

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 16 May, 1980

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I will have to wait until — oh, the Minister of Health is here. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health pertaining to the 1953 chemical test spraying that took place. Can the Minister of Health confirm that in fact it is true that it was zinc and cadmium sulphide that was sprayed and not zinc cadmium sulphide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No I can't, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. My understanding is that it was zinc cadmium sulphide.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise what quantity was injected into the air and what quantity was likely breathed in by the average Winnipegger in the testing that took place in 1953?

MR. SHERMAN: I'll have to take those questions as notice and attempt to get that information for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. Those are highly specific and precise and technical questions. I'm not sure whether that second question can be answered. I would think that an answer should be obtainable for the first question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister should insist upon an answer from someone as to the second question if he is unable to obtain it from within his own sources. Can the Minister advise whether or not there were any areas outside of Winnipeg that were involved in the 1953 testing within the province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: We have no knowledge of such. I have no information that would suggest that were the case, Mr. Speaker, but I'll check further on that. I might say that the information we've received thus far — through public health and through the Cancer Foundation and medical sources with whom we've checked here, and the medical records — reaffirms what I told the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the other day, that up to this point there is no evidence, no indication of any unusual increase in the incidence of disease that could be related, or

diseases or illnesses that could be related to that particular spraying incident.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Finance, as the Deputy Premier, can the Deputy Premier advise whether or not the province of Manitoba will support the call by representatives of this province and the House of Commons, that there be established a public inquiry into this and other chemical or biological tests that have taken place on unknowing citizens in the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I think, Mr. Speaker, that the undertakings or proceedings with the federal government have been mentioned by the Minister reporting for the Environment. As to whether or not the government specifically will support a House of Commons resolution, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been any decision or discussion with regard to that specifically.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Deputy Premier, can the Deputy Premier advise whether or not any reply has yet been received by Manitoba to the request for the original report, intergovernmental correspondence, that was requested some one week ago?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I know he gave an indication to the House that he was pursuing that.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may interject at this time. I apologize, I forgot to introduce to the members 24 visitors from La Porte School in Minnesota under the direction of Mr. Evenmo. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: I'm rising on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was out of town on a speaking engagement when the Member for Gladstone made his insulting and sexist remarks in what was apparently his maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, his maiden speech, at least to my knowledge. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he has the guts to repeat them in my presence. I wonder if anyone, man or woman, on that side of the House, has the integrity to stand and apologize for the sexist and insulting remarks of the Member for Gladstone. He is sitting there with a smirk on his face; he thinks he's a very clever and witty man, no doubt.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, that you did not intervene and prevent this insulting attack on me and on my party. I beseech the government, any member of the government, to

stand and state that they do not agree with the sexist and insulting remarks of the Member for Gladstone. If anyone has enough independence and decency on that side of the House, I would respect and honour them for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have listened to the point of privilege allegedly raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. From time to time in this Chamber there have been many remarks made of a personal nature which no doubt would be better left unsaid. However, it has been an accepted practice in this House when a person feels obligated they rise and bring it to the attention of the House, and I thank the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for doing so at this time. However, there are certain rules that apply to the language of this Chamber that, as far as I have able to ascertain, and I haven't got the Hansard in front of me, at the time the remarks were made I did not find anyone rising and objecting to the language at that time.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the same point of privilege and to the Member for Fort Rouge, she'll have no problem reading the Hansard. What I said I certainly will not withdraw. This is a political forum and if she doesn't like the heat in the kitchen, she knows what she can do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Gladstone he withdraw that remark. It is not parliamentary to issue threatening language in this Chamber. I ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. FERGUSON: The language was not meant to be threatening, Mr. Speaker. If it was, I'll withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: In view of the fact that the member has refused to withdraw his remarks of yesterday, I would ask him specifically to state with which members of the socialist party I have been in bed. He's a dirty little man and I suggest that it's a dirty little party since not one of them will stand up and defend the honour of a member of this House.

MR. FERGUSON: To the Member for Fort Rouge, I think she'd better read the thing and find that it was in political bed, not in bed. And if she would like me to name who it was, I would say the Member for St. Boniface, the Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Johns, Logan, Selkirk, St. Matthews, Kildonan, St. Vital, Brandon East.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, would you please advise me what rights I have in this House. This really is more despicable than I could have believed. I do, surely I do have the right to the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. The honourable member feels that she has been insulted by the member's remarks. He obviously, and to other members who did not stand at the time, regarded them as figuratively. She does not so regard them. The honourable member has compounded it, knowing that the honourable member does not regard this as some type of eloquence, but regards that as an insult. It seems to me that for the benefit of all of us, that the honourable member should withdraw it. He shouldn't use that type of technicolor if an honourable member feels insulted. It's not for us, Mr. Speaker, to judge. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member regards the remarks as sexist, she regards the expression been in bed with as being some type of wrongful relationship, not of the political nature but of a moral nature. And having been advised by the honourable member that she so regards it, it is ill for the honourable member to compound what was the original insult. And I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that you ask the honourable member to quit this adventure and withdraw it as far as it has gone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of privilege, there were many in the House at the time, the Member for Fort Rouge obviously wasn't. The people that were here I think, by and large, accepted the remarks in the sense that the member was talking about, in the political sense. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, earlier than that there was a member across the way referred to the Member for Gladstone as the jackal. Was there any request for that to be withdrawn?

