

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 29 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs have a statement to make?

HON. EUGENE KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks): I would like to table a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House on several program announcements related to the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement Program. At noon today, I participated in a media conference with the Deputy Mayor for the City of Winnipeg and the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration. At the conference it was announced that Air Canada is to build a \$30 million structure in the Winnipeg Core area. The building will be located on the north side of Portage Avenue, north of the public lane and the block bounded by Carlton Street, Ellice, Hargrave and Portage Avenue. The province welcomes this announcement and the participation of Air Canada in the Core Area Agreement program. We are confident that it will contribute many new jobs in our construction industry and, as well, provide employment opportunities for Core area residents. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to working with Air Canada to ensure that maximum benefits are derived by residents of the core area through these new job opportunities.

The Policy Committee for the Core Area Agreement believes that the decision of Air Canada to locate in the core area on the north side of Portage will contribute new employment opportunities in related industries. The Air Canada Building can be a stimulus for the construction of other commercial and residential developments thereby revitalizing the core area.

The parties to the Core Area Agreement have agreed to facilitate the Air Canada project by assembling the land required. In addition, the north of Portage park already initiated under the Core Area Agreement will be extended one-half block east of Carlton Street and will afford full exposure of the Air Canada Building to Portage Avenue.

All privately owned properties required for the Air Canada and park extension projects are being expropriated by the Province of Manitoba acting on behalf of the parties to the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement. Air Canada will contribute \$3.5 million for its site and the net cost to the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement for the park extension, is estimated

at \$1.8 million.

The second announcement today is the appointment of Mr. Larry Boland of Toronto as the General Manager of the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement. The Policy Committee is confident that Mr. Boland who has wide-ranging experience in urban development projects will contribute significant leadership in realizing the goals of the Core Area Initiatives Program.

Mr. Boland has been involved in numerous urban development projects including co-operative housing projects; he has coordinated neighbourhood improvement projects and so has gained considerable expertise in working with various levels of government and public interest groups. We believe that his background suits him well to the task of General Manager.

Members of the House will appreciate that one of the major goals of the Core Area Initiatives Program is the creation of new job opportunities for core area residents. Since assuming office some four months ago, we have been examining programs under the Core Area Initiative and I am pleased to report today, Mr. Speaker, that there have been changes to the agreement which will result in greater emphasis on employment and training opportunities.

As a result of discussions with our partners, we announced last week four major authorizations for the Core Area Initiatives. The total expenditures of these programs all dealing with employment and training will be \$9.5 million. They include \$1 million for a Community Response Program; \$4.4 million towards establishing a training and employment agency to be administered by the Department of Education; \$1.9 million for an education development institute; some \$2 million for an Inner City Social Work Program, an additional \$115,000 for the first year of an Inner City Nursing Program.

Mr. Speaker, we have developed further proposals to enhance and strengthen the employment and training component of the Core Area Initiative Program. These proposals will be presented to our partners in the agreement and we look forward to their implementation.

Mr. Speaker, these developments represent significant progress in bringing the Core Area Initiative Program to the people of the core area. Now with their General Manager appointed and these major program initiatives launched, we said that the Winnipeg Core Area Initiatives Program is indeed moving ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to the development of an effective Core Area Program which will enhance and revitalize Winnipeg in a meaningful way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, may I say that we welcome the announcements made today by the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. We are delighted that significant process is now being made on the Tri-Level Core Area Agreement which, of course, our government was an integral part in the establishment of such a program. We're delighted to hear that a significant

employer, Air Canada, will be locating in the Core area as part of this overall establishment and will result in jobs and infusion of people in the Core area so that the entire program may revolve around a number of significant major enterprises such as its locating there.

We are, as well, pleased to hear of the appointment of a General Manager, Mr. Boland, who is not known to us, appears to be qualified to carry on the major works involved in the Core Area Agreement. We know that this will be central to the making of good progress in future to have a well-qualified person established as the general manager in this program.

We, as well, are pleased to hear of other initiatives that were announced by the provincial government. Of course, the establishment of a training component and the involvement of the Department of Education was part of the initial plans as announced by our government in the past. We know, as well, that the various other ancillary agencies that will be established there will contribute towards continuing employment and development with respect to all of the initiatives and all of the objectives of the Core Area Agreement. So, with those few remarks we welcome the announcements made today by the Minister for Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 1980-81 report for Channel Area Loggers Limited; and the 1980-81 report for Moose Lake Loggers Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return under Section 20 of the Public Officers Act covering the period March 1, 1981 to March 1, 1982; and a Return under Section 30.2 of the Law Society Act covering the period ending March 31, 1981.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain

MR. A BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Will the Minister advise the House as to what progress is being made on the establishment of the \$640 million potash mine and refinery in western Manitoba?

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

HON. WILSON D. PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between the provincial officials and officials with IMC and the discussions will, in fact, be continuing over the course of

the next few months.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of outstanding items remaining to be resolved which were set out in the Memorandum of Understanding which was entered into last May by the previous government.

Can the Minister advise what progress has been made towards resolving those outstanding issues contained in the Interim Agreement?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I must say that there was no progress by the past government; there was no progress realized in trying to work out those outstanding problems that existed between the then Government of Manitoba and IMC. Indeed, as late as the actual period of the election campaign, the government advisers were sending in letters pointing out some very major concerns with respect to those negotiations; those major concerns were put forward to IMC.

We are hoping that discussions over the course of the next months we'll, in fact, be able to deal with those concerns that were considered to be significant then by the staff negotiating team and the advisers to the government and which we indeed consider to be just as significant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister maintains that very little progress was being made by the previous government, can the Minister advise the House whether he has personally met with representatives of IMC in an effort to further items mentioned in the Memorandum of Understanding?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have not personally met with them. The matters raised were raised by, I think, some very senior advisers to the Conservative Government and the Conservative Party, I might add. Those were concerns which I felt would best be put forward as a continuation of the concerns put forward — I assume they were real concerns by the previous government — and indeed I felt that since there had been some attempts in the past to possibly bypass the negotiating process by dealing with the politicians, it was best to let the negotiating process proceed whereby those concerns could be put forward in exactly the same way as they had been put forward before.

They are very major concerns, as I am sure the previous government must have realized. That was one of the reasons why no agreement was in fact reached of a final nature. Those are the same concerns that we are pursuing, Mr. Speaker.

I must say that without revealing the concerns and trying to undermine or jeopardize the negotiations, which I think would be wrong for the long-term interest of Manitoba, I do believe that the previous government thought those concerns to be very real and significant. We, as well, feel that they are very real and significant. We, as well, feel that they are very real and significant. Hopefully, they can be overcome, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we are trying to pursue over the course of the next while.

They are very major concerns that, in fact, arose when there was some changes with respect to the

drafting procedure; when indeed the government quit drafting the agreements and the company's legal firm took over the job of drafting the agreements. At that stage some very major concerns arose that still exist.

It is our intention to pursue the negotiations in a way to trying to deal with those, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we are doing. We are doing what I think the previous government would have done and certainly the negotiating team is proceeding in generally the same way that it was before.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Minister that we would not be stalling this agreement in the manner that he is stalling it.

Can the Minister advise the House how often his negotiating team has met with International Mineral and Chemical Corporation in the four months since they have formed the government?

MR. PARASIUK: We have indeed, they have met once. There have, indeed, been exchanges of communication between the government team and I must say that if one wants to go through all the correspondence and all the material, one could show, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations were not proceeding well, that there were difficulties of a major type.

Mr. Speaker, we think we should try and resolve those difficulties, rather than try to raise them out in a public manner. The negotiations and discussions with IMC are indeed proceeding, Mr. Speaker, they are proceeding in the same manner that they were proceeding before. I think we will probably end up if they, in fact, proceed and if the project proceeds, with a much fairer deal for Manitoba because we don't feel anxious because of a supposedly impending election, to possibly retreat from fair positions for Manitobans.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, no one ever said that a \$640 million potash mine could be established without difficult negotiations and without encountering some problems. Those problems are not going to be solved if the Minister isn't going to involve himself and his officials won't meet more than once in four months that they have been in office.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister, is the Memorandum of Understanding with IMC still in effect?

MR. PARASIUK: The Memorandum of Understanding was extended, I believe, on October 30th for a period to December 15th; that memorandum has expired as of December 15th, 1981.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the House then, whether or not IMC has any different standing in the eyes of the government now with respect to the development of a potash mine, than any other potash company that they might be dealing with including the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we indeed have said to IMC that they have spent some time in Manitoba; we expect that our dealings with them are major dealings and that we are treating them courteously in this process of negotiation; we believe that, having spent the time to date, that they have a very good opportunity of pursuing these discussions to a fruitful culmination,

Mr. Speaker.

I must point out to the member that the potash market, indeed, has grown extremely soft over the last six months, that there are lay-offs in Saskatchewan, that there have been postponements of projects and that might be one of the reasons why various people are, in a sense, slowing down this process and not setting up any artificial deadlines as to when projects might begin.

The discussions, as I said, are continuing with IMC. We certainly feel that we will be proceeding with those discussions in good faith, Mr. Speaker, and we certainly don't want to undermine them in any way, shape or form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House how many applications have been received and how many have been approved for the Small Business Assistance Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. MURIEL A. SMITH (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the total is over 500 of applications that have been received but none will be officially approved until the program goes through this House.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the case of the Rural Small Enterprise Incentive Program that was programmed between the Federal and Provincial Governments there was a specific brochure put out on that program that explained all the details regarding the eligibility, etc. I questioned the Minister last week regarding the details of eligibility. Can the Minister advise the House whether there is a pamphlet like this available or will there be one available very shortly?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there are such pamphlets available and I'll ensure that the member opposite receives one.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the Minister is, in the Enterprise Development Program we used private sector boards in three areas throughout this province to advise us and give recommendations on applications. The applications went to a private member board; the application was then sent in to have discussion between the Federal-Provincial Government Board; and then it had final approval by the Minister. Will the Minister be using the private sector boards to advise her on what applications should qualify or not?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there will be a Board named of five people, all of whom will come from the private sector. The applications will go through an initial filtering by staff people and the Board will then have the right to ratify their recommendations, open up any new questions that they wish to, and also they

will be empowered to hear appeals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone:

MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. How many cheques have been sent out to help the farmers who are suffering from high interest rates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, my hope is that all those who have applied would be eligible, but I can't say that; there are certainly approximately 400 that are in the process of being approved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Housing. How many cheques have been sent out to help homeowners who are in danger of losing their homes because of high interest rates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks a very facetious question because she knows that I advised the House late last week that the forms had been received and were being sent out; forms for people to apply for this. So to ask a question "when are the cheques going to be mailed out or how many have been mailed out" is just being facetious, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the welfare of people who are in danger of losing their homes to high interest rates and who had promises made to them by these people before they were in government is not a facetious question. The Member for Kirkfield Park asked a very direct question, I believe she is entitled to a direct answer and not to have her motives maligned by the Member responsible for the Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of this year's light snowfall and shortage of runoff water to fill the dugouts for the farmers, is the Minister continuing the program to help supply pumps to assist the farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice but I do believe that pumps are available to assist farmers; but the actual cost of filling, I will have to take that question as notice.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I wonder can the Minister advise the House how many of the applications, of the 500-or-so applications, for abandoned railway right-of-way have been approved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice, I don't believe it's under my area but I'll take it as notice.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a supplementary question then of this Minister or the Minister of Highways, can either of the Ministers advise these 500 applicants why the provisions of their applications have been stalled since November?

Mr. Speaker, then I'll ask another question and see if I can get an answer. I wonder can either Minister assure these applicants that their claims will be approved before seeding starts this spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, a week ago I replied to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, and I would hope that the two get together once in a while, I would suggest that they do to pass on the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister, the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation. I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the former NDP for Radisson, one Harry Shafransky, has been hired as a special assistant to his department with a salary in excess of \$32,000.00?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I can confirm that the person has been employed but at a much lower rate than what the member alludes to and much lower than the previous Minister of Highways paid his special assistants.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, I wonder if he could advise this House just what the salary is and also what the duties of his special assistant will be?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that's a question that is proper during the course of Estimates Review which is just around the corner but I don't mind telling the honourable member that it's in the \$20,000-\$30,000 range.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, just as a final supplementary question. At least it is encouraging to this side of the House to see some significant signs of relief to the small businessman in the hiring of this one. I wonder if he could advise us the term of employment that Mr. Shafranski will be employed and the Order-in-Council that he would apparently sign was for \$32,249 in salary.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the honourable member that he get a better research director because his information is incorrect; and secondly, that he ought to know that all of these appointments are at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, with their administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could advise the House if his government has formulated a policy with respect to outside audits of Crown Corporations being carried on by outside auditors, that is outside auditors in practice in Manitoba, who then report their findings to the Provincial Auditor and he, in turn, reports them to the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, let me advise the Leader of the Opposition that the overall policy pertaining to outside auditors is presently under review as to, indeed, whether we should continue with the use of private outside auditors in various instances or whether there should be a change to the original format which involved the Provincial Auditor doing the auditing in the province.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the response of the First Minister that the former practice was that the Provincial Auditor would do all of the auditing with in-House auditors paid for out of the public purse and on full-time staff with pension benefits and all of the things that accrue. Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister not confirm that until 1970 or thereabouts, all of the audits of Crown corporations from the beginning of time, so far as I'm aware in Manitoba, were done by outside auditors in Manitoba. It was only the Schreyer administration that made that change and that our administration changed it back, our administration changed it back in the interests of economy and in the interests of good audit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the dates that the Leader of the Opposition outlined are basically correct that the change did take place in 1970 and I believe that the

then Schreyer government indeed made a change that was sound and was in the public interest. In 1978, I believe it was 1978, the then Leader of the Opposition while he was Premier made a change back to having all audits done through private accounting firms. Mr. Speaker, it was our opinion at that time and we are presently evaluating that indeed, rather than as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, the practice adopted by the Leader of the Opposition while he was Premier, was more economical that indeed it may very well have been the very reverse and indeed there may have been a great deal of additional costs to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba because of that change that took place in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I am not as concerned whether the audit is done in a public form or the private form, but as to what is the cost benefit in relationship to Manitobans. That appears not to have been, that appears, Mr. Speaker, not to have been the main concern in 1978 when there was a change in policy, but we're prepared to look at this very very carefully as to indeed which route serves the public interest rather than any sectional interest.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister confirm that the alleged savings that he foresees for the change of auditing from downtown firms would cause the same amount of savings for the taxpayer as his colleague is bringing about by charging an extra \$1.5 million for security guards by putting them on full-time staff as well?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll recheck Hansard, but when I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that there was a thorough review as to cost benefit indeed, if there is a savings, then there will be changes overall. There is a review and I understand it's presently before the Treasury Board in this connection.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister has said that this matter is being reviewed and that no decision has been made, could he kindly then explain why it was that his Cabinet at a meeting that took place on the 23rd March 1982, passed Order-and-Council No. 335/82 under the Departments of Finance and Attorney-General terminating the appointment of Abbot, Harrison and Company as auditors of the Liquor Control Commission and appointing the provincial auditor as the auditor of the Commission.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we would have been very very unwise in that instance not to have followed the advice of the provincial auditor that indeed he could do the work involving the Liquor Control Commission without I understand, additional staff, without additional costs so why would we have insisted for doctrinaire reasons that the Leader of the Opposition would appear to have liked us to have pursued to have continued to employ a private firm when all that indeed could be done in-House without additional costs, without additional staff.

