

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 1 April, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: On the motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I've listened with a great deal of interest to the contributions made by members opposite to the Budget Debate. I must admit that my initial interest fairly quickly turned into a great deal of disappointment as Tory after Tory failed to provide any constructive criticism whatsoever.

We ended up this afternoon with the Member for Sturgeon Creek, for instance, referring to the \$72 million and saying that before you legally have it, you can't write anything down about it anywhere. Well, if he could have taken his own advice back in 1981 then and stopped going around handing out money to companies without having had legislative approval, then maybe I could understand why he would say that. But without having done that, I think the member has a pretty significant glass house that he should be very very careful about.

I should express my disappointment, Mr. Speaker, at the Conservative failure to take any position on a number of the important questions outlined in the Budget Address in the area of federal-provincial relations and fair financing for public services. It was touched peripherally, but nobody was saying anything specific. Most of them didn't even touch it peripherally.

Specifically, three important areas were outlined in the Budget Address dealing with the November 8th federal cutback announcements, federal transfers, and income tax reform.

It's particularly disappointing that in light of the specific invitation I made to members opposite to outline their position on these important issues for Manitobans, that the Conservatives have simply refused to take any position. I believe ordinary Manitobans would continue to be quite interested in whether the provincial Conservatives support the federal cutbacks in the manufacturing technology research centre, the VIA Rail maintenance centre, research cutbacks in Churchill, Gimli. Obviously strong and vocal support from the provincial Conservatives would help our province protect ongoing jobs for working Manitobans.

As indicated in the Budget, the estimated effects of the planned federal cuts entail losses of 6,000 jobs in Manitoba and over \$400 million in investment. If I'm wrong, let the members sometime in debate over the next few days tell us where we're wrong. We have shown the province where we get those numbers.

Surely, working men and women throughout the province have a keen interest in knowing the views, even of the official opposition on that issue. Where do the provincial Conservatives stand on federal transfers

to support health, post-secondary education, social assistance, economic development, other important initiatives? Currently, federal transfers account for 36 percent of the province's revenues, a substantial sum, certainly, but far below the 43 percent federal contributions which prevailed six years when the Tories were in office.

The future of those federal transfer rates and ongoing federal intentions will affect jobs, programs, services and taxes for ordinary Manitobans. Do the provincial Conservatives support the interests of Manitoba on these matters? Are they prepared to speak out forcefully on issues which will affect jobs for our sons and daughters?

Mr. Speaker, based on their comments during the Budget Debate, the answer is obvious. Provincial Conservatives are not prepared to speak out for and defend the interests of ordinary Manitobans. A third area where I specifically sought comment from the provincial Conservatives is national tax reform. Our government believes that national tax reform - and I'll get to that - is urgently required to restore fairness to taxation and to provide the resources necessary to sustain needed public programs and services.

These views were reinforced on reading the Free Press report last Tuesday, which quoted Michael Wilson as saying, "There are some funny things going on in tax collections. We have kept greater control of spending but tax collections over the last few months have been less than what we had expected and I can't give you the answers because we don't know the answers. Our government believes that a return to fair taxation is a basic requirement for the financing of services and programs for ordinary Manitobans and ordinary Canadians, as well as to improving fiscal flexibility available to all governments in Canada." The kind of comment Mr. Wilson is quoted as making reinforces our concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite disappointed at the failure of the Leader of the Opposition or indeed, the Finance critic, to deal in a realistic manner with the important issues of federal transfers, tax reform and the November 8th cutback proposals which are so important to Manitobans throughout our great province.

Mr. Speaker, opposition members sought to convey the impression that Manitoba's spending on public programs and services for ordinary Manitobans is somehow excessive or out of line with spending levels across the country. That kind of carefully contrived impression is, of course, totally out of step with the facts, and I believe the opposition knows that; but they like to play on the fears of Manitobans.

For instance, for 1984-85, according to the Conference Board analysis of provincial budgets, Manitoba's budgeted spending was \$3,094 for each man, woman and child in the province. Our government believes that level of spending could have been necessary for the provision of programs and services important to Manitobans and for the continuation of initiatives to create jobs and strengthen our economy over the long term.

While the opposition Conservatives apparently consider that to be excessive, they provide no indication of the programs and services they feel should be cut in order to reduce Manitoba's spending. How then does our per capita spending compare with those in other provinces? Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board comparison of provincial budgets says that Manitoba's spending, 1984-85, is the third lowest in this country on a per capita basis. We budgeted spending on a per capita basis of \$291 or 8.6 percent lower - \$291 lower than the all-province average. It's 8.6 percent lower than the all-province average, third lowest in the country, and the members opposite would have the public of Manitoba believe the falsehood that we somehow are spending excessively, that spending is out of control in this province and they know that that is a direct falsehood.

Those facts are available to the Leader of the Opposition, to the opposition critic, and to the other people who have spoken on that side. I would have hoped that those facts would be taken into account when people were criticizing us for excessive spending, which is totally inaccurate and unfair, and unfair not only to the government, but to the ordinary Manitobans who listen and think politicians on the opposition side might occasionally be telling the truth.

Even though they know that in accordance with the Conference Board numbers, our spending is third lowest in the country, they keep criticizing that moderate spending as being excessive in the hope that by their constant repetition of such an incorrect and inaccurate view, Manitobans will begin to believe them and I think that's regrettable.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why this particular Budget has been well accepted by average Manitobans, by ordinary Manitobans, by people out there in the province, is the fact that there have been a great deal of discussions going on before this Budget was either prepared or presented. Many hundreds of Manitobans had the opportunity for input, thousands of people through their organizations had gotten some understanding of our problems. We heard their difficulties and we worked together. We provided this kind of information to people who were out there with no understanding as to the background for why decisions were made, and that was why the day after the Budget was presented, we had basically members of the public in this province supporting the Budget and the budgetary policy to this government.