Mr. Speaker, these sorts of things go back and forth across the House in that manner. There should, Mr. Speaker, be underlined the fact that the remarks were made in the sense of the political sense. I recall at one time in the opposition, Mr. Speaker, on an almost identical type of an accusation being made about a member on the government side practising political incest. Mr. Speaker that was accepted; it was accepted in the —(Interjection)— That's right, Mr. Speaker. The reason I remember so well, Mr. Speaker, is that I said it about the then Minister of Natural Resources, who was the Member for Inkster.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, to try and draw it down, I hope that the Member for Fort Rouge will, upon reviewing it, will accept it as having been a remark made in the political sense. I fully understand why she would be sensitive to the remarks and I trust that when she reads it and thinks about it, she will recognize that they were made in the political sense and that these things are said from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the same point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that every member in the House would have regarded the Member for Gladstone as speaking figuratively. I don't think there's any doubt about that. But the Member for Fort Rouge got up and said she did not take it that way. Having said it, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge is entitled

to the privileges of this House. She said she did not take the remarks figuratively. After she said that, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone, rather than indicating that was the case and that he did not intend any such thing, got up and compounded the insult. And I would, Mr. Speaker, in all respect to one of the members of this House who happens to have a right to her position on the remarks, to ask the Member for Gladstone to do the honourable thing, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw the remarks that he has made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the remarks were made figuratively; they were not meant as a personal slight to the Member for Fort Rouge, and I have no intention of withdrawing those remarks. I'll withdraw them possibly when the Member for Ste. Rose withdraws calling me a jackal, and when that lovely lady from Fort Rouge withdraws calling me a dirty, little man.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I think that courtesies that are or should be extended in this House in many cases are not. I think this may serve as a warning to all of us that we have a responsibility to promote good debate, lively debate, and maintain a sense of dignity that seems to have been slipping in this Chamber in the last 10 years. And one of the courtesies of the Chamber is not to interrupt when the Speaker is speaking. I would hope that the members would conduct themselves in a gentlemanly way and I hope that is not interpreted as a racist comment or sexist comment. There are courtesies in this Chamber that should be afforded to all members and I would ask the Member for Gladstone to consider what he has said, and if he has slighted a member in this Chamber, I feel that he should apologize.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity to take this under advisement.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the matter of privilege, you've not actually made a ruling, you've made a request of the member which he is taking under advisement. I'd like to draw to your attention — I have kept some of the documents you have distributed to us to indicate to us rules in respect to decorum — Rule No. 41, which I am reading from this list and I'll abridge it, it says no member shall use offensive words against any member thereof. Now, I have abbreviated it; it speaks about Her Majesty, other members of the Royal Family, or against the House or against any member thereof. I think it should be time, Mr. Speaker, when you will make a decision, using this as an example, as to whether or not there is use of offensive words against any member thereof in this case. That's a ruling, I think, Your Honour should take; so the fact that we are able to say, it has been said in this House already this morning, that there

are all sorts of things being said that are not gentlemanly but are being said. This may be a good occasion to correct or try to correct ourselves by making a ruling on the point that was raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Frankly, she has the right, as has been recognized, to raise the point. I think, Mr. Speaker, you are bound to make a ruling on it and I would ask that you do make a ruling on this particular rule that I've just read to you.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the problems I have is that if I make a ruling on this at the present time, there is a real live danger that I will be interrupting every debate from this day forward. I would hope that all members would take it as a warning rather than a ruling, so that the tenor of debate in this House could be upgraded without constant interjections and so the level of debate would proceed in an orderly manner without the interjections that seem to constantly occur. I would again ask the Honourable Member for Gladstone to consider what his actions will do to the tenor of debate in this House, and I would ask him to withdraw the remarks.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege, and indeed as one has on occasion perhaps far more seriously abused the privileges of this House with respect to this kind of discussion, but the phrase in question, Sir, is one of such common usage. I remind honourable members, and you, Sir, of the time that the federal minority government was supported by the then New Democrats in Ottawa under the leadership of Mr. Lewis, the phrase of having been in political partnership, having made a political bed with each other, is one of such common usage that it only belies the inexperience, in this particular sense, on the Member for Fort Rouge for this sensitivity. If a member crosses the floor for some reason or other, and joins another political party, the phrase that the member is making his political bed with that party for that reason. Sir, I ask you to reconsider the propriety in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is not one of language at all, the question is one of the courtesy of one member of the House to another; and if one member makes a request and feels that they are slighted, then I think the obligation is one of a personal nature from member to another. And on that basis I would ask the Honourable Member for Gladstone to withdraw his remarks.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, this was not a personal slight; as I again say, this is a political forum. I've had several things said to me that were a lot worse than that. I will not withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I make my comments in general, but specifically to the Member for Gladstone. I simply point out that the expression used in bed with is in common currency, and is