MR. LYON: Well then, Mr. Speaker, could the First Minister then tell us whether this policy is in fact as he said at the outset under review, or whether in fact his

government has predetermined that it's going to fire all of the private auditors who were doing the Crown corporation auditing?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I really don't understand the inference of the Leader of the Opposition's question because it is my understanding that the auditors were appointed — I may be corrected in this — but I seem to recall they were appointed without tender, without tender to the community at large; that certain firms were appointed simply at the will of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I'm not quarrelling with the honourable members across the way, but I think that they should be very careful when they talk about firing and their suggestion that indeed the non-appointment of certain firms that were appointed without tender should be interpreted as firing, that indeed that would be, I think, questioned by the people of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we are doing a review and that review I am satisfied will be done on the basis of what is most cost-benefit efficient to the people of the Province of Manitoba. If indeed it is more cost-benefit to carry on with private auditing firms, I would think that we would not quarrel with that, but we will not unlike the members across the way, because of doctrinal obsessions, continue to proceed in a route that would cost the taxpayers of the province more money.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, having heard the First Minister in his best Pecksniffian way, talk about doctrinal reasons for hiring auditors, talk about tendering for auditors, and so on — "Pecksniff," for the benefit of the press, was a great Dickens character, well-known, Mr. Speaker, for his hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, can my honourable friend, having put to one side all of the nonsense about doctrinal reasons, and all of the nonsense about tendering, can he tell the House, Mr. Speaker, why the practice that was followed from the beginning of this province in about 1870, of having outside auditors do audits to help the provincial auditor, what all of a sudden has he found to be wrong with that practice that has obtained in this province in all but eight years when the Socialists were in office?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition refers to the Socialists having changed the policy in 1970. We did change the policy in 1970, and we changed that policy because it was in the public interest at that point as a result of analysis to undertake the change. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, while Premier in 1978, decided to change the policy back to the historic policy in the Province of Manitoba. It was our view that indeed the policy in 1970 was in the public interest, that indeed economies could be arrived at. It was our view in 1978 as I recall — and I believe that there was plenty of data to support our position in 1978 — that the reverting back to the pre-1970 policy was costing the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba — what was it? — (Interjection) — it was costing hundreds of thousands of dollars of additional money and we questioned that in 1978. We would be less than responsible, Mr. Speaker, in view of the information that we'd received in 1978, if we did not in the interests of Manitoba taxpayers review

that policy in 1982.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, understanding that the Honourable, the First Minister said, a few minutes ago, that they were reviewing the policy, could he explain to the House and to the people of Manitoba how that review has already resulted in the firing of one of the outside auditors for the Liquor Control Commission?

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

MR. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge): That question was asked in almost the identical terms just a few moments ago. It may be that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't hear or doesn't want to hear, but question period is not cross-examination, and once it turns into a species of cross-examination, which appears to be the only way the Leader of the Opposition can operate, it is no longer question period. That is definitely out of order, and I ask you to so find.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not so familiar as the honourable gentleman with cross-examination procedures, but I notice that the Honourable Minister was standing up to reply to the question; I think he should be allowed to.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm not sure if the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the same firm that he made reference to in an earlier question or whether he's referring to a different firm. I did respond in connection with a question involving the Liquor Control Commission and if, indeed, the Leader of the Opposition is again referring to that particular firm, I think my answer was very clear. The information that we received from the public auditor that that work could be done in-House, without additional staff, without additional costs and obviously, as a result, at savings to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation. Has the Government of Manitoba developed, or is it contemplating developing a schedule of rural meetings, the locations at which the Crow rate issue will be discussed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, last week, I don't know if the honourable member was here when I did announce that we will be undertaking a public forum position on the issue which may take two or three different options into account - one of which may be that very option - but we haven't concluded that one; we haven't made a final decision on that point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MANNES: If the government decides to go ahead with public hearings will the Minister furnish that information, that schedule, and will he table it

immediately on finalization of that schedule?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, whenever we make that decision, yes, it will be so announced. We are making information available to all people, on request. What has not yet been decided is whether or not the government itself will sponsor a series of rural meetings, but we are making the information available and we are making ourselves available to respond to groups who request that we attend at those functions, but beyond that we have not decided, Sir.

MR. MANNESS: Can the Minister tell the House what the average cost per bushel to the farmer in Manitoba of transporting Manitoba wheat to the Lakehead is?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly sure that I can be precise but it's in the neighborhood of 15 cents.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister Responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. In view of the fact that last week he indicated that he, and his department, would be intervening on behalf of Westman Media Co-op's application for license renewal before the CRTC, my question is, will the intervention include support of the interim use of satellite dishes for the receipt of U.S. SatCom signals, as is presently being delivered by Westman Media Co-op to several communities in western Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. LEN EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, that certainly is implied in our general support of Westman Media Co-op. That organization has done an excellent job in western Manitoba in distributing cable service, and certainly we would want to see it have its license renewed so it can continue to do that excellent job. In the interim, it has made certain arrangements which the honourable member is familiar with, having been a former Minister with that type of responsibility, so we definitely support Westman Media Co-op in its application for renewal of its licenses, implying as it does, an interim situation, which surely is the better situation, the best situation that we can have, given the circumstances that we're dealing with.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the government intends to intervene and support the interim use of satellite dishes for the receipt of U.S. SatCom signals in western Manitoba, could the Minister indicate whether the signals being provided to Westman Media Co-op, via U.S. SatCom satellite, are the same as those being provided to the residents of Flin Flon and Thompson?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member know full well that a SatCom package is a SatCom package, and whoever receives that particular package will generally transmit those signals. It's rather

interesting, Mr. Speaker, that many of the communities who are getting the SatCom package on this interim basis, including many in southwestern Manitoba, seem to be very unhappy with the SatCom package and would prefer the so-called Three-plus-one; namely, the three American networks, plus Public Broadcasting System, and I believe the people in Dauphin have been making those views particularly known and, indeed, people of Boissevain, I believe, and some other communities in western Manitoba. My information is that within a year or so the Cancom satellite, the Canadian Satellite Company, will be able to deliver the Three-plus-one package, and therefore, I refer to this situation as interim, and I really believe the member understands that to be the case.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary then for the Minister. Can he confirm that the signals, which have been supplied by Westman Media Co-op, from the U.S. SatCom signal, provide the same channels to residents in the communities he mentioned in western Manitoba as the signals provided by the cable companies in Thompson and Flin Flon, those signals also being derived from U.S. SatCom signals, are the channels identical in the case of Westman Media Co-op customers, as they are in Flin Flon and Thompson?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, to be very clear on that and very certain, I will take the question as notice and check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the announcement that was made over the weekend by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to the effect that they would, for the first time in 50 years or more, be laying off all of their employees, with the exception of senior personnel, for a period of five weeks or more, in the Community of Flin Flon, can the First Minister advise the House as to what remedial actions or what other plans he and his government have under way for this unprecedented layoff?

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

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the layoff is unprecedented. This is the worse minerals market since the Depression; that is quite well-known in the industry, it's well-known I think, on the part of the public. We have undertaken a number of steps, Mr. Speaker, to work with mining companies, with workers, with communities affected in a way that frankly wasn't done by the previous government. In 1977 when INCO just after the 1977 election laid off a number of people in Thompson, Mr. Speaker, without the previous government doing one thing, we — in fact, the Leader of the Opposition could never remember how many people were laid off in Thompson — could never remember the fact that the population of Thompson had declined tremendously during the Conservative term in office but we have set up joint consultative committees with the mining company, the workers,

the union, the community in the case of Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, we've had discussions with Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting, Mr. Speaker.

At our suggestion and our recommendation to the Mines Ministers, the National Mine Ministers' Conference, a special committee has been established that is co-chaired by the Federal Department and Manitoba with all of the provinces participating, with worker representatives participating, with representatives from the mining industry participating in this and what we are looking at, Mr. Speaker, is a way in which we can try and develop longer term programs to deal with the fairly deep recession that we are in right now and the impact that these types of layoffs have on single enterprise communities. We are looking at this matter as a very critical short-term matter, but we also acknowledge that these types of shutdowns are of a long-term concern.

We've had a shutdown or a complete close out at Uranium City. We had one in the past in Bissett. So we in fact are attempting to work out these problems; we anticipate them; we know that we are in a very difficult recessionary cycle. Rather than turning our backs on those programs, Mr. Speaker, and pulling out a lot of public money and putting it into paid ads telling everyone that they're living on a gold mine, we are facing reality and we are trying to deal with it in a very effective way rather than trying to sweep the problems under the carpet the way the previous government tried to.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, referring the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines to that document of promises on which he and his government were elected — A Message from Howard Pawley and the Clear Choice for Manitobans — referring him to the section on working people, would the Minister mind telling us how he is keeping the promise of the New Democratic Party to the people of Manitoba made as recently as last November that the Manitoba NDP believes working people deserve job security in a workplace that poses no threat to their health or safety? Would he mind telling us how he and his government are providing that job security in the light of the announcement over the weekend which is only one of a number that we have heard since he came into office?

MR. PARASIUK: It is partly because we have had discussions with Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and we are indeed I think having a five week layoff. This is not a close-out of jobs, Mr. Speaker. We expressed concern with Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, with Inco and with Sherritt-Gordon, that is very important from the government's point of view, from the company's point of view and from the community's point of view when you are faced with this type of very deep cycle, lack of demand for minerals, that the companies don't take a shortsighted approach, lay off people indefinitely, lose them and then have to face the massive problem of very high turnovers within their communities, unstable work forces, but rather what we were looking at when we asked them to join with us.

We've asked other governments to join with us in looking at this problem of trying to develop long-term

stability. That's one of the reasons why we established that committee, Mr. Speaker. We are indeed going to deal systematically with those types of commitments that we made in the past, Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous government that says that governments shouldn't pay any attention to those particular problems, that the best government is the least government, a government that doesn't care, Mr. Speaker. We care; we are dealing with those problems. We have only been in for three-and-a-half months and we have the Conservative Party moaning and groaning and whining like a bunch of losers because in four years they couldn't deal with anything and in three-and-a-half months we've done a lot more than they have.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call on Second Reading Bill No. 8, The Loan Act?

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 8 - THE LOAN ACT, 1982

MR. SCHROEDER presented Bill No. 8, an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the same. (The Loan Act, 1982) for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is intended to provide borrowing and expenditure authority urgently required for the new fiscal year beginning April 1st for specific nonbudgetary self-sustaining Capital programs. These requirements are in addition to the normal Capital Estimates for self-sustaining purposes which will be tabled later in the Session. Capital authority is needed immediately to provide for the loan portion of the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Programs, additional loan authority for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and funding required by Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited to maintain the province's interest in the Trout Lake Mine being developed near Flin Flon. Due to the urgent nature of these requirements, it is important that this Bill be approved prior to April 1st.

This Bill is similar to previous Loan Acts except for the inclusion of a section on the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Programs. This Bill also provides for a loan guarantee in support of the loan portion of the Hog Income Insurance Program which had been announced by the previous administration. When the Bill reaches the committee stage, I can provide a section by section comparison and explanation for the information of members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Capital Supply Bill because it has a fairly major impact on the agriculture community. I as well feel that the Interest Relief Program and the promises made by the individuals who now are holding the trust or the funds in trust for the people of Manitoba should be accountable for the use of those funds. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat alarmed. I have to say that we have seen over the past few months the new Minister of Agriculture in office as taking the sit and see approach, or the sit and review approach, at a particular time when the agriculture community is undergoing a severe economic downturn as far as the returns that they're receiving, when all those businesses, Mr. Speaker, in the smaller towns and communities are hurting and are losing money because of a loss of business when the farm community has a downturn. It certainly has fallen on the heels of an election that this particular government came into office when they promised and I will again go over some of those promises that are written down in an NDP handout which was a guarantee from the First Minister when in fact there were some - I would call them pretty blatant - untruths in them, one particularly, dealing with the number of hog producers that had left production, Mr. Speaker, that figure can be challenged and I will take an opportunity in the near future to challenge him. But I would like to deal a little more specifically with two or three of the other items.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to introduce an emergency action to provide interest rate relief to the farmers of Manitoba and in this capital supply bill, Mr. Speaker, we see \$9 million. Well, let's put \$9 million, Mr. Speaker, into perspective. What that would do, not only for the farm community that it's supposed to support — and remember there are some 30,000 farmers that are all feeling the pressure of high interest rates — we've got a total small business community which I think the majority of businesses in Manitoba, some 70 percent of them are some people involved in small business; and we have all the homeowners in the Province of Manitoba who have mortgages who are supposed to qualify, or if they qualify will also have a drain on the \$9 million.