Mr. Speaker, those people were given the background information, which of course the opposition has but fails to talk to their people about; and we went into rural Manitoba; we went into Northern Manitoba; we went into mining towns; farming communities; we met with ordinary Manitobans, business people, Chamber of Commerce people, teachers, hospital administrators - all those people out there who work so hard to improve the quality of life in this province. And they had the chance to see what this government was doing and to tell us where we could improve and we listened and we responded. That is part of the reason why this Budget was accepted.

Another part of course was the totally, totally incredible opposition that we heard from the other side. There was basically nothing there. There was basically nothing worth talking about and very little to defend,

after eight days of Budget Debate, very little in terms of what they've been to accomplish in terms of suggesting to people that there was anything wrong with that Budget.

This is my fourth Budget, Mr. Speaker, and I must say that I have never had - never - so little constructive criticism or even unconstructive criticism from the opposition. They've been all over the fence, all over the field, but they have not been able to come up with anything that anyone, any reasonable Manitoban would say would provide better budgetary policies for this province.

You've been a hopeless opposition. Members opposite chose to criticize the province's total budgetary requirement level for '85-'86. The Member for Morris was hoping that I'd get on to that right at minute one of the speech. I could assure him we'll talk about that for a bit. Of course, they were saying that the requirement of \$496.2 million budgeted for was too high.

In light of that criticism, I listened with extreme interest to hear what suggestions - and, again, that was only for the first few days because I quickly realized they had no suggestions - what suggestions they might have as to how that budgetary requirement might be reduced. Did I hear anything about that? What did they say? Somebody came up with the great idea that we would cut out advertising which was rising in the last three years on average in their term at a faster rate than it has risen under our government. But there's one big difference. Under their government it was a do-nothing, hideaway, cut-back government that never did anything worth advertising. Under our government we have provided new programming people want to hear about and want to know about, want to know how to apply for.

Even if they took all of the advertising money away, all the advertising for employment, all of the health notices that people get, all of the Workplace Safety and Health material, all of those kinds of things, they've now accomplished what? A reduction in the deficit of 1 percent, 2 percent? It's not even 2 percent. Are they saying if it was \$490 million they would be happy?

Can they tell us what they were spending their 43 percent and 48 percent increases in advertising on in '79,'80,'81 and so on? Could they tell us about that? That proportion, that's the one thing I've heard in terms of cuts. How about in spending? How many times have they spent it? How many times over in the last few weeks in Boissevain, on highways. I think on highways alone, they've more than three times spent it. They said we should put about \$20 million extra into highways at least. There they are. They've more than three times spent the one area that they say they can cut somebody on.

Of course, if they cut the money, we would have no means of communication with some 8,000 Manitobans who will be working on Careerstart this summer. What is it? 20,000 or so people overall working on Jobs Fund-related projects. No way of communicating with the small business community, with the community organizations out there that are eligible for these programs. Who are they kidding? it's one thing to say no advertising when you're not doing anything as you weren't doing anything from '77 to '81. it's another thing to say don't advertise when we've got something to

talk about, when we've got a program on everything from day care to family programs, to dealing with impaired drivers and so on. Talk about drivers. We see the Leader of the Opposition out there saying, after he voted in favour of seat belt legislation, he goes out there in the country and he says, oh seat belt legislation was terrible. Where is he going to get the money from to pay for the people in the hospitals if that legislation was ever changed? Where are they going to get the millions from to pay for that if that legislation was ever changed? On that one item alone you can make up for any cuts that they have overall suggested to this government.

They are a group that goes from issue to issue; they are the "party" party that wants to throw fun and money at every particular problem . . .

A MEMBER: What does that mean, Vic? What's this "party" party bit? What do you mean by that?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The "party" party is the fun people who think that you don't have to make any tough decisions; you can just sit there and say, we will decrease taxes by \$110 million, just like that; won't say where we're going to replace it; we're going to add to community services; we're going to add to education; we're going to help cities and municipalities with property taxes so that they will be lower. We will help everywhere you turn. They will do more for agriculture; they will do more for whatever ails you, they will do more. They will spend more money; they will tax less and they will have a lower deficit, and they think that people out there believe it.

Well I have news for them, they are totally unbelievable. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we had the Member for Lakeside telling us the pie will grow. We all recall when we had a PC Government in Manitoba and the pie practically disappeared . . .

A MEMBER: Stuck in his thumb.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . but now they're saying, if they get a new PC Government, miraculously the pie will grow. Let me give you some numbers. Provincial-source revenue growth, Mr. Speaker, 1979-80 to '81-'82, the last three Tory years, how much did it grow; where were they, in terms of ranking across the country? Well, Mr. Speaker, they had one saving grace to make them look respectable, that happened to be a sales tax increase of 49.7 percent in 1979-80, and that was following up on a reduction in sales tax in '78-'79, when the bottom had fallen through and they thought that would somehow encourage people to do more in this province - and we'll come to that later on. Excepting for that, they were really in tough shape, and even including that, their three-year growth, through 1981-82, put them in seventh place overall. They were seventh in income taxes; ninth in corporate tax and, of course, because of that extraordinary sales tax item, which brought them up 49.7 percent that one year as compared to the all-ten-province average that year, including Manitoba of 27.4 percent, they got in at third place in sales tax; but overall they were number seven.

Now you bring in this NDP Government, from '82-'83, '83-'84, '84-'85, we are the people, according to the

Member for Lakeside - and some Tories would have Manitobans believe this - who can't make the pie grow. But what happened in these last three years?

Own-source revenue grew stronger in Manitoba, overall, than in any other province in this country. We were number one. We were number one on our own-source revenue, which means of course that under the Tories you're always near the back, in terms of any pie growing, and under the NDP we're number one, or have been for the first three years of our government. So that issue is not an issue that is based on fact. The historical facts are that we have done better in revenue growth as compared to other parts of this country under an NDP Government than under a Conservative Government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had the Leader of the Opposition wringing his hands, saying how that deficit is too large, and in another part of his speech he says, well, we'll eliminate over \$100 million in taxes. I am sure that ordinary Manitobans would be interested in hearing his explanation as to how he proposes to reduce taxes by over \$100 million without increasing the total budgetary requirement by the same \$100 million plus — (Interjection) — or over 20 percent. Nowhere in his remarks did we hear the Leader of the Opposition suggest which taxes he might increase in order to provide over \$100 million in tax reductions - tax reductions, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, favouring banks; favouring lawyers; favouring accountants; favouring professionals; favouring insurance corporations; favouring the Federal Government. Those are the people who basically would benefit from that particular tax change. Who would pay for the new taxes put on by Tories who would have to do that in order to make up for it? Ordinary Manitobans.