normally not taken exception to by most members of the House. But I think that when the member uses it in reference to a woman MLA, there is a second dimension or another meaning given to that expression which is not taken offence to by a male MLA; but there is another meaning, Mr. Speaker, given to that. He took a risk in using that and I think he should consider the double meaning, the double meaning used in that expression and on those grounds, Mr. Speaker, should in fact withdraw his remark.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You have asked the member to withdraw the remark. He has refused to withdraw the remark. I ask, Mr. Speaker, for you to go back to the records of this House to see what occurred on a similar occasion, when the Honourable Member for Thompson, as he then was, was asked to withdraw a remark by the Speaker. He refused to withdraw; members on this side of the House started to scream as I was already writing, as House Leader, the naming motion of one of my colleagues — one of my Cabinet colleagues — and I had to read, Mr. Speaker, a motion immediately. I remember Mr. Molgat sitting from this seat saying, stop weaseling, as I was writing the motion; that I was required by the Rules to write a motion naming the member, and did so. And it was because the Member for Thompson, who was a Cabinet colleague, refused to withdraw a remark when requested to do so by the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I can speak on the matter, I wonder if it would be appropriate and acceptable if the Member for Gladstone could have an opportunity to look at the Hansard and give consideration to it, which he has requested, and not consider it until such time as having any relationship as to whether or not it had to do with an instruction from yourself, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made that this is a phrase in common usage and I want to suggest that words such as broad, nig, kike were also in common usage and are not acceptable. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that because some people have been in the habit of using certain offensive phrases, which perhaps only reflects their lack of command of the language, that just because they have used them in the past does not mean that they are acceptable. And I am suggesting that with more women entering government at all levels in the years ahead — I'm not asking for special consideration, as the Minister of Health shouted across the floor a minute ago. I am not asking for special consideration; I am not more sensitive than other members of the Chamber. There may be some who would be proud to think that

someone would go to bed with them. I am not one of those, Mr. Speaker.

However, I am suggesting that because offensive phrases have been used — and I believe there were sexist remarks made in committee and quoted in the newspaper less than a year-and-a-half ago by a member of that side of the House, and I believe that that member had to withdraw or apologize for those remarks. And I'm suggesting that this type of comment comes in the same category, while certain people may have thought it was once acceptable, I am suggesting it is no longer, in today's society, acceptable to use such sex-related remarks.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this point, I think the matter has gone far beyond whether or not the remarks made by the member were proper or not and I don't think we should be back to arguing that point. I think the important thing is that you, Mr. Speaker, who makes rulings that are sometimes challenged and usually from this side of the House are challenged, have three times, I believe it is, requested the member to withdraw his remarks. He has refused to do so. This becomes much more important to the conduct of this House than does the remark itself.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that he may say he will not accept your request until he reads Hansard, but I suspect that the original typewritten transcript may well be available now, and I think that either, Mr. Speaker, you have to enforce your request or you have to give the member an opportunity to get a copy of Hansard right now and, before the Session today ends, deal with your request because three times, to refuse your request, is something I don't recall hearing in this House. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have reluctantly, and even ungraciously, accepted the request of a Speaker, but I don't recall a person refusing to accept a request such as you made, and being allowed to let it sit that way. I recall very vividly that the Member for Inkster then, when the Minister of Highways at the time claimed that certain members of the previous government had and I quote, been involved in, some misuse of government, I think, gravel or trucks or something like that — that's what he said. And, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker then asked him to withdraw; he refused and it was a matter of moments only when the Member for Inkster, as House Leader then, brought in the motion and indeed the member was named by the Speaker and was dismissed from the daily session.

It seems to me that if your request is being rejected, then it is up to you to decide how you're going to enforce your position in this House and if the member insists on refusing then, Mr. Speaker, the least is that during this sitting he ought to absent himself until he reads Hansard. And when I say sitting I mean literally today's sitting, so that he does not infringe against you. This will give him the opportunity to read Hansard — and I'm sure he can get a copy now — and come back here and make his proper explanation, Mr. Speaker, and I think he should do so at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed to make a further comment. I think most of the members that are here now, on both sides of the House, were here last night when the comment was made. The Speaker was in the Chair. Perhaps we were all here yesterday afternoon, or whenever it was, Mr. Speaker. I think that that in itself, the fact that it wasn't taken in other than the usual political sense at that time, Mr. Speaker, that I would ask that in that case I think it would be in the interests of all to review the Hansards and have a look at it, Mr. Speaker. Because I think the member, without having that opportunity to do that review, could rightly claim that the earliest opportunity was not taken to take exception to it. In that regard I would ask simply that he have an opportunity, that we all have an opportunity to see whether it was stated in a fashion that would be where personal offence certainly would be clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the hope of giving you some assistance, I would like to suggest to the members of this House that we elected Mr. Speaker to chair our proceedings. I think we owe him some courtesy when he has to make decisions on the split second and I believe it is unfair to ask, when he has made a decision after having listened to all of us that offer him advice, that one member should have, by whatever reason, the obstinacy to refuse to comply with the request of the Speaker. If we strip Mr. Speaker of the authority by any one member of this House, then our parliamentary system goes down the drain. Now I think we have to think and reconsider what we are doing if we're going to allow any one member to make a decision arbitrarily, unilaterally, on his own, that he will not adhere to the rules of this House. So I ask the members to reconsider and they should inform the member who is involved to make a decision. It's not a great decision; other people have made it before and have apologized for having had a slip of the tongue, and I think that the Member for Gladstone is big enough to make that decision. I hope this has helped you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): On the point of order, or privilege, or whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, that we've spent unnecessary time on. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend refers to a lack of authority in your position, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest has not happened —(Interjection)— I just want to point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, you have made a request to a member; the member has made a request that he be allowed an opportunity to read Hansard. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it is your decision as to whether or not you wish to take any further action at this time. If you wish to take the position of naming the member, I have no alternative under the rules but to make the appropriate motion,