Mr. Speaker, \$9 million to the people of Manitoba, that's \$9.00 for every man, woman and child. If you were today to go out to the people of Manitoba and say to every one of them, whether you're a farmer, a small businessman or a homeowner, I think that pretty well every person in Manitoba is affected by high interest rates. So to put it into perspective what the NDP government are offering to the people of Manitoba, to all the people of Manitoba under an emergency Interest Rate Relief Program is \$9.00. Mr. Speaker, what is \$9.00 going to do to anyone who is facing an emergency payment on their home or a problem with high interest rates, and we know we're all facing that?

Mr. Speaker, \$9.00 to an individual who is farming today is an insult, if they were talking about supporting the price of wheat to \$9.00 a bushel, might have more realistic meaning or if they were supporting the price of the beef producer to some 90¢ a pound, Mr. Speaker, but no we've got \$9 million for the people of

Manitoba to help them against high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, how could this government go to the people of Manitoba and say they are going to help them with interest rate relief? Well, the Minister of Finance says, I don't understand. Well maybe I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, but let the Minister of Finance tell those 900 and some thousand people who aren't going to be able to be helped. —(Interjection)— well, that's even worse, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance says this is the loan portion. He's admitting now that there isn't a program for the people of Manitoba as far as an Interest Rate Relief Program. The First Minister, I really am amazed at him, I shouldn't be I know, but he stands before the people of Manitoba and he says, our financial policies are changed from those of the previous administration. They believe in high interest rates. We don't support high interest rates. We are going to help the people of Manitoba.

Tell the people of Manitoba that a \$9.00 bill is going to help them with high interest rates because that's what they're giving them, they're giving them \$9.00 a person to help every man, woman and child with the interest rates that they're facing. It won't wash, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin — and I'm pleased he's here because he always helps add to the debate — he says what did we do? I did something, Mr. Speaker, that that Minister of Agriculture cancelled, stopped for the people of Manitoba and if the member would take the time to read the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation Annual Report, it's right in there — for the members of the press I think there is some very interesting reading that is there as well — because it's on the record.

We introduced a program in July of 1978 and the record speaks for itself. Mr. Speaker, in fact even with the programs we put in place, helped more people at less government expense because on page No. 3 it says, "Under The Credit Corporation Act the government covers the corporation, administration and net interest costs. These costs were \$693 million in the year under review compared to \$1.15 million in the previous year. The decrease being mainly due to additional income derived from the sale of real estate." Selling those farms back to the people of Manitoba, help those farmers, Mr. Speaker, as well as help the costs of operating a government.

How much better kind of program, how much better kind of a policy should we have for this province? If you want to talk philosophy and how things work, Mr. Speaker, this report lays it out very well.

During the 1980-81 fiscal year the corporation's agricultural activities totalled some \$35.2 million an increase of 2.5 over the previous year. Mr. Speaker, the numbers speak for themselves. We used some \$35 million to loan to the farm people yes, Mr. Speaker, to loan to the farm people so they could own their farm operations and do those things best without government being involved in the ownership of their land and controlling leases or making them tenant farmers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the numbers of direct loans, we had some 405 loans direct in 1979-80 that increased to 430 loans in 1980-81. But there is more good information and I think when we talk about interest relief and support for the farm community

and the voting of funds, let's look when we go to that last year, or the total operation.

Young farmers — of the \$29.5 million approved in direct loans in 1980-81 some 74 percent were used for the purchase of land; 12 percent for the consolidation of debts; 7 percent for the permanent improvements to buildings and remaining 7 percent for livestock and other purposes. But here's a point that has to be made. Young farmers — remember this — were recipients of 98 percent of the proceeds of the Direct Loan Program; 98 percent of the program recipients were young farmers, the people that we all are supposed to be working towards the future generations in our agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, what has the Minister of Agriculture done? He has cancelled the program. He has stopped it. He has put a freeze on it. He's looking at it and reviewing it. Mr. Speaker, that isn't good enough for the people of Manitoba.

We are being asked today to support a capital bill of \$26 million for the Minister of Agriculture who hasn't got a policy or a program. He's like the Minister of Natural Resources. He wants a blank cheque from this Legislature, he wants a blank cheque from us to go and do what he wants with that money. He hasn't got a program. He hasn't got a policy and that's what we're supposed to accept, Mr. Speaker, as Legislators in this province? Putting in trust the people's money to a Minister who has stopped a program that has proved in the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation Report that it's helping farm people, Mr. Speaker, and he's stopped it.

Here's another paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and it's on page 6 of the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation Report because it's really important. The program — and this is an additional program that was introduced — Crown Land Loans, Mr. Speaker. The program was designed to provide mortgage money to lessees of Crown lands to purchase the lands that they had leased. It was just started, Mr. Speaker, last year.

The program, Mr. Speaker, which commenced during the current year has provided 21 loans for \$364,419, again using resources of the people; selling those resources to the farmers; getting the land into the hands of people to generate wealth for everyone. Again, Mr. Speaker, he has put a freeze on, not only the funding of that lease conversion from Crown lands to private ownership, he has cancelled the funding or stopped the funding for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, to support those individuals who are desirous of conversion, converting their lease land.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's good enough coming from a government who have in their election promise — we are going to introduce a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture — Mr. Speaker, they have cancelled every program that was in place to help young farmers and it's not good enough.

They're asking for \$26 million and they haven't laid a policy on the table. Four months they've been in office and what are they doing? They're looking and seeing or reviewing, Mr. Speaker, that's what they're saying up front. But behind the scenes they are firing, Mr. Speaker. They fired the Crown Lands Assessment

Review Board. What are they doing with these boards? They're firing them and that, as far as I'm concerned, is playing pretty dangerously with the mandate that was given to them. They're using the taxpayers' money to benefit their own political beliefs and not the betterment of all the people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the Minister of Agriculture should stand up and announce some of these programs that he's going to help these people of Manitoba with. He's the chairman, Mr. Speaker. He's the chairman of the Interest Relief Program. Well, let him stand up and say that we have \$9.00 for every man, woman and child in Manitoba; that he has a program under an Interest Rate Relief Program; he's got a \$9.00 bill for every man, woman and child in Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, that would deplete his \$9 million that he has put in place.

I should repeat, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members opposite some comments I made the other day because they're pretty important. In 1980 when we faced the drought conditions in this province we said to the farm community who were supporting the small businesses and the machine companies and all those people in rural Manitoba — because if you remember the mental attitude of the people when we were facing one of the worst droughts that this province had faced in some 50 to 100 years — we said we will put the money in place. You all qualify if you grown green feed or if you put in a crop to help the conditions of this province; to not lay the land barren or open for wind exposure; but if you plant a greed feed crop we will either pay you \$15.00 an acre or \$15.00 a ton. We didn't say you have to jump through a lot of bureaucratic hoops to get support. We said the money is there. We didn't use it all, Mr. Speaker, we didn't use it all; but we didn't restrict people from getting it.

Mr. Speaker, today I will challenge the Minister of Agriculture, I will challenge him right now that the majority of the farm community in Manitoba do not get one nickel of support under his Interest Rate Relief Program. I will challenge him, Mr. Speaker, that very few home owners get one nickel of support under his Interest Rate Relief Program and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that the small business people will think that he's a foolish person to introduce ever such a mickey-mouse program, and that's what it is.

He will go down in history as the Minister who introduced a mickey-mouse Interest Rate Relief Program because he's proving it, Mr. Speaker. He's only asking for \$9.00 for every man, woman and child in this province. How can he justify his position from an election promise, Mr. Speaker? It's an election promise that they're going to bring in an emergency action to provide interest rate assistance to farmers.

He cancelled the program, Mr. Speaker, under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and let us refer to that program because it's here. I'm not making this speech up, it is all factual, and you know me I give factual speeches and it's right on the mark.

Mr. Speaker, we have here — and I go back to that figure again — 98 percent of those people who received support were young farmers. We have the program that was in place that helped people who were starting farming because it was the interest they

were having one of the most difficult times with — were the high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister asks how much? Every farmer that went through the MACC Direct Loan Program received a 4 percent — remember this — a 4 percent reduction on their loan up to \$50,000, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Minister says he hasn't done away with it. He has, he has frozen that program. He's not lending any money for it. It's gone like the Crown Lands Sale Program, it's gone, Mr. Speaker, it's gone.

We are today being asked to vote funds, \$26 million to a Minister who hasn't got a policy or program on the table. He hasn't announced a policy. — (Interjection)— Same thing, that's right. He wants us to give him \$26 million so he can do what, Mr. Speaker, and he won't come clean? He wants to go back out and buy the farmland. He wants to restart a state farm program.

Mr. Speaker, again if you read the MACC agricultural report it tells you how successful and how many people liked that program. How many people like it? I'll tell you how successful it was. Over two-thirds of the farmers that had the option they bought some 586 properties when they were in office. When they were in office for eight years, Mr. Speaker, they bought some 586 farms. Thank god they didn't buy any more. They bought 586 farms and by the end of March in 1981 — and this is important — two-thirds of those people have opted to purchase their land, two-thirds. Almost 400 had decided to buy their own land.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we're giving him \$26 million for. I'm afraid that that's what he's doing because he's not telling us; he's not laying it on the table; he's not coming clean; the same as he's not coming clean about a Beef Income Assurance Program or a Beef Support Program. He's saying, we're going to meet with the farmers, Mr. Speaker, we're going to meet with the cattle producers.

The first thing he did was again fire the committee that was in place to make recommendations on the kind of a program that was in the beef industry's best interest but he fired them, Mr. Speaker. He fired them. Cold-blooded firing that same as he did to the Crown Lands Appeal Board and they, Mr. Speaker, sit there as a nice, nice government who don't do those kind of things, they're just not up to that kind of tactics. Well, I see we have the Minister of Health here.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in this province one of the biggest breakdowns in the relationship between doctors, between patients and between government and how long did it take them to screw it up? Four months, Mr. Speaker, four months. Our Minister of Health worked very well with the people and we had the best health care in this province but it only took him four months to have everybody fighting because they work better under the confrontation system, Mr. Speaker, and not the consultation system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member. I wonder if members would keep the noise level down and they will enjoy the same remarks as the Chair I'm sure.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will try and speak a little louder although it may be difficult. I appreciate your concern and I do think that these are points well

worth the government listening to because again, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a lot of broken election promises, a lot of broken election promises. They, Mr. Speaker, continually say they're introducing programs to help young farmers. All they have done to this point, Mr. Speaker, is eliminate a program that has been helping young farmers and I'll go back to it again, because it's pretty good reading. — (Interjection)— It is. It's pretty good reading. He tabled it, Mr. Speaker, he tabled it. They were our programs and they're in print. I didn't make this up. This came from a very very neutral board and organization. They're laughing, Mr. Speaker, about a program that helped some 430 farmers last year. Mr. Speaker, we helped more in one year than he's going to help in his four years in office. He, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, will be the Minister for introducing the Mickey Mouse programs for the people of this province.

Well, for the Minister of Finance, you know, to be bringing in a Bill where he's going to offer each Manitoban nine dollars — that's what it works out to — \$9 million — (Interjection)— well, he says I can't read, well I see a Bill here before me, an Emergency Interest Rate Relief program for \$9 million. There are approximately a million people in Manitoba, God bless them, and they're leaving everyday under this administration. They're losing their jobs, Mr. Speaker, everyday. I'm sure the Member for Flin Flon is afraid to go home for fear his job isn't there, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important again to go back to some of the facts that I have laid on the table. Mr. Speaker, it's time to go back to the report that I was reading from and it's documented and I stand here, very proud of an organization that operated under my administration or our administration when I was the Minister responsible for that program. What have we seen, Mr. Speaker? We've seen the Minister of Agriculture who has done nothing, absolutely nothing. I can't believe it, four months that he said we're going to sit down and review. We're going to wait and see. Well, Mr. Speaker, what are the farm people doing right now? They're wondering how they're going to service their operating loans from last year, let alone paying for this year, Mr. Speaker, and they thought over the normal winter months that they would have sold enough grain at a decent return to pay off those loans. They're faced with planting a crop, Mr. Speaker. The beef producers of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, — and I talked to a lot of them over the last few weeks — they're waiting for the Minister of Agriculture to announce a program. They're committed, Mr. Speaker, committed people. — (Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin happens to want to give a speech. I wish he would get up and speak, other than from the seat of his pants sitting there as a mouthpiece from his chair. Mr. Speaker, he says my speeches are all over the place. Well, I'm at least up giving a speech, Mr. Speaker. I'm at least up talking about some of the issues that are facing the people of Manitoba and particularly the farm community.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll touch briefly on the other programs that the Minister hasn't introduced and again we'll go back and I'll try and justify for . . . Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture says, let's talk about the Crow rate. I'm quite prepared to debate the

Crow rate under the resolution that he is bringing in. Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to talk about the whole issue of grain transportation and Crow rate. Mr. Speaker, I can go back again to tell the Minister of Agriculture some of the things we did in Grain Handling and Transportation and I'm glad he's reminded me of it.

Mr. Speaker, when he's fighting with the Federal Government over issues, we had the Federal Government come to Manitoba and discuss with all the people in the grain industry the difficulties we were facing because half the supplies of grain, Mr. Speaker, were sitting on the farms in Manitoba and our Premier, who knows what's going on in the province more than the man who sits in that chair today said to the First Minister of the province and all the other premiers in November of 1979, at a meeting in Ottawa — for the new members here, it's interesting history and it's an important one because it got the whole ball rolling. He said, if you want to help the economy of Canada, move the grain off the prairies. No, he didn't say, get rid of the Crow. In fact, he said the very opposite. He said, we have to deal with the issue. We have to deal with the issue that's before us and can help our economy. And yes, Mr. Speaker, we organized a meeting in Winnipeg in January of that year and we had the wheat pools, the wheat board. We had the other governments who were interested, western Canadian governments. And what happened, Mr. Speaker, following that? Mr. Speaker, we had the commitment by the Alberta government to put some \$100 million excess to support the development of Ridley Island. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of development that came out of the leadership in this province.