Of course in previous years when you had different kinds of strengths on your benches - Mr. Speaker, in previous years we heard a previous Deputy Minister at least make a suggestion about what he would do and that is instead to raise the sales tax by 2 percent. This bunch is not courageous enough. It's the "party" party. They do not want to make serious decisions that will have any kind of impact anywhere. They just want to be nice to everybody, without making any of the decisions that are required of a government.

Well, if the Conservatives are saying that they will reduce taxes by more than \$100 million and decrease the province's total budgetary requirements without other tax increases - and that's the only opportunity. The pie doesn't work. They couldn't do it under the previous administration. They're not going to do any better, should they ever become elected in terms of any kind of a pie in the future. So if they're not going to decrease . . . Well, what it comes down to, no bigger pie, no increase in the deficit, a decrease in services. Okay? Now we're talking \$110 million and if you want to add the \$22 million of today, as I heard a critic mumble from his seat, that adds to it, where are they going to get it? They cut day care spending. We've doubled it. Would they cut it? Would they cut health care spending? Would they chop support for education? — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, hidden agenda, the Member for Sturgeon Creek says. Interesting concept, interesting concept.

I have explained to the House, Mr. Speaker, how they can't do it with a larger pie. If they're saying they won't

raise taxes, the only other choice they can make is to decrease services, so we're looking at areas where they might do it. Would they cut important income assistance programs for the needy in this province? How about economic programming? I tend to think they wouldn't do those things. Who knows? I do think they might look at the Jobs Fund, but in one way or another . . .

A MEMBER: Sales tax.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, sales tax they said they won't. I'm saying if they don't increase taxation. Mr. Speaker, ordinary Manitobans do not have the answers to those questions. Why don't they have the answers to those questions? Because the Leader of the Opposition is playing hide-and-seek with Manitobans; he's hand-wringing about total budgetary requirements, his promises of tax reductions without telling us what services he's going to cut. That won't wash with Manitobans. They know better than that.

You know, again, we've been out there talking with hundreds, probably thousands of Manitobans in the last number of months and over the last number of years, and they understand far better than the people in the opposition would want them to, what the choices are that face the province and the people of Manitoba. They will not be fooled.

As I indicated in the Budget Address, the total budgetary requirement . . . well, let's just slow down on that. The last two times a Tory government went to the people, they got pretty badly surprised by what the people said to them. At least our record is one out of the last two, we won. We're going to make sure that when we go, we're going to have timing which is such that we can eliminate some of the people on the other side and possibly increase the people on this side. We'll do it in good time. Don't worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the Budget Address, the total budgetary requirement for 1985-86 at \$496.2 million worked out to about 2.8 percent of projected gross provincial product for the coming year. That's about 10 percent less than the 3.1 percent share the total budgetary requirement represented of gross provincial product back in 1982-83. In my view, that is a pretty significant improvement in the circumstances.

On that - I had mentioned this in a previous speech in the House; the Member for Turtle Mountain wanted me to find the exact quotation - I would remind him that back on December 10, 1982, he put the following statements on the province's total budgetary requirement on the record of this Assembly. I'm quoting: "The deficit on the basis of information which is now available, the deficit next year is going to go to between \$800 million and \$1 billion." About a sentence later, he continued, "I now warn the First Minister and the Minister of Finance and their colleagues that they're going to face an \$800 million to \$1 billion deficit next year." That's what he said.

Why did he say that? That's because that government that prides itself in somehow being so terribly fiscally responsible . . . and incidentally, the Member for Turtle Mountain was Finance Minister when we had the largest percentage increase in spending in the last six years - the largest percentage increase. He doesn't talk about that to his constituents. He talks about the fact that

this government has spent so much more. Well, this year, our spending is up 4.7 percent over last year. Last year overbudgeted, it was 3.9. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1981-82, his expenditure increases were over 18 percent and he would tell me, give me lessons about not spending money. He also knows that when he left office, Mr. Speaker, he and that other bunch left books which had preliminary numbers from the departments - this is end of November of 1981 - indicating a deficit for 1982-83 of \$500 million. That's what they left us with. I've still got the black book.

In December of 1982, 12 months later, and seeing the projections of Tory Government, remembering the projections, remembering and having run away from doing another Budget, having called an election instead, he got up in this House and said that next year it's going to be between \$800 million and \$1 billion. He's never explained to this House what we've done in terms of that \$500 million. Not a chance. And, of course, it wasn't anywhere near \$800 million to \$1 billion. It was about \$430 million overall for the year. Let him come up some time and explain to us why he was close to \$600 million out on his forecast.

I suggest that it was because he had increased the deficit exponentially in his year as Finance Minister. He knew we were in some difficult times. We all knew that. All Manitobans knew that. He saw the projections from that time from the Finance Department and there is a suggestion by people opposite that somehow it is solely a problem of the NDP that we are facing the kinds of budgetary requirements we are facing. That's hogwash. That is pure and simple hogwash.

In light of those comments, Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped members opposite would acknowledge that in presenting a total budgetary requirement for 1985-86 of under half the expectations of their Finance critic three years ago, that our government has succeeded beyond certainly their wildest expectations. Why don't you talk about that? The Member for Pembina, I heard him screaming away just a few seconds ago, it was just a few months after the Member for Turtle Mountain mentioned that business about \$800 million to \$1 billion, he was telling Manitobans to bet their bottom dollar that the deficit for 1983-84 was going to be \$750 million. He was over \$300 million out. Lucky none of his constituents trusted him enough to go out there and bet their bottom dollar or they'd have been in big trouble.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate, the Leader of the Opposition was talking about a dramatic drop in the proportion of private capital investment in this province since 1981. He implied that our policies of supporting job retention and creation and the private economy so it could get back on its feet after the recession were not making a difference. Of course, he didn't point out that private investment in Manitoba increased 9.8 percent in 1984, nearly three times the national increase. He didn't point out that the great number of people in the private sector out there, say, for instance, the National Homebuilders' Association are saying that our policies have improved the investment climate dramatically in this province.