following that action. I just want to make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, because the Member for Kildonan has made a suggestion that your authority has been eroded and I suggest that it has not been, in any manner whatsoever.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker. If the House Leader is not prepared to defend your position then there's no one who has the official position so to do. He calls from his chair that he is prepared, Mr. Speaker. I heard you on three occasions request the member to withdraw. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you're prepared to name him on your own or whether you'll get support from the House Leader to name him. But, Mr. Speaker, your position is becoming precarious and I no longer care what was said by the member but rather his refusal to comply with your thrice-spoken request. Now do we, Mr. Speaker, have to make you order him to do it, in order to satisfy the House Minister, or do you have to say to him, calling him by name, Mr. Ferguson, would you please do what you were asked to do.

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

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, those remarks are so exaggerated they are absolutely ridiculous. I said clearly, my course of action is clear under the rules, and if you proceed to name the member, I have no alternative and will immediately follow with the appropriate motion, so let there be no suggestion that your authority has been eroded in any manner whatsoever. The action that will follow is entirely dependent upon your decision, Mr. Speaker, and will be totally supported.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of privilege.

MR. FOX: We are all honourable members of this Legislative Assembly, some are —(Interjection)— I don't concur with a remark that some are less than others. I would give credit to all of them equally, but I would suggest that this House, if it is going to proceed, would operate much more efficiently and co-operatively by consensus than by confrontation. And I would suggest to the Honourable House Leader and especially to his member, the Member for Gladstone, that we should try to avoid confrontation and make the job of getting the work of this House done easier, and also a little bit simpler, for the Honourable Speaker, because he has a very onerous position. And if he has to work by confrontation, it's going to be very difficult to get any work done in this House. I think we want to co-operate in order to expedite the matters of this House and for that reason I plead with the Honourable Member for Gladstone not to call for a confrontation, not to place the Chairman of this House in an awkward position, and not to put you in an awkward position as well, Mr. House Leader of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments that were made by the House Leader of the Opposition. As well, I just simply would mention again, Mr. Speaker, that you did say two things; one was the withdrawal. You had also asked the member to take it under consideration, which he offered to do. I think that the first recommendation, Mr. Speaker, would be the appropriate one in this case, if you can see fit to stick with that first admonition to the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan on the point of privilege.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to our House Rules, Page 59, Matters of Privilege, the second paragraph, and I read for your edification and other members of this Assembly: There are privileges of the House as well as members individually. Willful disobedience to Orders and Rules of Parliament, in the exercise of its constitutional functions; insults and obstructions during debate are breaches of the privileges of the House. You have requested on three separate occasions, Mr. Speaker. The insult was compounded this morning, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are prepared to support you, but it seems that members on the government side are not. Your position . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I think it is very presumptuous of any member in this Chamber to anticipate how any member is going to react, and I think the honourable member should consider that and maybe change his remarks.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the remarks, but I will say by the actions that we have seen so far this morning by members on the government side, it seems unlikely that they will. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed by my House Leader, that unless we are, as honourable members in this House, prepared to support you, then your position indeed becomes untenable in this House. There are times, Mr. Speaker, when we all may disagree with you; we may challenge you; we may mutter from our seats. It is not you, Mr. Speaker, personally that we are honoring, it is the seat that you are seated in, are occupying. That is the whole tenor of what the parliamentary system is about and if members of this House are going to willfully disobey requests from the Speaker, then the whole parliamentary system breaks down and we have nothing here but a jungle. And I would suggest to the Member for Gladstone that if he's a gentleman, he would rise in his place and withdraw those remarks that he made unconditionally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity to peruse Hansard and I will absent myself from the Chamber until such time as I do.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to thank all members of this Chamber for the chance that we have had this morning to take a look at the operations that we carry on day to day. I think it's extremely beneficial for all of us to once in a while consider our own actions when we're so duty-bound to consider the actions of others in the performance of our duties. As far as I have been able to ascertain. I have not as yet seen Hansard; I don't think Hansard has been printed. The remarks that the Honourable Member for Gladstone is alleged to have made have become insignificant in this whole matter. We're now dealing with a matter which concerns a request from one member of the House to another member of the House, a member who, rightly or wrongly, feels they have been slighted. The Member for Gladstone has asked for time to look at Hansard. I will make every effort to make sure that an immediate copy is available, both for the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Fort Rouge. I think until that is available, maybe at that time the Member for Fort Rouge may feel that the remark is not as offensive as she first thought. Those things are still probabilities and I am prepared, if the House is prepared, to wait until we do get a copy, but the matter will be dealt with before today's session is completed.