We had the introduction of several thousands of hoppercars by the Canadian Wheat Board and when we talk Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, that's not government. That's farmers' and that's farmers' money. So don't take any salute for that because of taxpayers' money. That's farmers' money. And we, as a government in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, contributed to that hoppercar system in an immediate way, not several months after we said we were going to do it. I announced it at Manitoba Pool Elevators Annual Meeting in November that we were going to introduce hoppercars, Mr. Speaker, and they were in the system the 1st January, the middle of January, hauling grain for the farmers of this country, some \$2 million that was put there on the table and used. We didn't pussyfoot around like the Minister of Agriculture is doing now. We took hold of the issue.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and you know there's something that's lacking across the other way because four years as Minister of Agriculture, we had a man in this House who's not with us unfortunately in the House, but he's still with us. Mr. Speaker, it was a man from Rock Lake who kept asking about what is happening at Churchill. Well, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture someday, what is happening at Churchill? Are they committed to the use of that? Has he documented any support or any request of the Federal Government or the Wheat Board to use the Port of Churchill this year? It's obvious by their absence they don't give a darn, Mr. Speaker, about the Port of Churchill, one of this province's main ports. Why haven't they been

talking about it? They didn't even introduce it in their Crow resolution, Mr. Speaker, not a word about it because they don't have time to look any further than the end of their political nose. It doesn't wash, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Port of Churchill for four years was the interest of all our government, all our members and last year for the Member for The Pas who happens to again be unable to stand up and ask a question or speak to this issue, the output was double what the projection was going to be, and why was that taking place? Because we, as a government, Mr. Speaker, organized a meeting in Dauphin to put the emphasis on the use of the Port of Churchill. Ask the members of the press. Had they ever taken a trip to Churchill before? Who organized it and who emphasized the use of it? Well, Mr. Speaker, the point is, when the people of Churchill went on strike three or four years ago I said to the farmers we'll go to Churchill and load the boats if the workers won't do it because we want to move the grain.

What did the NDP say? Oh, he said the farmers didn't know how to handle grain. They didn't know how to move grain. I can't believe it, Mr. Speaker, that's on the record. The now Minister of Highways and Transportation said the farmers wouldn't know how to move or load grain. I couldn't believe it, Mr. Speaker, but that's part of the overall debates that I would expect the Member for The Pas and the Member for Dauphin to talk about. But they're muzzled, Mr. Speaker, they're muzzled by their Premier.

MR. ENNS: They're muzzled. They're lost in that urban setting, those fellows.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes. Mr. Speaker, could you indicate how much time because I have one or two more points that I want to make?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 13 minutes.

MR. DOWNEY: Thirteen? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that all these members on the opposite side of the House in the government, speak out on issues that are of importance to their constituencies. I can't believe the Member for Flin Flon sitting here and not squirming. Again I don't think he can go home because all of the people are being laid off. He'll lose his job too, Mr. Speaker. He'll lose his job too because he had a promise from his First Minister that they were going to do something about it. The people of Metro Drugs were going to get help, Mr. Speaker. Where are all these great support programs?

Mr. Speaker, \$9.00 for every man, woman and child is what the offer is from the members of the government in an Interest Relief Program when they're facing 20 percent interest charges and growing. I can't believe that we have a government who is staying in office with that kind of false promises to the people of Manitoba.

I'll go back to the MACC because it's an important point and again we are being asked to vote \$26 million to a Minister or for a support — the community of agriculture — which has to be supported with a pro-

gram like this. Mr. Speaker, the Minister hasn't laid one policy item on the table. He hasn't said we're going to continue to lend money to the farmers; we're going to go state farm or what. All we can assess is that from what he said to this point, he's frozen the Land Loan Program; he's frozen the sale of lease land and yes, Mr. Speaker, what is he doing?

We look at the page here in the Free Press and it's in the Manitoba Co-operator, March 20, "Notice of Tender Farm Property for Lease"; for lease remember, not for sale, but for lease. We go down to the bottom — and this is pretty important, Mr. Speaker — the terms of the lease are this: "The duration of the lease will be for 1982, the year ending October 31, 1982." — (Interjection) — Well, at the pleasure of the Minister. He has all this land loose for lease but he hasn't got any for sale.

A year ago for the last three years I would say, you could have picked up this paper and you would have seen agricultural land for sale and it was being sold at a reasonable and in an adequate manner, Mr. Speaker. But now we have a Minister who has a different philosophy and asking for \$26 million from this House to reintroduce the state farm program and it's right there, it's in ink, Mr. Speaker, and that really bothers me. It really bothers me that he is turfing, throwing out a program that was meaningful to the farmers of this province. You can't help all the farmers with MACC but you can help those who are the real legitimate people who are going to carry on with agriculture and that, Mr. Speaker, was some of the reasons why we increased our funding of MACC funds last year by 70-80 percent. That's how we were committed, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, not only funds that they have froze — my honourable colleague from Lakeside says funds that they had froze — not only that, if you look at the tables — (Interjection) — That's right, they took it away.

MR. ENNS: No, they wouldn't do that.

MR. DOWNEY: If you look at the direct loans for the periods of 1976-77 there wasn't a land program, there wasn't a loan made, Mr. Speaker, it was a land purchase.

Mr. Speaker, while the Member for Dauphin I think will eventually see that he made his mind up a little too quick in not giving it serious consideration who he is representing as the government in this province.

I am very astonished that the members in the back bench at this time are sitting there watching their Ministers cancel and abort programs that were helping the people of this province. To reintroduce nothing; \$9.00 for every man, woman and child — remember that figure, it's an interesting figure — it'll go down in history because I think, Mr. Speaker, when it comes time for the Minister of Agriculture who by the way has said nothing on anything as far as constructive policy, I challenge him to lay out what his policies are. What is he telling the farm people of Manitoba? What does the future hold for them this coming year?

He says to them this, Mr. Speaker, this is what I have heard. We're going to sit down with your representative group — which is the farmer's union that represent 1 percent of you or less — we're going to sit down

with that group of people that represent 1 percent of the farm community or less and we're going to conform to an ill-conceived idea that's going to help about 5 percent of the farmers if you can qualify. Well, I challenge the Minister of Agriculture to lay before this House precisely what the cost is going to be of his Interest Rate Relief Program as far as administration is concerned. I challenge him with all the people he's got employed that he's going to use more, Mr. Speaker, or as much in administration of the Interest Rate Relief Program as he is in helping people with that high interest rate.

I can't, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me figure out the First Minister. He says he's changed his Interest Rate Policy for this country. He says that we've changed our Interest Rate Relief Program. Well, tell us what it is. Tell us what's so changed about it because when I go the bank, they still want 18 or 20 percent for a loan. They haven't changed anything. All they have done, Mr. Speaker, they've hedged around or fudged around trying to let the people of the province think that they've got a great relief program in place.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they haven't got any program for anybody that's of any meaning and it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. Well, the member says I should talk about Alcan. I'll have lots of opportunity to talk about Alcan and I'll be more open about it than anybody in the world because I've lived here all my life; I have farmed all my life and I'm proud of it. That, Mr. Speaker, is a lot more than the majority of the members sitting across the way can say. They've either come into this country through the back door or slipped under the rug or the carpet some way — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the honourable member is not making imputations against other members in this Chamber. He knows that such things are unparliamentary.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Arthur, if I heard his remarks correctly, indicated that there are members in this House who came into this country through some surreptitious way. He is making an accusation of members who have come into this country — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe the honourable member, if I misheard him, would want to explain himself, and if he has made that accusation he should apologize to Members of the House who are here, duly elected, by all citizens of the Province of Manitoba, and are citizens of this province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure that the Honourable Member for Arthur will wish to explain his remarks and make it quite clear what he was referring to.

SECOND READING GOVERNMENT BILLS (Cont'd)

BILL NO. 8 - THE LOAN ACT, 1982

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to members

if they are a little sensitive about this. I think I can understand that if I have left some kind of feeling that they are sensitive about, I will apologize to members for the comments that I made and continue on with my speech, if that's satisfactory. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will continue on, Mr. Speaker, because I did hear what I would consider a snide sort of remark, if I can use that word. Hopefully, it's parliamentary from some of the members of the backbench of the government, and if they have something to say, Mr. Speaker, I would hope they have enough statesmanship to stand up and speak in the House, because we haven't heard any of them. If they have something that's bothering them this is the forum from which they should do it. I think it will certainly be left to be said by the members who have made those comments to clarify what they said at some point in the future if they feel they have some particular information that would be helpful for me, or for anyone else in Manitoba to know. I would be happy if they would lay it out very openly. The same, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope they would lay out about themselves and anybody within their own organization, so we will leave that said at that.

Mr. Speaker, I was going fairly well here and I must have been hitting a sore spot when the Minister of Agriculture spoke out because he is certainly sensitive about a few other things. Let me put it this way, if he were as quick to act on some of the election promises that his First Minister had promised, if he were as quick to act on some of those as he is to jump to his feet if he thought somebody within his ranks had some kind of comments made about them that he didn't like, if he would act as quickly with government policy and promises, then I think he has a reason to stand, but at this point, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that he has much to stand on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we will conclude my remarks today and go back to, —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could maybe proceed on and have leave of the House if they like my speech so well?

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks today by saying that they are introducing a bill of \$26 million to assist the Agricultural Credit Corporation or to fund —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we're voting here for \$26 million to support the Agricultural Credit Corporation and they're hollering about a Hog Program. At least there's a Hog Program in place and the hog producers are getting support. That program has been working very well for the members who are tee-heeing and haw-hawing across the way. Just ask the hog producers, if you know what one looks like. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is bound to say 40 percent have gone out of business. I want him to prove it. He's got a Minister of Agriculture. Lay the facts, because if the department tell him something the same as they told me, they'll tell him different. There wasn't 40 percent of the hog producers who disappeared from the province; in fact, hog production in our term in office went, Mr. Speaker, from 800,000 hogs produced to well over a million, and yes, when they talk about Swift Canadian, the reason Swift Canadian closed was because of their policies, Mr. Speaker. It was because of their policies under the Schreyer administration. The hog production in Manitoba went from over a

million hogs down to 800,000 hogs. They stopped the hog movement from Saskatchewan by regulation, Mr. Speaker. They took some 200,000 hogs annually away from Swift Canadian that were getting them to kill. That was under the Schreyer administration; under this bunch of responsible - irresponsible people across the way, and yet they said us, as a Conservative government, it was our fault that Swifts closed. It wasn't our fault that Swifts closed; it was the cutting off of the hog movement from Saskatchewan. It was the reduction from over a million hogs in Manitoba to 800,000 in 1977 when they were in office. That, Mr. Speaker, is why Swifts closed and it has to be put on the record.

Mr. Speaker, we were working diligently to get the hog producers back on their feet and producing hogs and, yes, we did. We went to back to over a million hogs. At the same time we put in a hog support program and they are sniffing over there like a bunch of porkers because they have to put in place \$5 million to support the hog industry. They don't want to help the hog industry; they don't want to help anybody. They just want to play politics, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hear remarks from the other side about being a Red Tory, and I can assure them that my past performance in my life proves that I have more social conscience than most of you over there. Mr. Speaker, my social conscience is on record. I can refer to the Member for St. James who worked with me when I was Chairman of the Social Committee in the City of St. James-Assiniboia. I think it's on record and I think he can prove to you that it is.

Mr. Speaker, it leads me, the question that comes along about social conscience or conscience generally, is something that is probably the subject that we should be talking about this afternoon. The conscience of presenting a program of interest relief that is basically not going to do, not going to do what they said it was going to do when they were on the hustings. It was going to save everybody from interest problems, all businessmen. It was going to save —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have it in front of me, but it's available right down there, there's a document available that says small business will not suffer under the NDP government with high interest rates. Mr. Speaker, it's the typical thing, and it's fairly funny that I'm hearing the First Minister speak when he's not on camera, because I've watched the posturing for several days, and it isn't my words, Mr. Speaker. When I was watching him on television at the First Ministers Conference, and after he made his first speech, and then all the other Ministers had spoken, the commentator said, "My, the Premier of Manitoba is playing to the cameras." That was the words of the commentator, it wasn't me that said it. I was sitting listening to that on television. So, Mr. Speaker, I only say that the comments of the First Minister continually with his posturing to cameras and etc. My colleague has walked over and said Emergency Interest Rates Assistance. An NDP Government would take

action to prevent the loss of homes, farms, small business due to abnormally high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker has mentioned the amount of money involved. Now let's all check our memories and the first amount of money that the First Minister announced during the campaign was for all three programs, \$23 million; then after the election he'd try to move away from that particular area and said oh no, it's just for mortgage - it's all in the paper. I'm going to do what the Premier has done and refer to things that aren't my words but words of others and his own. Mr. Speaker, it finally ended up that he had to move back to have the program of \$23 million for all three sectors. The program that came out for the young people on mortgages I'm sure is the most disappointing thing to young people with tough mortgage problems in this province than they have ever seen. Their applications will come forward and most of them will be turned down, those young people that are within a salary range that maybe 30 percent of their income is not quite being paid out for shelter, Mr. Speaker, but their mortgage rate or interest rate has doubled in the last year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, the usual parrot comment that we hear from the Member for Dauphin about what did we do about it; we put forward a program of \$22 million that would be strictly for mortgages. No, Mr. Speaker, it's being commented that it's —(Interjection)— that it happened Friday night before the election. Let me tell the honourable member that I'm getting the usual thing from the First Minister because he says anything at anytime, that was brought out the day after the Federal Budget came down. It was brought out and announced the day after the Federal Budget came down. Well, that's factual. That is very factual. We were waiting as a government to see what the Federal Government was going to put in place and when we found they did not put anything in place that would benefit the young people of the Province of Manitoba and the people who had their interest rates doubled; doubled in a year and a half, many of them. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, our own son and daughter-in-law's interest rate went from 11 ¾ percent to 20 ¼ percent. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister care to speak. I just wonder if the First Minister —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I'm having some difficulty hearing the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. I wonder if the honourable members would co-operate to allow me that privilege.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's a very typical thing and I'm used to it again from the First Minister; when you corner a socialist they change the subject. You know, it's very very automatic. Just corner a socialist and they change the subject.