In 1977 and 1978, Manitoba had private investment which was 9.5 percent of the level of the other three western provinces. That's where the previous government started out; about 9.5 percent of the other

- in '77 and '78 - it was about 9.5 percent of the level of the other three western provinces.

In 1981, investment in Manitoba was down to 6.2 percent of the level in the other three western provinces. They had really improved, really done well, dropped it from 9.5 percent to 6.2 percent in three short years.

Between '77 and '81, Manitoba, again, fell behind the other western provinces in private investment from about 9.5 percent to 6.2 percent. In 1985, Manitoba is projected to have private investment back up to 9.7 percent of the other western provinces; so we're back up to our proportion, a little better than the proportion we had in 1977 when the Schreyer government was in office, as opposed to the 6.2 percent under the Lyon government. Private investment, relative to the rest of the west is projected to do a lot better than back in 1981.

Let's keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this is after - not before or during, but after - the recession, when others west of us are saying that their economies are dramatically improving, and when the opposition is suggesting that we're not doing well enough. Keep that in mind as we look at those numbers, pretty well a 50 percent increase, in terms of our share of western Canadian investment, and those people have the nerve to say we're not doing enough.

I agree that more is needed. I don't think there's anyone on this side who says we shouldn't attempt to do more in order to create more jobs in this province. But we are proud, I think Manitobans are proud of the improvement in our economy, relative to what has been happening around us. From '77-81, we were falling behind and Manitobans were forced to leave the province to look for jobs; now we are bringing our economy back up to scratch. Private investors are demonstrating that the future here is a good investment and Manitoba has recovered the losses in private investment, relative to the rest of the west, the losses that were suffered under the previous administration. The opposition has great difficulty recognizing that Canada has a mixed economy and that the public sector can make a great contribution working alongside, and in co-operation with, the private sector.

The Conservatives short-sighted, naive economic philosophy would, if they believe what they say, leave them to pull out the public sector supports and cancel public sector capital projects when the private sector is in difficulty. Public investment would be cut when private investment declines simply to assure a nice sounding ratio of private to public investment; so when private investment drops, you've gotta drop your public investment so that it doesn't appear there's so much public investment out there. And, of course, I, and the members on this side of the House, believe that such policies would again be a disaster and irreparably damage our province, as they have in the past.

Fortunately for Manitoba, our New Democratic administration had the opportunity to pursue supportive policies in the recessionary times. The success of our approach and the confidence of investors in our province is evident in the result. Manitoba now has the best private investment recovery in the west, and a considerably stronger recovery than the country as a whole.

The Leader of the Opposition — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking as the Minister in charge in

response to an opposition motion, and I believe I have unlimited time on that basis.

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

MR. H. ENNS: I believe it has been a tradition in the House for a Minister to request that privilege, to make that known to the House before he begins his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If members will refer to Rule 33 in our book, subsection (1)(e) and (f) indicates that a member making a motion of no confidence in the government is not restricted to 40 minutes, and neither is the Minister replying thereto. However, it has been a courtesy that a Minister would indicate at the beginning of his remarks that he is the so designated member.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition expressed concern . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. At the suggestion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, where he stated that the Tories have failed to provide constructive criticism, I am prepared to provide that constructive criticism.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order, as I'm sure the honourable member is aware.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I was just going to explain my point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I would think that, at this time, out of courtesy, the Honourable Minister would allow me to have my say, rather than when it comes to Interim Supply, because I believe there has been some agreement made, when we do get down to Interim Supply, to hurry it through so that there won't be any inconvenience for any of the government members; and I think that, if there is any, that will fall on the shoulders of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Matters of courtesy are not points of order.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The Leader of the Opposition expressed concern over the level of utilities and communication investment indicated in the recent Statistics Canada Investment Intentions Report.

Apparently the Leader of the Opposition can't add any better this year than he could last. Wasn't it last year when he came into this House and said that an increase of about 10,000 people in the population of Manitoba was only a one-tenth of 1 percent increase? Didn't do any better this year. He should know that

the Statistics Canada Investment Survey was also, as well as that, compiled long before the NEB approved the Northern States Power sale, and long before I announced in my Budget that some \$140 million is to be spent on Limestone this year. So that \$140 million is going to add substantially to the total utilities investment reported in the Statistics Canada survey.

Most members know that transportation, utilities and communications are areas where the public sector, governments and Crown corporations have traditionally made substantial investments in this country. The Leader of the Opposition is apparently one of the few Canadians who does not understand this. In one breath he says there's too much public investment and that somehow give us more economic activity; then he turns around and says there's too little public investment and there should be more. When we announce more, he can't even add up the figures. So there he is, arguing less is more - more or less - and too much is too little - give or take a little.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke at some length about losses of manufacturing jobs. Once again, he didn't have his facts straight. He apparently can't read statistics; he doesn't seem to know why there have been losses of manufacturing jobs or what has happened in the manufacturing sector in other provinces. Between December, 1979 and December, 1981, when the Member for Sturgeon Creek had something to do with the decline and fall of the Manitoba economy, there were 4,000 jobs lost in manufacturing at a time of an upturn in Canada. Things were coming along pretty nicely in Canada. At that time he managed to have 4,000 jobs lost in manufacturing.

Manitoba lost 4,000 jobs, so let's take a look at some other provinces. How about Saskatchewan? What happened there? Because now I hear suddenly that it's okay to refer to other provinces, although just a moment ago he didn't want to. He said, "This is Manitoba." Well how about Saskatchewan? In that same period of time there was a gain of 4,000 jobs in Saskatchewan; Alberta gained 9,000; B.C. gained 3,000; those people were going that way; Manitoba was going that way - basically wrong way government.