We have now reached the unfortunate point in our proceedings where we have exhausted the question period.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and asking the House Leader to listen to my point of order before he responds. The proceedings this morning were interrupted on a matter of privilege and I am not too concerned about today, particularly, for the question period, but as a precedent I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would be harmful if the matter of privilege of the House be allowed to take the place of the prescribed 40 minutes for the question period. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many questions are left to be asked but it would be imprudent, to put it mildly, to deny the opposition its opportunity to use the question period in order to obtain information from the Treasury Bench.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that you should, in my opinion, and respectfully I suggest, withhold making a decision. We're prepared to go along with today not having a further question period but I think that it's an item that has to really be thoroughly looked at. We've had another occasion when we had, for another reason, the question period also, the time expired.

Now I believe our rules indicate that there will be 40 minutes of question period. They do not indicate a specified period of time that this will take place in and unfortunately, if we follow your suggestion, as of today, that's what would occur. I believe that if the Rules Committee had intended that it would be such

they would have designated the time from 2:35 on to the 40 minutes to that particular time. That's not what was done. It was just indicated that it would be 40 minutes and if we are going to utilize other tactics and means of destroying the question period, as such, then I think we are defeating the purpose of this House and why the Rules Committee set up this special period of time. There was a consensus in respect to the question period and it was a trade-off for other areas that had been agreed to. But if we are going to destroy the question period, either by points of order or privilege or any other ministerial statements, for instance, or some other procedure, then it becomes invalid to call it a question period. And I would suggest that we take this over to the Rules Committee and have a real in-depth discussion on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, in respect to the point of order we were discussing a moment ago that it's the interpretation that is being placed upon the question period by yourself. If this is your ruling, then I'm going to have to reconsider as to whether we will abide by it. But in the meantime, I would suggest that the —(Interjection)— I hear chirping from the peanut gallery as usual . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. ORDER please. I would hope the honourable member will reconsider the words he is using.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Definitely, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't aware that some of the members over there considered themselves in the peanut gallery, so therefore I have no problem that if they find it offensive and they aren't in the peanut gallery, then I'll withdraw and let them remain where they are.

Let me get back to the point of order. I would suggest that, as I said, if your interpretation is going to be a ruling, I would have to consider challenging it because I do not believe it's fair to use up the question period with other procedural tactics and consequently I would suggest that we will abide by today's interpretation. But I would ask the House Leader to consider calling the Rules Committee because if this is going to be the daily interpretation, then I would like to have it changed and a discussion in respect to the rules.

Now let me suggest to the House Leader, he's not conceded in his seat forever; he'll be on this side when he'll want to ask questions as well and he has to consider that fact. Of he wants to lose his question period on interpretation, then he should be welcome to that.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I have the Rules book in front of me, Section 19(5). The rule says, The time allowed for a question period, prior to the calling of the Orders of the Day, shall not exceed 40 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This subject matter has already once been referred to the Rules Committee and there has been no changes made. I am not the maker of the rules; I am a servant of the House, and until such time as the House does change its rules — and they always have that opportunity any time at Rules Committee — but until that time I have to fulfill the rules as I interpret them and as the House has interpreted in their drafting.

The Honourable Government House Leader. We're dealing with Orders of the Day.

COMMITTEE MEETING

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just before Orders of the Day, I want to indicate that the committee on Economic Development will meet on Tuesday and Thursday next week at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. I believe I heard an indication from members of the Chamber they were willing to proceed with Orders of the Day. Therefore I have called Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader. First on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Proposed Amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in this Budget Debate in this year of 1980 and I must say that I, have never before, taken the opportunity to read and re-read this particular budget document and study the statements made by the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this budget will go down in history, or at least will be looked upon a few years from now, not as any giant step forward in social development, not as any significant measure of social improvement. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we've looked at is some type of an attempt of some minor income adjustment and I say, Mr. Speaker, shades of welfarism, shades of welfarism because we on this side do not believe in welfare, we do not believe in welfare; we do not believe in providing programs only for a segregated section of society; we do not believe that Medicare should be for the poor alone; we do not believe that Pharmacare should be for the poor; we do not believe that hospitalization programs should be for the poor. Mr. Speaker, these programs are the fundamental right of everyone in our society, everyone is entitled to this.

So, I say that this budget smacks of welfarism, that's all it is and it is not, when we examine the figures in the days ahead, we will say that it is not a significant forward, it is not a move forward, it is not a giant step by any means, in the march of social improvement or social development. Mr. Speaker, what will be remembered, however, is that the Minister of Finance has slipped in a very very significant tax increase; more significant, I believe, than the people of Manitoba realize at this particular

time. Because, Mr. Speaker, without doubt we know unfortunately the price of oil at the wellhead is going to go up and as it does, of course, the province of Manitoba will now be taking its 20 percent on top of all federal taxes, as I understand. Not only the adjustment, the upward adjustment of oil at the wellhead price will be taxed, as it comes through the retail pumps here, the refined gasoline, but also the tax as applied to the federal excise tax. Mr. Speaker, as my leader indicated yesterday, we are looking at a tax increase of many many millions of dollars and I must say that we do have to collect taxes and we have to recognise governments do need revenue to operate programs, we are not taking anything away from that. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a kind of tax increase that the people of Manitoba do not welcome, it is a regressive tax increase and indeed it's a very hidden type of tax and I would say, however, that the people of Manitoba are going to become much more aware of this as the months pass by and as the years unfold.