Mr. Speaker, those young people that I was speaking of would have had a program under our administration that would have helped the young people of this province. It would have helped not only the young people — let's put it that way — but would have helped people who had to have their mortgages taken care of or renewed at the present time. One of the best ways

to help business, Mr. Speaker, is that you put money in people's pockets. It would have been more advantageous to have more disposable income for people with their own houses than the program that has presently been put forth.

Mr. Speaker, let's lead to the third question. The second question was very obviously presented by the Member for Arthur and I can say that the farm program is not one as far as I've had it presented to me by people who know agriculture that it will be of very little help whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the small business program that has been put in place.

We have taken tremendous criticism from the First Minister about the Enterprise Manitoba Program that put a lot of businesses into place in rural Manitoba and we have been criticized for that continually. I would say when he's re-negotiating the programs with the Federal Government that he look seriously — or the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism look seriously at continuing that program because there is a report on file that says it has benefited small business in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, but let's take a look at a business that does \$365,000 a year sales. Well, Mr. Speaker, \$350,000 a year, when you take away the operating costs or the costs of buying the material that you're reselling and the costs of whatever are involved in your administrative process, you will be very lucky if you have a business that's showing a profit of much more than \$35,000 a year. Do you know how many businesses, how many people of business with that type of profit can sustain as owners basically. Do you know how many people they could employ? Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said under her breath or loudly and I'm sure she would say it loudly, that it's 80 percent. There are a lot of small businesses in the Province of Manitoba but those small businesses — you're helping two-man operations at \$365,000 or under or \$50,000 or under; \$350,000.00. You're helping maybe a mom and pop organization or one with three people. Keep in mind after you've paid for the materials and the cost of operation, how much will you have left for salaries. You won't, you can't possibly have more than three or four unless you're in a specific specialized business. That is on record in this province. We do not have that many specific specialized businesses, Mr. Speaker, but what we do have is a lot of businesses in this province within the manufacturing industry, a broad manufacturing base, most of them doing over \$365,000.00. Probably the ones over \$365,000 are the largest employers, and I can assure you that they are the people that are in trouble with high interest rates. Those are the people that are car dealers; those are the people that are parts dealers; those are the people throughout this province who are employers of people in this province who are going broke, and Mr. Speaker, I am not going to lay the hand on this government for them going broke, but going broke because of high interest rates; but I am going to lay the hand on this government for going around during the election time and putting their hand on small businessmen's heads and saying, "we can take care of you." Do you realize what was said, Mr. Speaker? Do you realize when a Minister says 80 percent of them are under \$365,000 - That doesn't just take in the

manufacturing business, that takes in the service business, the grocery store, that takes in every business, and you really, really have come forward and put them in a position where they think they're going to be helped.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they'll be helped about as much as the Saskatchewan program helped the Saskatchewan small businessman, and I said during the Throne Speech the amount of people that qualified basically in 1980 basically cost the Province of Saskatchewan about \$193 million. They couldn't find enough people to qualify and the same thing will apply in the Province of Manitoba. You didn't just deal with the manufacturers which is your basic base for employment. You didn't really say that building manufacturing builds the service industry because manufacturing has jobs, those people in jobs buy from the service industry. You didn't say let's keep building on the manufacturing. You said, I am going to take the people that are having trouble with interest rates in small business and I am going to see them through their problems. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind this government doing that. I don't mind this government helping those who will qualify under this program. I don't mind that at all, but what I do mind is the misleading statement that I hear from the First Minister when he gets up in this House, when he's asked a question, and he comes up with his favourite speech three times a week. He doesn't answer the question and says this will not be a restraint government. This government comes along and puts in a program to help business with interest rates. He has got his gall, Mr. Speaker, because he has not presented basically who will be helped. There is a basis of who will be helped by that program and so let's be man enough in the words of the previous NDP Premier who one day stood up and said: Be men — and I can't use girls — Be men and women and come forward and admit what you're doing.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, flitting about in her merry way, has gone ahead and added taxes to small business in this province. They have just hit the small businessman in the country and in the city of this province like you wouldn't believe and at the same time the government says we will help you out of your interest rates problems, and that's very few they can help, but every single one will be hit by the education tax. There won't be just a few hit by that. There'll only be a few helped on the other side with your interest rate program for business, but I can tell you every single one of them will be hit by the education tax that just hit the small businessman in this province.

I'm well aware, Mr. Speaker, that the government of the Province of Manitoba is not responsible for the water rates in the City of Winnipeg, but they're going to go up 50 percent on business in the City of Winnipeg — user paying type of thing. I'm not here to debate with the Metro Winnipeg Council. I am here to say so, Sir, that the small businessman is being hurt more today than he ever was six months ago. His taxes have gone up. Why? I heard from the other side, has the person read the papers whether he's from the city or from the country as to what the mill rates are going to change and what harm it's going to do to small business?

We had, Mr. Speaker, somebody earlier today talk about out migration. Yes, we had out-migration when we were government. The average out migration in the Province of Manitoba didn't change all that much over the past fifteen years or so, but we did have the highest point during our time of office and we used to be criticized continually for that, but what would we do about it. We brought in a small enterprise program. We brought in an infrastructure program with the Federal Government. We brought in consulting programs with the Federal Government for the benefit of business. We also worked very hard, Mr. Speaker, to try and build the manufacturing base of this province to create jobs, and if you don't do that, let's talk about the out-migration. Let's talk about it because the people in Flin Flon who are going to be laid off are going to look for another job and they will probably go where they can find one. I can assure you that as businesses go broke or as businesses go bankrupt or even voluntarily out of business because they can't handle the financing, they will leave this province. They will go where there is jobs and this government has decided all of a sudden, and it does seem to be all of a sudden, that they are not going to proceed with the large projects that were brought forward. I don't understand that either, Mr. Speaker, because when I look at this prospectus that was presented by this government, presented by the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance did say at one time — this was dated December 23rd — well, Mr. Speaker, he obviously wasn't reading what was written along the bottom of this prospectus. This prospectus supplement is March 8, 1982. It's not the December supplement.

There is one thing that concerns me that the government is getting themselves involved with. They have said that the Alcan plant might not go in the Balmoral area. There is discussion. The Minister of Energy has basically stood up and he has said that there were other places that were looked at. That's true, there were about six desirable places that Alcan presented for that refinery and they were told, and there is a Minute to that effect, that they should choose their own location. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very — I heard Thompson's mentioned — and it's very very strange to me that the Member for Thompson stands up and hollers "Thompson" and while he hollers it he never once said that last year the development board of Northern Manitoba — the Regional Development Corporation (NorMan) had the officials from Alcan in Thompson and Northern Manitoba for three days to answer any questions he might have at that time and give him the answers to those questions and the reasons why and they were all documented as to why Alcan could not decide on, not Thompson but Northern Manitoba. So the Member for Thompson plays the same political game with this as he does with a dish, for the northern dish. He doesn't have any agreement, he doesn't have any approval from the Minister to put a dish up north, he doesn't have anything, really, he just stands down there on the front steps, Mr. Speaker, with another member of the House and say that's where it's going, we've got an agreement with the government to do this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that you are the Deputy Speaker you are in the chair in the present time,

Sir, and all I'll say - if the member who was with the Member for Thompson remembers it I'll be satisfied with that. So, Mr. Speaker, I can say that what is happening, one of the most serious things that you'd ever believe, gentlemen, honourable members opposite are now going to choose the place where the refinery will be if there is one, and it's starting to look doubtful, after every municipality and town and city in this province who were interested in having an Alcan Plant Refinery within their area made presentations to them, brought forward the advantages of their area, worked their butts off to convince Alcan that we would like to have them here, now, Mr. Speaker, I am waiting and it'll prove the point that this government only would probably approve things that are going to happen in areas where they want them to, or maybe because of the constituency stripe or whatever. I am waiting for them to say where the refinery will go and give the answers to those other cities and municipalities who have made the requests. Alcan travelled throughout this province and they listened to everybody's presentation as to the benefits that they could put forward for where the plant could go. Dauphin put one forward, Portage put one forward, Brandon, I know put one forward, the Pas, everybody, and Thompson put one forward.

Now we have a government that says to the cities and municipalities and towns of this province that we will be your big brother, we don't care —(Interjection)— right on, I heard, we will tell you where to go as my colleague says. I say, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be getting into very dangerous ground.

Mr. Speaker, I only referred to Alcan in this particular debate because I refer to the Potash now and I refer to the Hydro and I refer to the Forest Industries and I can tell you that a \$700 million refinery that was built in Grand Bay, I believe it was a little over \$500 million in Grand Bay, approximately 62 percent of the products were bought in that area of Quebec or constructed there, contractors etc., and approximately 72 percent of the balance was bought in Quebec and the balance of the money was spent outside, Canada first, international second. The same thing can be discussed with the Potash Industry, there is hopper cars, there's everything. The same thing can be discussed with the Hydro and even the Hydro towers that would be built on the line could be built in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this member who keeps talking the way he does to go down to St. James Street and down to Manitoba Bridge and over to Dominion Bridge and he'll see power towers being built by Manitobans. They're built here. He could probably have the plant that sits beside the pulp plant operating that machine, the factory that's operating - Bless us, it's not operating. But it could probably be operating if something happened in The Pas. —(Interjection)— Prove it. I am told it's going to happen shortly so, Mr. Speaker, don't the honourable gentlemen opposite realize that the best way to help the broad manufacturing base of the Province of Manitoba, which is probably more diversified and is more diversified, than any other of the Western Provinces - I don't know whether the honourable members realize that or not, we have a more diversified manufacturing base and broader manufacturing base in the Province of Mani-

toba than in Saskatchewan, Alberta and we're about the same with B.C. B.C. because they have the marine industry in that area. Do the honourable members not realize the spin-off for the small businessman in this province? —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just heard that's why we're supporting it. Now, do you really mean, am I really hearing, Mr. Speaker, that Alcan has to go through another two year survey of where they're going to go or maybe they'll be told where to go and if they're told maybe they won't want to go there. Did you ever think of that? Maybe they won't want to go there. Mr. Speaker, this government does not want large industry within this province that they can't control. No, they don't. —(Interjection)— They don't. Then we have in the prospectus, Mr. Speaker, that —(Interjection)— the prospectus - you should be back to that - because it says March 2nd on it and you know this prospectus and I will have the chance to speak again, because I don't think we could get it all in today - this prospectus talks about the economy in the Province of Manitoba, it tells how good the economy of the Province of Manitoba has been over the last four years. Mr. Speaker, when I take the prospectus of the Member for Brandon East, not the Member for Brandon West — I don't really know how the Member for Brandon West really fits in with that bunch of renegades over there — but I can tell you this, the Member for Brandon East put out what is close to being a prospectus on the economy of the Province of Manitoba for four years which absolutely differs from the prospectus signed by this government at this time, completely different.

Mr. Speaker, I really feel kind of bad about the members opposite. I feel sincerely sorry because a back bencher in government has one of the worst times at any time. I sincerely feel sorry for them when the bureaucracy that is being hired by this government is the Vice President of the Manitoba NDP; the Deputy Minister of Energy who is a top man in the NDP; all of these top high echelon people of the NDP party. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I make it very clear, I'm not criticizing. No, I'm not criticizing. I'm not criticizing. I am saying that either you honourable members who are elected by the people will have respect from those high echelon of your party or you damn well tell them who you are but I haven't seen any sign of that today.

In order words, Mr. Speaker, the high echelon, the bureaucrat of the NDP party is the one that's running this province over the elected member and I heard somebody say good about that. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the honourable members opposite when a prospectus like this comes up — and I would doubt that many of them hadn't read it until it was brought up in this House. yes, I would doubt that many of them have yet to — I would like to suggest to the honourable members opposite that it's more important for them to read it than us because they are government. They answer to their constituents, not the bureaucrats.

I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, I've been around the House a long time but I don't really think that makes me anything special. But in all my years I find that my constituents phone me or phone somebody that represents me very closely — they don't phone the

bureaucrats — they phone the member. If anybody was to question any one of them on that or especially let's put it this way, if they were to question the Member for Brandon East on the prospectus he wrote last year toward the end of the year, as to why it differs from the one he agrees with that's got March 2 written on it, I wonder what answer could be given.

The honourable gentlemen over there, especially the Member for Dauphin whose favourite saying for two months — or so far close to two months — is what are you going to do about it? Well, how much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Five minutes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may read into the record the manufacture from the Deputy of Industry and Commerce to the Honourable Len Evans, March 3, 1977 or March 28, 1977. The first report entitled Manitoba's Manufacturing sectors, past, present and future trends indicates the following:

"(1) The rate of growth in manufacturing employment over the past 15 years has been approximately 1.8 percent annually.

"(2) Increased employment in manufacturing during the period 1970 through 1974 averaged 1,400 additional jobs per year. During 1975 there was no increase and during 1976 there was a decrease of 1,300 jobs in the manufacturing sector.

"Had the 1970-1974 trend continued the number of jobs in manufacturing sector would have increased by 2,800 during 1975 and 1976. Instead, because of no growth in 1975 and a decline of 1,300 jobs in 1976, the manufacturing sector theoretically has lost 4,100 jobs. A recent study which is presently in the hands of the Red Secretariat, Mr. Speaker — the Red Secretariat — established that the job in manufacturing was worth \$27,000 per year to the provincial economy. Hence, the decline of 4,100 jobs as a cost to the economy of Manitoba of a \$110 million per year or over 1.5 percent of the GBB.

"The rate of growth in manufacturing investment during the period of 1952-1972 has been approximately 4.3 annually. The rate of capital investment fell by 25 percent between 1975 and 1976 following a 27 percent decline in 1974 and 1975; the annual investment needs for 1976 amounted to \$180 million; the actual investment intention for 1976 amounted to only \$61 million" — they needed \$180 million — "hence the shortfall of \$119 million existed in 1976. The prospects for 1977 is not any better than the past three years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we'll read, the '77 went down if you look at the records; '78, '79. Mr. Speaker, now we have the prospectus.