Our government hasn't, we agree, we haven't turned around all the declines completely that had started under the Conservative administration and we have had - and this is statistically undeniable - we have had the worst recession since the Depression across this country to deal with during our time in office. Most people know that since 1981 the recession started, I think the best definition of it is about the summertime of 1981, that's about when it started; no question. — (Interjection) — Well let's admit there was a recession. Let's agree that it started in mid-1981 and let's agree as well that there were significant manufacturing job losses in this province from 1979 to 1981, that two-year period when there were increases in Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C.

Let's look at the record from 1981 to 1985 because I've talked about what's happened in Manitoba from 1979 to 1981. Alberta lost 25,000 manufacturing jobs from December 1981 to December 1984. In B.C., 28,000 jobs just in the manufacturing sector and of course we know that there are many other factors in an economy than the manufacturing sector. We know for instance that overall the last numbers show that there are 63,000

fewer people working in British Columbia today than there were at the start of the recession - 63,000 people fewer in the Province of British Columbia. And there are many other provinces where that kind of - maybe not as drastic - but where there are way fewer people working today than there were in 1981. That's not the case in Manitoba. We're heading in the other direction. We do have more people working. We're not doing well enough, but in comparison to what others are doing and in comparison to what the Tories did before us, we're doing pretty well.

The Royal Bank recently commented on Manitoba's manufacturing sector and they take a somewhat longer view than the Leader of the Opposition because the bank is in the business of identifying where the economic opportunities are in this country. They're looking at prospects for the next 10 years and say that "Manitoba's manufacturing sector" - and I'm quoting - "is expected to grow at a pace very close to that of the manufacturing sector at the national level and will likely remain a reliable source of employment in the province." That's what they're saying about it.

I think we should talk a little bit about what the recession has done to manufacturing investment in Western Canada. The Leader of the Opposition likes to crow about how good manufacturing investment was in 1981 in Manitoba. Well, let's take a look at it. In 1981 manufacturing investment in Manitoba amounted to 5.5 percent of the manufacturing investment in the other three western provinces - 5.5 percent of the manufacturing investment. That sounds like quite a bit. Of course that was less than the 6.2 percent when they took office and it was down a fair bit from the 6.8 percent it was the year prior to that. So manufacturing investment fell from 6.8 percent of what it was in the other three provinces to 5.5 percent under their government. They must really be proud of themselves.

What has happened since 1981? Has that trend continued? Manufacturing investment is up in Saskatchewan, but it is lower across the rest of the west and in Canada as a whole. Nonetheless, for 1985, Manitoba is projected to have 10.9 percent of the manufacturing investment of the other western provinces. Okay? From 5.5 up to 10.9.

A MEMBER: Almost double.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, that is almost double. Almost double the share of manufacturing investment we had in 1981. So let's not pretend that the New Democratic Party Government of this province is anti-business or scaring business out of the province. The facts simply do not correspond with that kind of nonsense.

Last Thursday - I think it was last Thursday that the Minister of Employment Services provided some statements with respect to Manitoba population. I want to talk a little bit about that. — (Interjection) — Well, yes. As of that date, Manitoba's population stood at 1,065,000 people. In the last three years our population has increased by 34,900 people. These gains stand in marked contrast with the actual population losses Manitoba recorded under the previous administration.

To provide some scale, because you know you say 34,900 people - people don't really conceptualize that

all that much - that's roughly the same number of people as lived in the City of Brandon in Manitoba at the time of the last census, that's how many people. We have more today than when we took office. Or if you want to get to smaller towns — (Interjection) — well actually 34,900 people is just a little bit more than the combined population of Portage la Prairie, The Pas and Thompson - not bad. Not bad for three years, after four years when we had a decline of about 1,000 people - not bad. In fact, the gain in population in the past three years has been — (Interjection) — let's put it in a different way. You didn't like my first two methods of showing as much as the population of Brandon at the last census or more than Portage, The Pas and Thompson altogether. Let's try it in different way that you would understand a little better.

We'll try - as compared to the population of all the rural municipalities in Manitoba, 18 percent of the population of all the rural municipalities in Manitoba - that's the increase in the last three years. Pretty significant. Or if that's still something that doesn't grab the imagination of members opposite, how about 38 percent of the total population of all towns combined in this province? I believe that that uses the number 762 for Emerson.

Now members opposite don't seem impressed. I'll try again. It is more - the population increase in the last three years is more than the total population of all the villages in this province, every single village - if you took every single person who was there in 1981 - yet we've got more people in Manitoba right now, added, than residents of all the villages in this province. — (Interjection) — I don't seem to be impressing the opposition to the same extent, so I'll continue. Maybe I can hit some sympathetic chord over there because I think beneath those cold blue Tory suits there must beat some warm hearts who care for the future of Manitoba.

In each of the last three years, 1982-83 and '84, population growth in this province has exceeded the national average. Now, we have not been able to achieve that since Statistics Canada first produced these quarterly estimates in July of 1952. In fact, not that long ago, I believe I reported to the House that we had not been above the national average in terms of population increase since 1919. I think that's important to say because the opposition frequently uses the argument that there's a recession and that's why everybody moved here. This is the traditional thing to when there's trouble out there on the economic horizon internationally or nationally, everybody moves to Manitoba. It's sort of like the lemmings moving to the sea. That's their argument for saying it's something that's happened in the past.

Can they show us when it last happened during a recession in the past? They can't show us. It hasn't happened since 1919, so let us not get this nonsense out on the table that somehow this isn't something that's fairly unique. We've done a good job here. We're rather pleased with it. A key factor behind this above national average population growth has been the decision of thousands of individuals that Manitoba has once again become a better place to live.