Mr. Speaker, we have been presented with a budget document which makes some very brave statements and some assertions that cannot be substantiated. For example, on Page 2, and I'm quoting one sentence or part of a sentence This Budget will sustain our recovery and the important economic and fiscal gains of the last two years. Mr. Speaker, I ask, what recovery? What economic gains? And exactly what programs does it contain that will stimulate the economy? We've had, particularly yesterday, we've heard a lot of huffing and puffing from the government side, a litany of statistics, recitations of data, that I suggest are taken out of context, or used usually in a meaningless way. For example, and there are lots of examples but I'll use two or three, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, the government side, always seem to wish to want to compare what's happened in 1978 and 1979 with the years 1976 and 1977 and when you ask why look at only the last two years of NDP administration, it's because, Mr. Speaker, they find it very convenient to look at those two years because it was, there's no question about it, it was a down part of the business cycle, as it operates in the province of Manitoba, as we are subjected to business cycles. The members opposite, if they study the figures will see that we do have good years and we do have bad years in this province, that we do have years of more activity and we do have years of lesser levels of activity and 1976 and 1977 were relatively poor years in the business cycle. So, here's an example, they always point out to the number of jobs that were created since they've been in office. And the numbers I agree with, according to the labour force survey there were 13,000 new jobs in 1979 and 11,000 in 1978, for a total of 24,000 jobs. Yes, 24,000 jobs and then they turn around and say, well, but only 9,000 in 1976 and 3,000 in 1977 and that's only 12,000. So you see, they tell the people, Mr. Speaker, the NDP only created 12,000 jobs in the last two years of their office, we created 24,000, twice as fast. So they leave the impression that under their government, that under their economic policies, they have an ability to create jobs that the New Democratic Party did not have and the honourable member — I'll never demean myself as

he demeaned himself in the names that he called me the other day, which I think was a matter of privilege but I wouldn't waste my time with the House to challenge the member in some of the terms that he used. But, Mr. Speaker, they forever compare with 1976-77, so that the implication is, well jobs are not created adequately under the NDP. They do not wish to look at the other years of New Democratic Party administration; they want to conveniently ignore that if you look back, for instance, in 1973 there were 16,000 jobs created, the same sources, the same tables, the same Statistics Canada figures, 16,000 jobs; in 1974 there were 17,000 jobs created. I say okay that's a total of 33,000 in two years, compared to the 24,000. So what, I am not attempting to select figures to make us look particularly good by saying we'll take those two years and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite are really fooling themselves by comparing only the year 1976 and 1977 with 1978 and 1979. The same thing is true of manufacturing shipments, Mr. Speaker, they crow about manufacturing shipments rising. In 1978, they increased 15.7 percent and we're told in 1979, they increased 20.2 percent. They say, but look, this is far better than what the NDP did or under their administration, it was only 3.4 in '77 and 6.5 in '76. But they never want to look back over the whole period and see that in some years we did, indeed, do very well. In 1973 — I shouldn't say we, the economy of Manitoba did very well — in '73, the increase was 21.9, greater than anything that has occurred thus far under the Tory administration.

In 1974, the amount of manufacturing in Manitoba increased by 24 percent; again, far greater than anything we've seen so far. So, Mr. Speaker, that is one way that they are misusing the statistics, only making this one comparison — these two particular years. Usually they don't want to compare Manitoba with the rest of Canada, except when it suits their purposes and again referring to the jobs created, they say 1979, we created 13,000 jobs, which was indeed a 3 percent increase. But, Mr. Speaker, that increase that occurred was the lowest of any province in Canada. The fact is that there was a significant increase in manufacturing jobs right across Canada in the latter part of '78 and '79, and it also affected Manitoba. Manitoba, indeed, had a 3 percent increase in jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, let us put it into perspective. Everything is relative; you can't ignore what the pattern is in the rest of the country, but this is what members opposite are finding it very convenient, that the job creation in Manitoba — 3 percent we welcome — but I say again it was the lowest of any province in Canada. We had the weakest performance of any province in Canada.

Again, another what I consider to be a wrong use of statistics is that they are forever ignoring the inflation that are in the figures. The Minister of Education is not in his seat at the present time, but yesterday he displayed his total ignorance about the adequate use of statistics by crowing about a 7.6 percent increase in retail sales in 1979 in Manitoba. Yes, retail sales did increase by 7.6 percent in Manitoba in 1979. He is totally correct. But, Mr. Speaker, apart from the fact that that increase was the lowest of any province in Canada, apart from that, when he talked about retail trade and you want to consider what's happening, surely, surely, Mr.

Speaker, you have to look at what is happening to retail prices. We know from the Consumer Price Index that the rate of inflation in Manitoba and Canada generally was between 9 and 10 percent. So that if you have a rate of inflation which exceeds the increase in retail sales as it does in this case, what is actually happening?