"The gross investment comprised an average of 27.1 Gross Provincial Product during five years through 1976-1980. Trade, finance, commercial and manufacturing investment have shown the strongest growth over the period. In 1980 the private investment amounted to 70.9 percent of the capital expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the prospectus also says that the gross product was 11,160,000; poor harvest conditions, generally weak conditions, export demand were probably the reasons why, even though it says,

even though we had these conditions, it was up 780 million. 780 million, and, Mr. Speaker, do you know what the conference board predicts for Manitoba for 1981? They predict a 1.3 million increase which is 3.3 for productivity for the Province of Manitoba, and that's the third highest in Canada. Would the member care to come over and see the figures from me later? I'd be very happy to show him.

Mr. Speaker, what did we do about it? — (Interjection) — I must say that the previous Member for Gladstone had a good name for Andy — and I would hate to bring it up, but I'll tell you, what did we do about it? Mr. Speaker, this report suggests, to have manufacturing to grow in the province, that we decrease the manufacturing tax from 15 and 13 percent to 13 and 11 percent, and this government did it; the previous government did it; should eliminate the two 10 percent capital tax manufacturers; this government took it down. Modify the Inheritance and Gift Tax whereby bequests to spouses, sons, and daughters would be totally exempt; this government did it. We did it. We did it and manufacturing investment grew and that's what you're March 2nd, 1982 prospectus says; not December 23rd. It says right on the front and, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the date of this prospectus supplement is March 8th, 1982, and in it it says that the manufacturing sector done nothing but grow over the last four years in the Province of Manitoba and your report, that was in your hands before the '77 election told you it had gone nothing but down. The report's available.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the First Minister will stop talking about the Hydro freeze and remember what he said on January 13th. In the Carillon News it's reported, "Pawley promises his government will honor the Hydro rate freeze for the remaining two years of the agreement." I don't have much confidence in that, Mr. Speaker, because I have heard the First Minister of this Province get up, say anything at anytime. All it does is he drives along in his car, sitting like a dummy on Regehr's knee; excuse me, Mr. Speaker, like a puppet; that's a better word, and he winds him up continually and he walks out, smiles to the crowd and says anything. Whatever you want to hear you'll get from him. One criticism that can't be said of us, Mr. Speaker, what we said, we meant.

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

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few minutes to participate in this debate on the Capital Supply Bill to register my disappointment with the transparency of the government's Interest Rate Relief Program which constitutes one of the major items in the schedule attached to this Bill. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to place on the record that I acknowledge, and my colleagues acknowledge, that the program does reflect a certain recognition by the government. No one is disputing the fact that in formulating and introducing this Interest Rate Relief Program the New Democratic Government of Manitoba has addressed a problem, has faced a problem, has said to the people of Manitoba and, indeed, to the people of Canada, there is a problem and we recognize it and acknowledge it. I

give the government credit for that, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure my colleagues do too.

But we have extreme difficulty with the nature of the program itself and with the realism of that program. Our difficulty from the outset has been with the fact that it seems very much to us to represent a classic case of woolly thinking, or fuzzy thinking, if you like. From the outset it has seemed to represent a classic of idealism not related to the facts, cold, hard and brutal facts of the day that face the three categories of Manitobans that are addressed by the measures contained in the program, but it represents, again, one of those sorry items to which we've made reference in earlier debate already during this Session in this Chamber, namely an election promise which was hollow and is proving now to be cynical and little better than a transparency.

The government, during the election campaign, at the time that it was the Opposition, made a commitment without waiting to see what Ottawa was going to do in the long delayed 1982 Federal Budget, to a program that was going to offer emergency relief and satisfactory relief to those categories of Manitobans who were most severely hurt by the fiscal conditions of the day and high interest burdens. Those three categories obviously, and they've been referred to many times, were the homeowners carrying excessively high mortgage interest rates; small businesses finding it extremely difficult under the fiscal and economic and interest rate conditions of the day to maintain their inventories and stay in business, and farmers throughout the province. That category of Manitobans in trouble was addressed during the election campaign by a promise, a pledge, to deliver and put in place immediately, an emergency interest rate relief program that was going to, in the rhetoric in which it was presented at any rate, offer relief to those suffering categories of Manitobans.

We were critical of the pledge and the promise at the time, not because it was a position with which we took exception, or against which we had objection, not because of that, Sir, because as I have already pointed out, we do recognize, certainly I have, and I do again, recognize that it did reflect a willingness on the part of the NDP to recognize a problem and to address it; to say people are suffering, people are in trouble because of interest rates in this country and financial and economic conditions in this country and, to a large extent because of policies that have been pursued by the Federal Government of the Day in this country. They need some help and a provincial government, although it can't do much, can do something.

On that same vein, I would say that it was implicit in the NDP's promise and, again, constituted a principle and an approach with which the Progressive Conservative Party concurs, that a province can do very little, that the basic responsibility in this area of difficulty rests with the federal administration. The Federal Government in Ottawa, of whatever stripe, the fact that it happens to be a Liberal Government has nothing to do with responsibilities - it certainly has something to do with the way they may approach their responsibilities - but any Federal Government in Ottawa has a clear undeniable and unarguable responsibility to do something to relieve the pres-

ures and burdens that are weighing down the Canadian homeowner, the Canadian small businessman and the Canadian farmer today, as a result of fiscal and economic conditions flowing from both external factors and from the policies of a fiscal and economic nature being pursued domestically in Canada by that very government in Ottawa. So we start from the accepted truism that the responsibility rests with Ottawa, in the main, and action should have come from Ottawa and anything a Provincial Government can do is secondary and peripheral to federal action.

We took the position that the Federal Government had a responsibility to initiate some programs and undertake some thrusts that would bring this interest rate relief requirement into being in this country. Our Finance Minister of the Day, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, in fact, was the prime mover and instigator of an initiative among his counterparts, the other provincial Finance Ministers and the Federal Finance Minister, that called for joint federal-provincial action to formulate and produce a program that would get at this problem. We took the position throughout 1981, in fact, that we were prepared to move as a Government in Manitoba to introduce such relief as soon as we knew what the Federal Government's intentions were and as soon as we, therefore, had the realistic opportunity to develop a provincial program that could be tailored to dovetail with, and fit in with, and compliment any federal initiative.

Well, the efforts of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, in his capacity as Minister of Finance for Manitoba of the Day, were unsuccessful; the efforts of our government throughout 1981, in attempting to get the Federal Government to address those economic problems, were unsuccessful. Many Canadian politicians, certainly federal politicians, were preoccupied with the constitutional question in 1981 — obviously many provincial politicians were too, but that became a necessity of survival, Mr. Speaker. It was not possible for us to be other than heavily concerned with the constitutional debates of the time for Manitoba's very position, and our own concept and belief in the concept of what Canada is all about and belief in what Canada should be, was at stake. But our position had been throughout, let us defer the urgent discussions now taking place on the constitution and turn to a more urgent matter; and when we have it resolved get back to the constitutional questions, and that more urgent matter was this need for federal initiative and dovetailed federal and provincial action in the interest rate relief field. We were totally unsuccessful in our efforts to persuade the Federal Government of that, but when the Federal Minister of Finance finally announced that he was bringing a budget down in November of 1981, we said we are ready to act alone to help the people of Manitoba if there's no federal action, but we'll wait to see what's in that federal budget and if there's nothing there for the homeowner carrying a mortgage with an oppressive interest rate, we will move in and do what we can on our own as a provincial administration. It was in that context that the NDP made their election promise and, as I say, we welcomed it as a recognition of a problem, but disputed the very viability and the very structure of that New Democratic program at the time that it was proposed, Mr. Speaker. We disputed it

on the grounds that it was unrealistic, did not face the problem, constituted a gesture, and nothing more than a gesture, recognized the problem, but didn't do the meaningful things that could be done, the real hard pragmatic things that could be done to help resolve that problem.

And today, in the Interest Rate Relief Program, part of which is provided for in budgetary terms on Schedule A of the very Capital Supply bill that we're debating now, we've got that same unrealistic gesture in front of us and in front of the people of Manitoba, a very nice gesture but totally nonpragmatic, a totally imprudent use of the scarce financial and fiscal resources and revenues of the taxpayers of Manitoba. If you've only got a certain amount of money to spend, Mr. Speaker, for heaven's sake, no matter who the government is, whether it's the New Democrats or the Progressive Conservatives, let us spend it sensibly and pragmatically; let us get the biggest bang out of it that we can. And our position remains that this is not a program that does that; that is not pragmatic in its approach; that, to a certain extent and a fairly broad extent, represents another posture on the part of this government which is hollow and which is going to prove unproductive for those Manitobans whose expectations and hopes have been raised and that's the worst feature of it, Mr. Speaker.

With the announcement of their so-called "emergency" relief program, the New Democrats, Sir, raised false hopes and false expectations among thousands of Manitobans and they were clearly reinforced by the content, again, of the now infamous NDP election brochure to which many on this side of the House have referred in debates in recent days, Mr. Speaker, the gospel according to the NDP circa, October/November, 1981, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." Again quoting from that brochure, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that Manitobans are coming to rue the day that the contents of this brochure ever saw print, we note on a page that was devoted to the housing issue the following direct guarantee, direct promise, guaranteed by the First Minister, which says the following and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "For too many Manitobans the dream of owning their own home is turning into a nightmare of ever mounting mortgage payments. Thousands have been forced to give up their hopes of home ownership." With that, Sir, we agree. The brochure then goes on to say that, among other things that a newly-elected New Democratic government would do, it would do the following and I quote again: "The government would take steps to help Manitobans in difficulty with both interest payments and rent."

Again, Mr. Speaker, the kind of position that their promise and their pledge program personified but which, while making very good election reading and very good campaign material, did little except to raise hopes and expectations and did nothing in terms of spelling out the specific realities and difficulties of implementing such a program and outlining the specific help that would be given. Sufficient, it seems, at that time in the view of the government — for the government which was the opposition at that time — to say simply that the government would take steps to help Manitobans in difficulty. But then, Mr. Speaker, that same page goes on to say and I quote again:

"That the government would take steps to relieve the interest burden facing families buying a home or renewing a mortgage."

And that is one of the very clear headline super promises made in that election manifesto. As a consequence of that, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested a moment or two ago, thousands, tens of thousands of Manitobans oppressed by high interest rates on their mortgages, on their homes and in danger of losing their homes, were given sudden hope.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 4:30 we have reached that stage of the Order Paper being Private Members' Hour.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, by agreement we are going to dispense with the Private Members' Hour and continue the debate and at 5:30 move the motion into Committee of Supply — there will be Supply this evening — and I understand that it's likely but not necessarily certain that Natural Resources may finish this evening, in which case, the next Estimate on Fitness, Recreation and Sport will not start this evening but would start tomorrow after Natural Resources are through in the Committee Room this evening.

MR. SPEAKER, D. James Walding (St. Vital): The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we of the opposition are so anxious to see the business of the government and the business of the House proceed that we are prepared to forego Private Members' Hour this afternoon to get on with the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 25 minutes remaining.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that as a consequence of those promises tens of thousands of Manitobans were given sudden hope. They took that sincerely and they took those promises sincerely and they went into the election campaign to make their choices for the next three or four years in terms of an administration over their affairs believing that perhaps there was a miracle that could be performed; that the campaigning New Democrats had indicated that it was something that could be done and would be done; and many of them put their faith in the New Democrats to deliver on that and other promises; and for that and a number of other reasons as all Manitobans know, Mr. Speaker, the purveyors of those promises and disseminators of those promises are the members of the government today.

Well, what do we have now, Mr. Speaker? We have got a program that at the time that it was announced aroused our sincere and legitimate criticism for its lack of reality.

Our criticism of it was not partisan. Our criticism of it was not intended to reduce the issue to a political football. We had said before the New Democrats ever did, that we would bring in a program of our own and go it alone if the Federal Government wouldn't produce something to which we could dovetail ours and

we were waiting for the Federal Budget in order to make that move. When the Federal Budget included nothing or relatively nothing for the small homeowner in this difficulty we did move the very next day — it happened to be November 12th or 13th — but prior to that, of course, the NDP had made their election promise and when they did so they talked about a \$23 million program which certainly was presented as a program that was going to take place over one year. I don't want to hold them conclusively to that position — they may have suggested subtly somewhere along the line that it was going to be a two-year program — but certainly the impression that most of us got and I believe most Manitobans got, was that it was going to be a program over one year, Sir.

They went on to suggest that it was going to deal with three categories of Manitobans and we said that that was totally unrealistic. We had explored this very subject and concept for many months in 1981 as intensively as we could and the best advice we could get, the best evaluations and assessments that we could get indicated to us that any kind of program that was going to provide meaningful help, anything meaningful to three categories, homeowners, small businessmen, and farmers was going to require an input over the course of a year of some \$60 - \$80 million. Well, we didn't have \$60 - \$80 million and neither has this government. The New Democratic Government hasn't got \$60 - \$80 million and no one faults them for that. The Federal Government should be doing this in the first place.

But if you haven't got \$60 - \$80 million then it seems very unwise and very imprudent dime-wise and dollar-foolish, Mr. Speaker, to go into a program that's going to require three times the money that you've got, an attempt to get anything tangible or practical out of it in the way of help for people unless you hone it and fine-tune it in such a way that it's directed to zero in on one group where it can provide some meaningful help. So that was then and continues to be our basic objection to this program, Mr. Speaker.

The lack of wisdom involved in the scope of the program and therefore in the spending of the money, not only that, but we find now with the introduction of the program, the announcement of it some weeks ago that we're not talking about \$23 million over three categories in one year, we're talking about \$23 million over three categories spread over two years.