Between January 1, 1984 and January 1, 1985, Manitoba gained 685 persons through net migration from other provinces. — (Interjection) — Well, obviously

you didn't understand it. I'm going to try to explain in a little more detail. This, combined with increases in '82 and '83 has added 2,359 to Manitoba's population over the past three years. Of course, this contrasts vividly, starkly, with the losses of 9,557 souls in 1978; 13,806 in '79; 11,342 in 1980. Of course, the Tories are trying to suggest that these people are all coming here to collect welfare and they should be ashamed of themselves for making those kinds of comments from their desks.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, because sometimes you hear the Tories say, well, you've got a population increase because you've got all these thousands of people coming here at the end of the oil boom in the west. Of course, we've pointed out that there was an oil boom in the west during the Schreyer years as well, but they'd like to ignore that. Just over 10 percent of our total increase - I'll explain this carefully; I wish I had a picture so you could see it - in population is as a result of gains made from Alberta, that is about 3,500 people net came here from Alberta out of that almost 35,000 people; about 10 percent net from Alberta. Yet, we've seen column after column written by those people attacking the population statistics and say that it's just a bunch of people coming back from Alberta and Saskatchewan and B.C. In fact, none of our increase is a result of net migration from Saskatchewan or B.C. We've got this increase as a result of other reasons altogether than from net increases in population from Alberta. Maybe you should get your facts right when you're doing your constituency reports rather than distort the important events that have occurred here in Manitoba over the last three years.

The economic implications, which the Tories never understood, of this population increase, cannot go unnoticed during a Budget Debate in Manitoba. The people moving back or choosing to stay here in Manitoba are expressing confidence in our economic present and future, people with a will to build a strong economy. A growing population represents growing demands for a vast array of goods and services. Meeting the demands of such a growing population may be seen to provide growth opportunities for all sectors of the Manitoba economy. Above national average employment growth has coincided with this population growth.

Since mid-1981, our province with just over 4 percent of Canada's population has accounted for over 13 percent of the new jobs, better than three times the national average. That's jobs for teachers in a place the size of Brandon across this province, or the other examples I've used. That's an awful lot of jobs, for retail workers supplying services to people; people in the service sector. Those people all need those kinds of services. They need shoes, they need clothing, they need all the services that the economy is so capable of providing. That is one of the reasons why we've had strong employment growth. We have had close to 35,000 new people for whom we're able to provide education. We've been able to provide them with food and other services and so on. That is very important for the future well-being of our economy.

It's true, it has provided jobs for many people; building houses for people, building rental units, building all kinds of commercial space, retail space. That's why, although the Member for Sturgeon Creek finds it

incredible, we're able to say with some confidence that our sales tax revenue will go up in the coming year. In fact, retail sales went up 16.6 percent January to January in this province. That's pretty good with inflation at the low point where it is. That is tremendous for a province like this and would not happen if we took those 35,000 people away from this province as the Tories did and just referred to them as more problems for welfare. We used to have "Boxcar Bud" in the Legislature here, the Health Minister, suggesting that we should have fewer people because all those people who were leaving were on welfare anyway. I think that was quite a shame.

One of the bright spots for the members of the opposition in the past couple of days has been the forecast of the Conference Board which was published the month before last and which the Leader of the Opposition apparently accepts as the final gospel on what is going to happen here in Manitoba. We've heard him and other people opposite. That's the only report they will refer to, although there are many others out. As members are aware, for some time now the Conference Board has been expressing grave concern that interest rates in North America are much too high. Those high interest rates, according to that very same board they so admire when they refer to our growth prospects, are costing Canadians and Manitobans thousands and thousands of jobs.

The Conference Board is telling us and trying to tell Conservative Governments in this country that high interest rates are bad for the economy, that high interest rates are bad for ordinary people, that they cause unemployment and that they could cause another recession. That's what the Conference Board is saying as well. I share the concern the Conference Board has been expressing about high interest rates. When the Conference Board national forecast came out in January, they said that a significant easing in monetary policy and lower interest rates in North America could provide 222,000 additional jobs in Canada by 1986 - 222,000 additional jobs if we got a sane monetary policy. Those are jobs that ordinary Canadians need.

Last fall, when I spoke to the Chamber of Commerce Economic Outlook Conference, I included some comments on the Conference Board forecast. That wasn't, of course, the only forecast discussed at that conference. There were representatives of the Royal Bank, Richardson Greenshields, business people, academics, at a conference and a wide range of views was shared. However, I did include in my remarks some comments on the Conference Board's outlook, which was released the day before.

If the Leader of the Opposition had bothered to read my notes, which he referred to and which were distributed to the conference, he would know that I did not agree, as he implied, with everything in the Conference Board's outlook for this coming year; but I did say that the board had some important things to say. One of the things the Conference Board was saying was that lower interest rates could translate into nearly 3,000 additional jobs here in Manitoba in 1985.

I know the Conservatives here support high interest rates. They charged farmers usurious rates of interest when they were in government; they supported the high interest policies of the Federal Government, but when they get up in the House and talk about what the

Conference Board has to say, they don't talk about the damage that high interest rates do to an economy. They don't get up and talk about the jobs for ordinary people that aren't there because of high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, when the Conference Board prepared their last provincial forecast a couple of months ago, interest rates were going up again, so I'm hardly surprised that the board didn't predict very impressive growth anywhere in this country. They had a little more information than they had last fall and they did predict Manitoba would do better than they were predicting in November of 1984. That's something else the opposition didn't mention. The opposition doesn't mention high interest rates, doesn't mention improvement in the Conference Board's growth outlook. It just sort of wouldn't fit in with their general comments of doom and gloom.

I said the Conference Board had more information in February than they had last fall. One of the things they had was a chance to analyse the November 8th cuts announced by the Federal Government. Our analysis shows that if the Federal Government proceeds with those cuts, some 6,000 jobs in Manitoba and over \$400 million in investment could be lost. So again, I'm not surprised that after the Federal Government announced cuts, with a disproportionate impact here in Manitoba, that the Conference Board's assessment of the improvement in our growth outlook was not as great as in some other provinces that didn't suffer as greatly from those cuts. But the Conference Board didn't have, for example, the investment intentions outlook published by Statistics Canada in March of 1985; so that isn't contained in the indications they have for Manitoba for 1985.