What did happen in 1979 is that we had a lower physical volume of retail goods traded over the counters in Manitoba than we had in 1978. So let's not get carried away by throwing out a figure of 7.6 percent increase in retail sales. I say that we are only deluding ourselves if we don't take into consideration, where required, the inflationary element of any figure. Mr. Speaker, the greatest fallacy I can detect in the speeches made by members opposite yesterday and, indeed, in the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance, is that the government of Manitoba is solely responsible for the new jobs created; that the government of Manitoba, that its policies can directly be related to the number right down to the last job, the amount of new employment that is generated in the province, or that it is responsible for the level of investment. Public, I can see, provincial public I can see, but it is also responsible somehow for bringing on a degree of private investment. It does, of course, if it provides a subsidy or grant, but generally speaking, the impression is left that they are solely responsible. Mr. Speaker, if they want to take credit for everything what they consider to be good that's happening, they also must take the responsibility for our economic difficulties. You can't have it both ways. If you want to crow about new jobs, and that that's the result of your policies, then you have to assume responsibility for the economic difficulties we have, inadequate levels of investment, inadequate output in industry sectors or whatever.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we're getting from the opposite side is, if there are problems, you blame the federal government; you blame high interest rates; you blame the weather; you blame everybody but yourselves. Of course, if good things happen, then they take the credit. But, Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a double-edged sword. Now, having said that, obviously, provincial government policies do have some influence, some bearing on the state of the economy, obviously. No one in this world or in the universe can tell me exactly what degree of impact the provincial government has on the provincial economy because there's just too many variables at work. Too many factors at work, not only international trends, international events, changes in the value of the Canadian dollar, federal policies, fiscal policies, monetary policies, changing transportation policies. There's a whole mix that has a bearing on the state of the provincial economy, not just what this government does. I recognize that and the members opposite should recognize that. But we do recognize that there is a crucial role, there is an important role for economic policies to play.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, with their approach in this budget, in the speeches made yesterday, that they're really deluding themselves with self-congratulations. I say, let them be complacent if they wish, and as an opposition it is our job to bring them back to reality. It reminds me of the parable of the caves in Plato's, I believe, the Republic. The parable of the caves

where people in the caves looking at the shadows and confusing the shadows for the real thing. I say members opposite in their speeches yesterday were looking at the shadows, and it's our job to bring them out into the sunlight and to look at the reality that exists, to look at the truth in the broad sunlight of the day.

The economic review that the Minister tabled in his budget, I guess one shouldn't expect it to be an objective document. I had an economist friend from B.C. who contacted me asking for a copy of the budget — this is before it was handed down — because he wanted to do some assessment, but I have a little hesitation to give it to him. I'll certainly send him a copy if I can get an extra one but, Mr. Speaker, I'm going also point out to them that it's filled with distortions. I'm talking about the economic review which takes up a good chunk of the report of the budget document. It's filled with distortions. It's misleading and really it's almost, not totally, but almost totally biased. But, I guess, what can we expect? But some parts of it are a real insult to anyone's intelligence. Really so, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know whether — well, I guess the Minister has to take the responsibility, but someone on his staff is sure good at drafting charts to leave misimpressions or to give a wrong notion, a wrong impression as to what's happening.

For example, in the economic review, I think it's Page 7 — yes, Page 7 — there's a chart showing private sector share of total, new capital investment, Canada and Manitoba, and if you take a quick look at this, you say, my golly, private capital is sure increasing; it's sure increasing its share. That's what it says and that's what has happened, Mr. Speaker. But it leaves you with the impression that somehow the private investment picture is improving in this province. But, really, the reason that graph is going upward, the line is going upward, is because there's been a very drastic and significant cutback in the level of public spending. It's not that private investment has taken off, because it hasn't and I'll deal with that in a minute. The fact is that it's simply a matter of public investment falling back to fairly low levels. As a matter of fact just while I'm at it in 1979, I have to remind the members opposite, that in 1979 where we now have the figures that we had the lowest increase in private investment spending of any province in Canada. We had the lowest increase of private spending of any province in Canada. That is nothing to boast about, Mr. Speaker. But you get the impression that, by golly, private sector share, private spending is really on the upswing, but it isn't, Mr. Speaker, it isn't.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at page 8, there's half a page devoted to population. Well, my golly, you'd never know from reading this bit on population, you'd never know that Manitoba lost 5,000 people in 1978, that our total level of population dropped by 5,000 people. Those aren't my figures. I read them and I presented them to the press and to the public. I've laid them all out, there they are and that's unfortunately what is revealed, 5,000 people less in the province of Manitoba than in the previous year. It doesn't say anything about us being the only province in that position, the only province to have a negative rate of change; it doesn't say a word that the net loss for interprovincial migration was almost

15,500, which is the greatest loss on interprovincial migration that this province has ever experienced, the greatest loss that we've ever experienced on interprovincial migration.