So where we had proposed a \$20 million program to help homeowners in one year we're now looking at a program that is \$23 million to help farmers, small businessmen and homeowners over two years. So the whole concept and the whole impact has been watered down by a multiplier or a divider of about six. It's about one-sixth what the program proposed by the Progressive Conservative Government of last November constituted. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for Springfield says at the very last minute, Mr. Speaker, and that's a myth and a misconception which is unworthy of the Member for Springfield. We had said throughout 1981 that if the Federal Government wouldn't do anything, we'd go it alone and we would announce it as soon as we got some word from the Federal Government. They held us off until the 12th of November. The Federal Budget

was postponed two or three times as the honourable member will recall, and once we got firm word from them as to what they were going to do, and it amounted effectively to nothing, we did move the very next day within a matter of hours in less than twenty-four hours, and I think we were as good as our word on that so I don't think it's correct that the Member for Springfield or others can accuse us of doing it at the very last minute. We would have done it in September or in August if the Federal Government had co-operated or responded in any way that let us know what they were going to do.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to a program now that is watered down because of the extent of the categories over which it is spread and the time frame over which it is spread and so all we're left with is the gesture. No one faults the gesture, I repeat, but if all the money you've got is \$20 or \$23 million, and that's all they've got and I concede that, that's all we had, you've got to spend that limited amount of money very pragmatically, very sensibly, and as we look over the range of persons supposed to be helped by this thing and the requirements that they have to go through to qualify for help, we can see very clearly that very very few people are going to be helped. Those who can meet the qualifications which are very stringent —(Interjection)— and which, as my colleague from Arthur says, reflect the condition which nobody would want to be in to begin with, those requirements, Sir, are going to inhibit serious application for help. There may be cursory application; there may be superficial application out of curiosity, but I think the conditions that the onus that is placed on the applicant for very extensive information, personal domestic information, is going to inhibit and discourage a great many people from applying.

In any event, if they do apply, there's not much there to help them. You can't take a program that was going to cost by the best estimates of experts \$60 to \$80 million, that's a program to help those three categories over one year, and expect to do very much of it with \$11.5 million which is really what we're down to because a \$23 million program over two years is precisely that, and we've got with this government's program those three categories instead of one. We could have helped, we estimated 20,000 home owners in Manitoba with our program. The current government estimates they'll help maybe 4,000, and the difference, Mr. Speaker, is that for that sort of minimal assistance to a very limited number of homeowners, there will be some similar minimal assistance to a very limited number of small businessmen and farmers, and in the end no group will be helped in a meaningful way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I could not let this debate on this Capital Supply Bill pass without offering those comments. I feel that in this program, the First Minister and his colleagues have offered a hollow gesture to Manitobans which is going to be another situation which is going to result in dashed hopes and expectations. They've raised hopes and expectations and they're not going to be able to make them. They've raised them and they're going to dash them, and it's not the only example of thatm we've heard of a number in the four or five weeks during which this House has been in Session, But here is, I think, a clear

disappointment of very sizeable magnitude for tens of thousands of Manitobans, this meaningless idealistic and totally unrealistic Interest Rate Relief Program.

The First Minister has made a good deal of the fact that he intends to keep faith with Manitobans. One has to ask whether this constitutes keeping faith with Manitobans. What it constitutes in my view, Mr. Speaker, is another shambles along an avenue of brokendreams which is being created in this province by the government's failure to meet honestly and candidly with the promises and pledges that it made, not only during the election campaign but over the past four years. This is the latest edifice to crumble on that avenue, Mr. Speaker. I believe that unfortunately because of the lack of realism on the part of the government itself prior to its election, it's going to find that many of the brave promises it made are totally unachievable, are totally beyond realization, and are going to constitute bitter pills of disappointment for Manitobans. So that avenue of broken dreams I talk about is just under way. It's going to stretch many miles before we travel much further in the life of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I close by repeating that I do not fault them on their idealism. I fault them for being idealistic and nothing else. I fault them for their lack of realism and their lack of candour and their lack of forthrightness in some of these issues. They're attempting to patch it over by this Interest Rate Relief Program, but it's transparent, Mr. Speaker, and of little value, if of any value indeed to those Manitobans who are deeply in trouble and who sincerely accepted the pledges and the promises of the government at the time that this kind of help and this kind of interest and this kind of concern for public welfare was preached and announced by a party desperately seeking techniques through which to win an election.

Mr. Speaker, the government is putting itself in a condition where I think its credibility I think is becoming seriously impaired and this Interest Rate Relief Program is a classic example of that impairment; so I participate with my colleagues on this side of the House in offering those serious concerns about the Capital Supply Bill and the whole fiscal program that's in front of us at the present time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise also to speak on Bill No. 8, on Interim Capital Supply.

First of all I'd like to begin by congratulating the Members for Arthur, Fort Garry and St. James for their elegant presentations here today. I'm —(Interjection)— Sturgeon Creek, I'm sorry. I'm stunned by the objectivity, particularly of the Member for Arthur and the way that he obviously has brought with him his skills and the understanding within his department. I think citizens in this province are realizing after four short months that, in fact, a mistake was made, particularly when I hear the present Minister of Agriculture unable to answer any questions in dealing with his department. I know full well the former Minister carries with him a tremendous wealth of knowledge in that whole area. Similarly I could make comments about my colleagues, the former Minister of Health and of Economic Development. I enjoyed very

much their contributions today.

I'd like to direct specific remarks to two items under this Bill, the Agriculture Credit Corporation's proposed spending of \$26 million and the Emergency Interest Relief Program of \$9 million as it relates specifically to interest relief on the farm. The \$26 million under the first item itself isn't of major concern to me. I haven't had the opportunity to research it and to attempt to find out how it compares to last year's spending. The main concern I have is the purpose of that particular amount of money. We've waited and we've asked on many occasions in various committees as to what the government's objectives are under this MACC Program. Just last week in Estimates, we asked the Minister of Natural Resources if he could see the Government of Manitoba once again owning prime agricultural land and he said yes, he could. After having come through an election period where I, in particular was on the trail against an opponent of a member of the NDP party who indicated that he also thought that this party should become government could see itself again owning prime agricultural land and then hearing the questions that have been posed on numerous occasions to various people across the way; then also hearing the Minister of Natural Resources, his question to a very direct pointed question, saying yes, they could see themselves owning against prime agricultural land, we are concerned. We on this side are very definitely of the wonderment as to whether in fact a new program for purchase will develop. So, the \$26 million as we see it is concerned not so much in itself but as to what it represents for the future.

The Minister tells us in due time or the Minister of Agriculture has told us that they are reviewing all the aspects of MACC objects. But I think it's pretty well time to come clean with this House and with the farmers of Manitoba to let us know specifically what the intentions are because all of us as farm members, and of course it's probably no secret why of course, the majority of farmers are represented by members that sit on this side of the House but many of us have applications that are now on file with MACC. They're told that nothing can be done until in fact this particular bill is passed and that there are funds available but they haven't been told whether in fact those funds will be available if this bill is passed. We still do not know in what direction this \$26 million will go. In 1981-82 the total roughly in this area was some \$33 million I'm led to believe with another \$3 million for debt consolidation.

I'd like to again, as other members of our party have made reference to the great NDP policy of the future, to page - well it isn't paged - but I'll just list the heading Farms and Agriculture and some references made to this particular item and I quote: "While the Conservatives sat on their hands almost 40 percent of Manitoba hog producers left production." That's a point that's been bandied around I think for just too long. I think it's almost time that was put to rest. Those numbers came forward, of course, at a time when the Hog Producers Marketing Board were out to make a specific point. I think that the government, if they wanted to be honest with the people of this province, in fact, they would at this point in time take a new survey to see how many of those producers who have left that

particular industry are now producing again. But the worst part about making that statement of numbers is to fail to notice production. The Minister of Agriculture who is fully cognizant of this fact I think, could have risen in the House and indicated that in fact for the 1981 year that hog production in this province wasn't down 40 percent but indeed was up 1 percent. For what reason then could it be up 1 percent when 40 percent of the producers supposedly had left the business? There's something there that doesn't mesh. I would think it's incumbent upon that side to explain that particular fact; to come forward and tell us why hog production has increased. If in fact one of the reasons that production of hogs has increased was because of the hog stabilization plan that the former Minister and the government of the day brought forward, give that government its due credit because indeed that whole industry has been saved and it's been protected and it's basically healthy. It was done through good action. So, that's for \$26 million. The final comment on that particular point is fine. We have no objection to the amount but tell us where it's going to be spent. We do not want to go into another situation like we had the other evening with the Minister of Natural Resources when he indicated to us that we were passing a capital expenditure but in effect it was a blank cheque. It was at his disposal and his government's disposal to direct in any fashion they so chose. Hopefully the Minister will do that sometime in this debate and will tell exactly where this \$26 million - where his priorities lie with that whole review of MACC lending policy.

Now, I'd like to move onto the second item, the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program; the \$9 million as shown coming forward into the farm sector for support of those individuals who are hard-pressed within the grains and agricultural industry, \$9 million sounds impressive.

The other day I made a slip in Estimates and I made some comment that I exaggerated a number to \$500,000 from \$400,000 and the Minister at the time jumped on me very quickly to say that there was \$100,000 difference in my comments and that I should take due note, so I did and that's why no figure goes by me today without using it specifically. So I see the number \$9 million and I say, well, where is it going to go?

Bearing in mind that there is a \$70,000 criteria, in other words if you have gross sales on your particular farm over \$70,000, you do not apply. What does that mean, a \$70,000 limit to a particular farmer? Well, let's put a little of this into perspective to try and make that \$70,000 figure a little bit more clear as it fits into a grain farm specifically.

A section of land today, 640 acres, well that represents returns of about \$110 an acre. If you exceed that, you're ruled ineligible because you've surpassed \$70,000, so \$110 an acre, gross returns on a section of land. I wonder if the members opposite have any idea whatsoever as to what it costs to farm that particular section of land today. I know there aren't many rural members across the way and the ones that are in that particular party aren't here, but I wonder — (Interjection) — I'm sorry. I retract that.

But I'm wondering if they realize what the specific costs of farming are today. If in fact they know that the

cost of farm rent is somewhere around \$40 an acre; that if the cost of fertilization \$25 to \$35 an acre; seed, \$15 an acre; machinery expense, capital expense, \$40 an acre and by the very present Minister's Estimates his staff put out on the cost of farming, grain related, \$180 an acre. That came into my hands with a release that came forward at the Outlook meeting at Oak Bluff in early January. So here's the same Minister saying, well your cost as my staff has calculated them for the 1982 growing year are going to be around \$180 an acre. But so help you if you surpass \$110 an acre on the revenue side because if you do, this \$9 million or any part of it is not available to you in any form and that's when we're looking and we realize who this policy was basically made for.

That's why this particular side of the House is going to be watching very very carefully as to the location of the benefits, the benefactors. We're going to be watching to see who benefits from this program because we all have our own theories and I'm going to tell you what my theory is as to who's going to benefit.

I think it's going to be the individual, the older individual who does not own or owe an awful lot of money; who has a very high equity ratio; who has gone to the bank for a small loan, \$1,000, \$2,000, \$5,000; and who for some reason has decided or may probably decided not to pay that particular loan back at that time, that's the person who's going to be eligible for that loan. Nobody else. Because the people that need it, the small people that need it, those who are now in debt \$50,000 or more — and there are many young farmers — do you know what \$50,000 represents on the farm today? I think most of the members opposite have an idea. It represents the purchase of one-half a new modern combine. It represents the purchase of one new tandem truck, regardless of the age of the person that's purchasing. I'm saying to you is that person who is \$50,000 or \$70,000 in debt who has interest payments in a year approaching \$14,000, he will be ruled out considerably. He's the desperate person that needs that financing but he won't receive it. So we're going to be watching carefully the benefactors of your program, both in a geographical sense and more so in a sense as to the particular debt equity ratio at that particular time.

I'd like to take the \$9 million and as my colleague, the Member for Arthur has related it to the total population of the province and came out with a nice, neat, tidy figure of \$9.00 a person, I'd like to relate it to the active farmers. If there are some 30,000 or 35,000 farmers in this province, what it represents or returns, it's \$200 per farmer help across the province, \$200.00. Yet, as has been related in this particular House over the last week, the increase in property taxes alone on that farm, on that one section of farm, \$600.00. So you're losing both ways. Most of the people aren't eligible and the ones that are, are going to receive their \$200 and they're going to be asked to pay increased tax, property tax of \$600 an acre. Again, let's put into perspective the \$9 million and when our party previously indicated that to do anything meaningfully you would have to inject three or four times that amount, that they knew of what they spoke.

Also, again referring to the NDP election propaganda. I quote: "They were going to introduce a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture."

Well, that's very laudible. I don't think anybody, if that was the sole purpose or reason why we vote for or against anybody, or if any of us used that particular line that voters would be hard-pressed to not support us. "Introduce a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture." What do they mean by that? Is that something that's going to be released once we have the conclusions of this review and to MACC loaning? Is it something that's going to come forward by way of new policy or is it something that's tied into the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program? We don't know. Or is it nothing? Or is it just words at the time? I really wonder.

Or is it going again to be directed towards the buying of prime agricultural land for lease back and where, where would that happen? It's not going to happen in Southern Manitoba with \$9 million or \$26 million. I think you could purchase about — how many acres could you purchase — 260,000? Possibly so.

I'm very curious as to the Member for Dauphin, his attitude towards this whole feeling. I'm wondering how he feels his farmers in his area, because whether he knows it or not, he has a lot of farmers in that particular riding, a lot of good modern farmers; people in the Sifton area, Ochre River, your area, good farmers. I wonder how they're going to react when they realize they're not eligible at all for any of that \$9 million. What's the explanation then to those people? What's going to happen? Well, I'm sure he doesn't know and we don't either. But as far as the funds in general, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I see no concern with the quantity of the amount listed here. My only concern again, or two, just to sum up, one is the 26 million to be directed to the Agricultural Credit Corporation; what is the ultimate purpose of that 26 million? Is it to buy back land, is it to borrow for the purchase of land as has been traditionally the case? And also in the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program, the \$9 million that's been allocated there; where and who is it going to support? I can say that members in this House will be following that whole area with keen interest.

Thank you.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to make a small contribution to Bill No. 8 and want to put some comments on the record as to the intent of this bill, and more particularly, Mr. Speaker, I guess the intent of this bill in the background of the circumstances under which it is presented to Members of the House and the people of Manitoba, and that, of course, being an election document from the N.D. Party, the policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party.