They didn't know that the investment outlook for Manitoba is the strongest in the country for this coming year. They didn't put that into their numbers; so they missed out on strength in the construction industry; they missed out on some high-paying construction jobs; they missed income and all the spinoffs for the service sector of the economy, spinoffs for transportation to move construction materials around, wholesale and retail trade and so on. So when a forecaster doesn't have an up-to-date view of the investment picture, when interest rates were going up, not coming down as they are now, I think it's fair to be a little more critical of the results than the Leader of the Opposition; and we've often said - and even the Governor of the Bank of Canada agrees - that higher interest rates have a larger impact on provinces with smaller businesses like Manitoba.

Did they take that into account in their speeches, in doom and gloom and crying about Manitoba? Of course not. The Leader of the Opposition and other opposition people failed to mention that there were other predictions made by the Conference Board that tied into that number. One was it was based on a poorer crop production for 1985 than 1984, in Manitoba. They were saying that, overall, yields are going to be down in 1985. Some people in Western Manitoba might very seriously question that. They may be right; they may be wrong, but they said very clearly in their forecast that was one of the reasons why they were saying there were problems, in terms of what they were saying our rate of growth would be. Did the members opposite ever mention that fact? No, of course not.

Did they mention the fact that the Conference Board referred, in their statement with respect to manufacturing, to the agricultural equipment manufacturing sector, which they said had not recovered in the way some other industries had. No, of course not. They know, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural implement manufacturing sector has been weak right across North America. They know that. Why has it been weak? It has been weak because farmers have not had the disposable income that some bureaucrats in Ottawa would like to think they have over the last few years and they have not been making the kinds of sales people would have liked them to make and we happen to have a larger proportion of our manufacturing in farm equipment production than other manufacturing bases in this country. And the Conference Board said that, said that the particular area was one where there is some concern because it hasn't recovered in the way some other sectors have.

Take for instance, auto manufacturing. Automobile manufacturing has been very strong, not because everything has been wonderful in Ontario, but people right across the country have been buying more cars. People in North America have been buying more cars, and there you are. There a manufacturing sector happens to have some different components and therefore has strengthened more quickly; but the Conservative Opposition would like to tie these kinds of numbers, every single number that indicates that we might be a little below the national average, into some plot by the NDP to attack business.

On Budget night, for example, and I'm going back to the fact that there was a lot of consultation out there before and I think it was important, I met afterwards that very evening, with members, ordinary Manitobans, people from the manufacturing community, people from the Association of Manufacturers, Canadian Association, Manitoba Association. They were telling me that very evening they have no problem with our budgetary policies. They can live quite nicely with them, thank you. In fact, the only business representative I heard out there who was off the wall was a fellow from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and that fellow was — (Interjection) — no, he wasn't from Manitoba, he was a flack from Saskatchewan who's been here for all of three days and he came in and he heard all about the things Tories want people to say - he was from apparently, the Premier's Office in Saskatchewan, and he came in here and just went through the whole Tory line, probably did it a little better than most of our local Tories can, the same line that other people in the business community were telling me they were embarrassed about.

They were saying, that's not where we stand; we know that this government has tried hard to keep its spending in line and tried to keep social services going and we support that, and nobody wants increased taxes and so on. The one organization that had changed people, because I think if they'd sent someone from their federation who had been at our meetings - and I should add, and who could understand what was happening - I don't have any doubt that those comments that evening would have not been the kinds of comments that particular individual made.

We've talked a bit about the Conference Board and also some of the reasons they had for making the

statements they did for 1985. Do you want to give me an extra hour, Dave? I have a fair amount of material here that I haven't even touched.

So I think that some Manitobans - maybe not the opposition - I think some Manitobans would be interested in getting some other views, because there's some notion out there that the Conference Board is the only particular organization out there with a forecast. Of course we'll see what their next forecast happens to be, but there are other forecasts out there, for instance, Statistics Canada saying that investment intentions for 1985 for Manitoba are the best in this whole country. That's pretty nice. We were very strong in 1984; we're strong again in 1985. We're coming on.

I'm sure that most members are aware that last week the Royal Bank said that Manitoba had the best economic outlook in Western Canada.

A MEMBER: The best in the west.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The best in the west, that's right. They said we'd have 3 percent growth this year; 3.3 percent next year - and get this - and for the next decade - because these people do plan ahead and try to figure out where the investment should go - for the next decade Manitoba would be the best in the west. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, were we the best in the west when that bunch was in office? And I think the resounding, practically unanimous view of Manitobans would be no, no, a thousand times no. In fact, 1,029,000 times no. I think that many people would say that we are better off under an NDP administration than a Tory one.

So we weren't the best in the west but now we have a financial community, investors, ordinary people coming home and they're recognizing that Manitoba is a good place to be and our economy is getting back on a stronger footing. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear the term "ordinary Manitobans" offends some of the people opposite. I noticed that and I find that to be pretty ridiculous, and in fact not worth commenting on, other than to say that it's too bad they don't like to hear about ordinary people, working men and women in the province, who are the people who are coming home.

You might be interested of course in another forecast which came out recently, the Scotia Bank forecast. They're a little more optimistic about the Canadian economy than the Royal Bank and they also say Manitoba's growth this year will be quite similar to the national average and certainly above the Western Canadian. The Scotia Bank is predicting 3.3 percent growth for Manitoba this year. That's more than double what the Conference Board is now saying.

The point is this: Manitobans know there are a range of views about what the precise growth numbers are going to be this year.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It sounds to me as though the member for the Royal Bank is a little uptight about somebody saving the credit union movement in Alberta.

That's regrettable. We had similar problems, of course, when we took over here.

Manitobans, again, I don't think — (Interjection) — Okay "ordinary" Manitobans then, if the Member for Minnedosa likes that better - know there are a range of views about what the precise growth numbers are going to be this year, next year and so on. They know that our government is capable of and committed to listening to a range of views on economic issues. And our government does not get so hung up on one statistic that we miss the main concern of all the forecasts available to us, that unemployment across this country is likely to remain much too high. We hear, in any statistics quoted, nobody talking on the other side about the last couple of years, which have been far better than you said.

The Leader of the Opposition a couple of years ago was saying that recovery would come across North America but it would pass Manitoba by, because of the policies of this government. Indeed, the reverse is true. The recovery came in this province, in a better, stronger fashion than anywhere else in the country.

