked business, small and large, to come to the table with us at the Economic Summit to discuss these varied types of problems. We said, let us all work together towards a common goal and objective. Let us recognize that we have differences in approach, but let us also recognize that we have commonalities upon which we can build.

So we have gone the Catholic Bishops one further in that respect, but I'm certain if we were to suggest to them that they should include in that statement the type of activity which was undertaken as a result of the Economic Summit that they would treat that suggestion with due consideration.

### (Lights went out in Chamber)

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** This is the warning.

**MR. J. JOHNSTON:** You should be struck by lightning.

**HON. J. COWAN:** No, for the Member for Sturgeon Creek who has just acknowledged that the lights went out, this is not lightning. Lightning is when there is a bright light. This is darkness and it probably descended from that side first and moved its way over.

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Fortunately, Sir, I'm at the end of the six-point plan. One more point which the Catholic Bishops had to make, and I would implore upon them if they have any sort of influence over matters like this, if they would exercise it at this time because their print is very small and difficult to read in darkness. However, the truth shines forward from this paper and I will proceed.

Furthermore they say, the sixth point, "All peoples of goodwill in local and regional communities throughout the country must be encouraged to co-ordinate their efforts to develop and implement such strategies." See, already they've taken our advice in the Economic Summit. They said, "All peoples of goodwill," and that's what we did. We brought forward business people of goodwill; labour people of goodwill; Natives of goodwill; fishermen of goodwill; the farmers of goodwill. We said, look, let us work together to develop an economic strategy which will enable us to rise from the economic circumstances of the day and that is what we have done in the Budget.

So rather than, like the members opposite, condemn this Budget as they have condemned almost everything else that has been positive and productive, I would commend the Budget to you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask only that those who have the opportunity reflect upon it in an honest and sincere way, and they will have to acknowledge that indeed these are difficult times. They will have to acknowledge that the problems which confront any government at any level are difficult problems; they will have to acknowledge that we have a hard path ahead of us. But I think if they are sincere

and they are honest in their analytical efforts, they will have to acknowledge as well that this creative and comprehensive Budget goes a very long way towards bringing us out of the darkness, Mr. Speaker, and into better days when all people of this province shall prosper and all people of this province shall be given a fair opportunity to participate; that all people in this province will no longer have to fear the plague of unemployment; that all people in this province will be able to achieve dignity and self-worth through the honest efforts; that all people in this province will be able to provide their input into the provincial economy in such a way so that we all shall move forward. Sir, I know you want to move forward with them and I only ask that the Conservative members opposite put aside their ideological blinkers and their constant complaining, criticizing and carping and and decide to move forward with all of us.

Thank you.

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

**A MEMBER:** Call it 5:30.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Well, if you're agreed, we'll call it 5:30.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We're agreed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If it's the will of the House to call it 5:30, the debate will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Agreed)

Accordingly, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).