I guess at the onset, Mr. Speaker, I want to open my remarks by saying that in the message from Howard Pawley, there's a couple of lines that, I think, all members opposite should have read back to them, and I think that all people of Manitoba should be reminded of constantly. The one that I want to read particularly is "With ManOil and Manitoba Hydro we can develop programs to guarantee that no Manitobans lose their homes or farms due to high interest rates." Mr. Speaker, that is a guarantee that no Manitoban, no Manitoban, it did not — I'll just read one more

line that I think is equally important. The last line says, "That's a promise we can guarantee," and it's signed by that illustrious, very firm and stern looking fellow, Howard Pawley, Leader of the Manitoba NDP.

Mr. Speaker, there's some catcalls from opposite over there and I think we can deal with them adequately tonight if they're coming from the one source. It didn't say anything else than that, no Manitobans, no Manitobans, will lose their homes or their farms from high interest rates. Now it's interesting to note, when we consider this \$9 million Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program that's part and parcel of Bill No. 8, and we examine it in the light of the statement "guaranteed," by the now Premier of this province, and it's very interesting when we analyse Bill No. 8 that guaranteed promise that no Manitoba shall lose their farm or their home, in light of the February 5th, 1982, news service press release, entitled "Manitoba launches \$23 million Interest Relief Program," bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that gang over there, when they're in an election campaign, guaranteed that no Manitoban shall lose their home or their farm from high interest rates. What do we find? First of all we find that the Minister of Natural Resources, who has responsibility for the Interest Rate Relief Program for homeowners, told us the other day that the forms are just nicely being printed, bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, those forms are being printed for an Emergency Relief Program. Some emergency, Mr. Speaker, when some four months later, the forms are now just nicely being printed. One thing that the N.D. Party did do in perfect agreement with their past administration is they appointed an advertising firm without tender, without due process. They appointed an advertising firm to run a bunch of ads on the fact that this Interest Rate Relief Program was coming for homeowners, but the forms are just available right now. Now, that's in keeping with the kind of delivery on promise that we are very rapidly becoming accustomed to from this government, from the broken promise Pawley that is now the Premier of the province. We come to expect that they're not going to be emergency; they're not going to be immediate; and they're not going to help every Manitoban who is in danger of losing his home or his farm from interest rate relief. Quite the contrary to the guarantee made that no Manitoban should lose, we find now that homeowners are going to be supported up to a maximum of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member used the word, "gang," in referring to other Members of this House, in his remarks a few minutes ago. I checked with Beauchesne and I find that the word "gang" is one of those under the list of unparliamentary terms. Since no one else brought it to my attention, I bring it to the honourable member's attention so that he will know not to use the word again.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall not use the word "gang" in referring to the gentlemen and ladies opposite.

Mr. Speaker, this assistance program which was much touted during the election and, we have to assume, since the N.D. Party won the election, that had to have some influence on the voter. Well, I think it

should have had some influence on the voter when they guaranteed that no Manitoban shall lose their homes or their farm; should have had some influence and, obviously it did, because they picked up a few of the swing seats like, a number of them over there and I won't mention them because there's quite a few of them. But, Mr. Speaker, when the program is announced February 5th, we find that, possibly by April 5th, the forms for Homeowner Interest Rate Relief might be available. Program was announced; no forms available. However, that's an Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program.

We find, Mr. Speaker, that when we peruse the circumstances under which homeowners are going to receive relief, we find out that there's a few hookers in it, there's a few kinks in the program. There is a \$40,000 maximum mortgage. There must be a 30 percent limit that principle, interest and taxes are in relationship to the individual's income. We didn't find those kind of stall tactics in the election promise that got them elected, no, Mr. Speaker. We had a blanket guarantee that no Manitoban shall lose their home. That isn't what we find out that we have delivered by this government after they have had time to consider the availability of money and how much the program is going to benefit. They've changed a lot of the criterion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill also deals with one rather important issue and that being the Hog Stabilization Program on which, I believe, there is \$5 million that is being guaranteed in here. That is a program which we instituted and I'm glad to see that this government saw fit to provide that continuing assistance to the hog producers in the province.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the members opposite once again because some of their swing ridings did vote for them; those swing ridings did have beef producers and those beef producers were promised during the election that there would be a Beef Income Assurance plan to help the beef industry. That was promised by the then Leader of the Opposition, the man who made all sorts of promises during the election, that it would be immediate. When questioned on immediate he said approximately six weeks. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are now some four months into the program —(Interjection)— that's right, I'm reminded by my colleagues that the now First Minister even indicated that he would have a special Session to deal with Interest Rate Relief Program to bring it in on an emergency basis and the Beef Program. That was one of the first indications that Manitobans could not necessarily take the First Minister fully at truth in what he has said from time to time, that he may be slightly anxious to please before he is ready to act and that's exactly what we have seen so far. No emergency Session. The emergency Interest Rate Relief has only now got forms out and the Beef Income Assurance Plan, which could have been included quite handily in Bill No. 8 with funding, still is not funded by the Minister of Finance and his group in government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been promised by the Minister of Agriculture since the election sometime shortly in November that there would be a program within six weeks. I had opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in Oak Bluff to listen to the Minister of Agriculture and this was in the

middle of January, to tell the Agricultural Outlook Conference that yes, a Beef Income Assurance Program was coming. When asked specifically when, he said in approximately six weeks, that would make it about the end of February, it is non-existent as of the end of February. We hear the now Premier going around the province saying Beef Income Assurance Plan is coming. When tagged he says in a couple of weeks, in four weeks, in six weeks. All this has been going on for the past four months and, Mr. Speaker, we still don't have the Beef Income Assurance Plan and when questioned just last week the Minister of Agriculture said, well it may be ready in about two weeks. But we do know one thing about the Beef Income Assurance Program, Mr. Speaker, we do know that the members of the Committee that were set up when we were government to investigate how the program should proceed, how much money and how the beef industry should be supported was fired by the Minister of Agriculture, we do know that. Maybe that is why nothing has happened on that side of the House with this new government on the Beef Income Assurance Plan.

Well, we'll wait with patience but let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Beef Income Assurance Plan helps as few people as the Interest Rate Relief Program which the then Leader of the Opposition made a promise, that no Manitoban shall lose his farm due to high interest rates, if that promise is carried through for the beef producers in a same manner then there is going to be a lot of beef producers in very very sad shape. Some of those beef producers no doubt voted and fell for the misleading campaign information that those people put out during the election and elected some new members to this House, they're going to be sorely disappointed.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, the one very interesting portion that is in here is that \$9 million and it is the relief for the farm, so that no farmer will lose his farm and that's a guarantee made, I have to assume by the Minister of Natural Resources who was chattering from his seat, he was part of the candidates that were running for election. I assume he had to believe that his First Minister was correct when he guaranteed that no farmer would lose his farm due to high interest rates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what do we see under the eligibility for the farm Interest Rate Relief Program? Well, we see that there is a maximum of \$70,000 in gross sales. We also see that that assistance provided will be integral to the prevention of a forced sale or loss of the farm.

Another condition we see in here that the assistance will only be provided if the operation can become viable. Well, Mr. Speaker, that isn't what the First Minister said when he said that no Manitobans shall lose their farms due to high interest rates, that isn't what he promised them, but that's what they're going to get. That's what they get. They built the hopes up in the farm community that the young farmers in my area would receive Interest Rate Relief and they wouldn't lose their farms, then when they come in — and the Member for Dauphin is chipping away, do you want a blank cheque — you're First Minister promised a blank cheque, your First Minister promised that no Manitoban shall lose his farm

due to interest rate.

Now, the Member for Dauphin is shaking his head that it wasn't true, we know that now, but unfortunately the farmers during the election campaign did not know it wasn't true, but the Member for Dauphin obviously knew it was untrue when they were telling it and when they put out this information during the election campaign.

Thank him and thank the Member for Dauphin and he will be able to explain to his farmers who are going to be forced off the farm why his government is not acting. Well, Mr. Speaker, we now have not only a program that's not going to help all farmers, only a select few. We also have a program that's not completely Interest Rate Relief but rather a loan over two years. Now, how is that loan going to be secured? Is the Government of Manitoba going to come in and take security above and beyond all of the security on that farm to guarantee their maximum \$3,000 per year loan? We don't know. Farmers are asking that question. They can't get that answer out of this government because that government doesn't know, or maybe it knows and it isn't telling them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suppose what is key, what is very key in the farm Interest Rate Relief Program is the fact that you cannot have any long-term land debt other than the home quarter section, in which you can apply for interest rate relief. Well, that gets us back into the standard philosophy that N.D. governments have had in this province since the Schreyer government on and what this one is going to bring in, that they don't want the young farmers of Manitoba to own their land base. So, they've excluded assistance on debt incurred on the long term land base. They've excluded it. It's ideologically in tune with where they want to take agriculture and that being into the state ownership program. It's implicit in what is in the guarantee.

But, you know, it's interesting to note that when we get into the small business relief, they've set some limits in there and I will admit they have the right to do this because in their guarantee to Manitobans they never mention small businesses. But, they only mention farms and homes. They have put a limit in there of some \$350,000, Mr. Speaker. Now the Member for Morris expanded on it slightly and I'd like to tell some of the members in the government just what that \$350,000 means to a small businessman in my area or indeed to any area in rural Manitoba.

Let's consider a farm machinery dealership. What that farm machinery dealership must sell is three combines, three tractors and \$20,000 worth of parts. That's all he can sell in order to qualify for this \$350,000 limit on interest rate relief. Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have pointed out that is not the larger combines, those are average size combines. In other words they are restricting their help in farm machinery dealerships to ones who sell less than three combines, less than three tractors and less than \$20,000 worth of parts. If anybody dares sell four combines, five tractors and \$50,000 worth of parts, you're out of luck fellows; no program, no help; go broke, to hell with you, we don't need you in the business community. That's the message that this government has given to the small business sector in rural Manitoba supporting agriculture. Mr. Speaker, it will not wash.

To the lumber dealerships in my area who may have

thought they could have applied for the Small Business Assistance if those home builders sell six houses at \$50,000 each plus \$50,000 worth of paint and lumber in a year, they don't qualify. This program will do nothing for them. Who was it intended to help? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it will help none of the businesses that are going to be the bed rock and the foundation of the business community for the 1980s. None of them that should be there, deserve to be there and have to be there will be helped with this program. Six homes and \$50,000 worth of lumber and you don't qualify under their Interest Rate Relief Program.

Mr. Speaker, I really find it quite interesting that they have the other criterion in the business interest relief, as they had with the farm industry relief, that the assistance must be integral to the prevention of potential bankruptcy. Well, that requires on the part of the government a value judgment. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know how good the value judgment by an N.D. Party is on business endeavours, their profitability and their future success. We saw it during the Schreyer years when \$40 million were poured into Saunders; we saw it when they set up all sorts of directly-owned government businesses, not a one of them ever to make a dollar; and here these new bright boys that have come along — the Minister of Energy and Mines was the head honcho of the planning bureaucracy when the Schreyer administration allowed the hemorrhage of \$40 million into Saunders — he was the head honcho then and now he's part of a government that's going to determine what business might be prevented from potential bankruptcy. They, the government that poured hundreds of millions of dollars into failing businesses in Manitoba are going to make a value judgment as to which should receive the limited help that they have offered? Mr. Speaker, they can't do that.

We know that program in the business community will not help the businesses that this Manitoba economy needs to provide the services, the manufacturing, the support industries for the 1980s; none of them will get help from this program. It's a sham; it's a farce; and it's a misleading of the Manitoba electorate during an election campaign. Now, the ponies are coming home to this group of people over here and they are going to have application after application turned down. Some of those applicants who are turned down may well have voted for this group and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it will be the last time because they will have decided that party, the N.D. Party, will do anything during an election campaign, saying anything during an election campaign and promise anything during an election campaign strictly to get elected and then turn their backs on the people in need that elected them. That's what they'll do. We have seen the initial criterion in the Interest Rate Relief Program and we will see the final touches to it in the next six months as the applications with a big "No" stamped on go back to the applicants; a big "No." The only thing I ask the members opposite is when you put the big no on it, put the big NDP after it so they know who promised it, who did not deliver it and who turned it down. That's all I ask.

Mr. Speaker, I had opportunity to have a discussion with a bank manager and I realize that's sort of true confessions to the N.D. Party; one is not supposed to

talk to bank managers because chartered banks are evil; chartered banks are the cause of many problems; chartered bank managers are terrible people. So, pardon me if I tell you I did talk to bank managers. I talked to them about how the Provincial Government should proceed in the next year and a half to assure that the newcomers to the farming industry, the young farmers who have started up in the last several years and who intend to start up in the next several years, should be helped. Do you know what those bank managers told me? They said what MACC should do is provide to the young farmers long term interest money for the purchase of land; that MACC should continue and enhance its role of long term mortgages. Now, we have already seen, as the Minister of Agriculture has told us, that they are reviewing how to help new farmers. Mr. Speaker, I venture to guess and speculate as I have that what that group over there will come up with to help the young farmers is not long term mortgages as we brought in as has always been the role of MACC until those aberrant years of the Schreyer administration; they will go back to the state farm program where the state owns the resource of production. But young farmers can no longer own the resource of production, the land. I hope I'm wrong. Mr. Speaker, I will give my pledge to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Treasury Bench that I will stand up in this House and I will apologize for laying my fears on the record that you will remove long-term mortgages for state farms, and I will apologize for saying that if you maintain long-term mortgages. But the Member for Springfield is already shaking his head saying you won't have to apologize. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that, but the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is being provided with \$26 million worth of funding under this Act.

Now the questions that we would like to have answered is will this \$26 million go to long-term mortgages for young farmers; will it go to the consolidation of some several loans that some of the young farmers have gotten themselves into; what are the purposes of the MACC \$26 million that we are going to vote in the next few days, I would assume? I have a great deal of hesitation in supporting this \$26 million if it is going to allow MACC to go out into the marketplace and compete with those young farmers in the purchase of land, so that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when we reach this item again, the honourable member will have fifteen minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, subject to the agreement that was arrived at by the House Leaders earlier, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the House do now adjourn and that we resume in Committee of Supply at 8 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday) Members will reconvene in committee this evening at 8:00 p.m.