In relative terms, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans can be proud that with 4 percent of the population, we have 13 percent of the new jobs created in Canada since the pre-recession period. That is the kind of progress this government is committed to building on with the people of Manitoba. I know I'm running out of time. I just want to say that I'm — (Interjection) — I've got material to go on until 10:00.

I'm surprised that members opposite, who incidentally, Mr. Speaker - I had some newspaper clipping here that I was sort of surprised at. The Leader of the Opposition was quoted a couple of months ago as saying, now that they're going ahead with Limestone, we want to get into the House and we want to ask those people questions; we want to do something about the . . . we've got all these questions, all this stuff we want to know about Limestone. We come in here, and I'm sitting beside the Minister of Energy and I'm afraid there's going to be a great attack on us. The hordes are going to come across. They're all going to have these well-researched questions on what is going on. And what do we have? We have a thud, a complete, absolute bomb out.

In question periods, the backbenchers of the New Democratic Party Government are supplying the entertainment and the good questions; we have a front bench in the opposition that has done basically nothing in terms of bringing out the real issues that concern Manitobans. They have been muzzled because of their lack of leadership. I have this theory that they've gone from a dictatorship under the previous leader, to anarchy under the current one. We've gone from a party where people could go to a caucus and they didn't have to think. They were told what to do; they were given their marching orders and away they went, and at least they had a team.

You had a group of people, whether they were right or wrong - and they were more often wrong than right - but at least they knew what road they were going down. We've got a group now, a rag-tag bunch of indecisive people with just pure anarchy ruling, no goal, no aims, no rational overall plan of attack, thinking that all they have to do is sit back and expect the government to drop because Sterling told them to do it. Because

Sterling says so. Now they go to their meetings and they begin arguing with each other about what they're going to do and not coming to any decisions. This great democracy they have in that caucus of theirs now is leading to no decisions, and that is in some ways unfortunate because what that means is that we don't have the quality of opposition that Manitobans were accustomed to in the 1977-81 period.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm looking at the time. I don't have a great deal left. I was going to discuss Limestone. I want to make a couple of points quickly about Limestone. I am surprised that none of the members opposite . . .

MR. H. ENNS: A point of order.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Well, actually it's a matter of compassion. If the Honourable Minister wants to call it 9:30 p.m., we're prepared to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I think a couple of those stones just basically hit home.

I'm surprised that nobody there talked about the National Energy Board. They went to the board and they said we've got these problems, these little problems. These numbers may not be right but we don't know what question to ask because if we ask you a question, you're going to prove that we're wrong. They said be very very careful about this. The New Democratic Party Government is going to say that if you say it's a good deal then you have approved the advancement. What did the board say? The board said a two-year advancement case based on their analysis, not Hydro's analysis, on their analysis, will provide Manitobans with a greater profit than a one-year advancement and the sale provides us with more profit than no sale.

What the members opposite failed to do, and a number of them very briefly referred to the construction of our next hydro-electric dam, what they failed to do is to honestly tell the people and the taxpayers and Hydro users of Manitoba the consequences of the no-sale event. The no-sale event means whether they like it or not, construction of Limestone within about two years anyway, it will then be funded by the taxpayers of Manitoba with none of that benefit of that profitable sale to decrease the increase. Nobody denies that there will be an increase in hydro-electric costs. The question is how much more do they want them to go up?

The National Energy Board, an entity of the Conservative National Government, says that we will make more money doing it this way than doing it without the sales. I say that is an issue that we will have to deal with more during the Session. We were expecting something serious to happen during this debate. It's been raised several times by us. It's not being raised in question period. It's not being raised in a forum

where we can discuss it. — (Interjection) — That's something that surprises and, indeed, disappoints me.

I heard one member outside this Chamber say on television the other day, well, I was a Cabinet Minister in the 70s; well, you know I went up to Limestone; well, you know. These guys were talking Portugese "well, you know". What was he doing as Cabinet Minister? Why wasn't he making sure that the jobs would be here in Manitoba. I've heard nobody here in the opposition comment on the fact that for every job to be created in Ontario and Quebec building the generators and turbines, there will be a job in Manitoba this time. Nobody's been talking about that. That is a tremendous benefit for this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

In accordance with our Rule 23.5, I am interrupting the debate to put the question on the amendment to the House.

The question before the House is the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition as printed.

Those in favour of the amendment, please say aye. Those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion, the nays have it and I declare the motion lost.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Doern, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 21; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Attorney-General and I had voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the First Minister. Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Agriculture. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance as printed. Those in favour of the motion please say aye. Those opposed please say nay.

In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask if members were agreeable to the same division in reverse without bringing in the members with the division bells? So we can have the vote recorded on division. Yes. Same division in reverse?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Why in reverse? Make it interesting.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to move adjournment of the House now. Before I do so I'd like to speak briefly to the business before the House for the balance of this week.

In discussions with the Opposition House Leader, we have examined the Estimates listing to go both to committee and to the House. We'll be going into Committee of Supply. Depending on the progress of other business this week, I would expect that we would be in two committees on Easter Monday, that would be the first instance, next Monday, and that in the committee room we would be considering the Department of Highways first, followed by Natural Resources and then Municipal Affairs. In the House, we would start with, well now it's going to be Health, Urban Affairs, Finance, Agriculture and Education.

Mr. Speaker, we still have outstanding in the Committee of Supply the Interim Supply Resolution introduced the day before the Budget. I would request the co-operation of the opposition in passing the Interim Supply as soon as possible because the new fiscal year has been entered today and I would appreciate that co-operation from members opposite. It would be my intention to call those bills that are both standing adjourned on second reading and those which have not yet been moved for second reading, upon the completion of Interim Supply sometime later this week.

And I wish to announce, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of members, I believe it may already be on notice, a meeting of the Standing Committee of Rules of the House for Tuesday, April 9th at 10:00 a.m.

If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, from honourable members about that schedule of business, I'll then move adjournment.

Monday, 1 April, 1985

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).