Also, that this 5,000 people, drop of the total by 5,000, is the most serious loss that we've ever had in peacetime. We did have a significant loss in 1942 and 1943, but that was not surely because of the economic conditions because the economy was booming by that time, it was because personnel, people in Manitoba were sent overseas and elsewhere to serve in the military forces to fight World War II. But apart from '42 and '43, we don't have this significant drop in total population until the calendar year, 1979.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you'd never know that. I mean, if this was some sort of a true economic review, let's say something. But instead we're fudging the issue; we're lumping eastern Canada; we're lumping western Canada. In fact we've got a meaningless table. The table in here is totally meaningless. It's of no use to anybody, no use to anybody looking at the Manitoba population situation.

What is mentioned, Mr. Speaker, and this is rather serious, there seems to be a move on the part of the government to try to change the statistics. On page 12 there's reference to the Minister of Economic Development going to Ottawa and talking to Stats Canada. I'm quoting on page 12, I understand that my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development will continue to pursue the need for a more accurate census — this population census — with his federal counterpart. But in the meantime, our government intends to step up our own efforts to improve the information available from provincial administrative records, page 12. What does that mean? They don't like the statistics. You're going to change them? You're going to have the pressure of Stats Canada to change their methods or are you going to come up with your own records and try to counteract this? If you don't like the message, you shoot the messenger, that's what this is all about. I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that really this government will desist from sending the Minister of Economic Development to Ottawa to try to bully Stats Canada into changing the method of calculation to the province of Manitoba. That would be the depth of dishonesty and deception.

Mr. Speaker, the budget talks about solid long-term opportunities in Manitoba. The fact is, there's two or three of the very important key variables, such as investment, you'll find that we're doing very inadequately. In 1979 our total investment spending increased by 0.4 percent. That was the lowest in Canada. How can we talk about these solid long-term opportunities or the great sustained recovery that we have when you have a level of investment as low as that? And in 1980 the Statistics Canada survey on investment intentions show that our total investment will go up by 5.0 percent, which is the lowest in Canada after New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, but the significance is — and the members opposite should understand this and your staff should understand it, if the Ministers and the members don't — that in real terms because of inflation, we had less investment put in place in 1979 than we did in 1978, and we will have less put in place in 1980 than we had in place in 1979, because

when you talk about a 5 percent increase, this is about half of the rate of inflation. If you talk about 0.4 percent increase we're going backwards, we're not going forward. When you take into account that these are current dollars and you deflate the dollars, you find that we've got less investment occurring, real investment, factories being put up, machines being put into place in '79 and '80 than we've had in the year or two before.

I say, how can we talk about these solid long-term opportunities that the Minister of Finance refers to on page 2? If you look at private investments alone, as I said, in 1979 the increase was 2.7 percent, again below the rate of inflation, again the lowest in Canada. In 1980 it's expected to be 7.0 percent — this is private — but again it's not the lowest; it's the third lowest in Canada after, I believe, two Maritime provinces.

Manufacturing investment, great propaganda on this. Statements on page 7 regarding manufacturing investment increases. In 1979 indeed there was a 24.6 percent increase in manufacturing investment. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is they were looking at a very tiny percentage of the total investment picture in the province of Manitoba. In 1980, it is only 6.5 percent of total spending. So you're saying there's going to be this big increase but we're talking about a very small portion of the total increase. Mr. Speaker, if you look in the past you'll find that we spent more, percentagewise, on manufacturing than we are doing this year. If you look at 1969 for instance, 9.2 percent of investment spending was from manufacturing; 1970 it was 11.9 and there are a number of other figures. So 1980, we're even spending a smaller percentage of our total spending thrust, a smaller percentage on investment. If you look at it truly in perspective — and that's what I'm pleading with the members opposite to do — if you look at it in perspective you see that manufacturing investment on a per capita basis is only a third, maybe 35 percent of what the Canadian per capita investment spending is.

Mr. Speaker, what has this government done to cause the expansion that you're talking about? They look at the manufacturing industry and they see that the jobs have risen there. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the figures they show for 1979, 63,000 jobs in manufacturing. But again I appeal to members to look over the history of jobs in this province and you'll see we have indeed had some years where we've had figures almost as big, or bigger. Well, in 1975 we had 65,000 people working in manufacturing; 1975 there were 65,000 people. So we welcome 63,000 but I'm saying, what evidence? There is no evidence to show that all of a sudden the manufacturing sector has burgeoned beyond any historic or previous high. That has not been the case. As a matter of fact, when you look at the output, they crow about the 20 percent increase in manufacturing output in 1979. Well, go back a few years: In 1973, it was 21.9 percent; in 1974, the manufacturing output increased by 24 percent. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you could indicate how much time I have left.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):
12 minutes.

MR. EVANS: 12 minutes, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened in manufacturing in this past year is, while it's a bit of an expansion over 1977-78, it doesn't come up to some previous years that we've had in '70s. Let's be honest with ourselves. What is the basic reason for this increase in manufacturing jobs, in the increase in manufacturing output? What evidence is there of any program that was brought in by the government to bring this about? There is no evidence of any government of Manitoba program that has any bearing on the increase in manufacturing jobs.

We do know, however, Mr. Speaker, that there's been a Canadian dollar devaluation. The Canadian dollar devalued, which has given us the problems on borrowing abroad and the heavier interest burden because of that, but that same phenomenon has given a shot in the arm to manufacturing right across Canada, including Manitoba. Unfortunately, our shot in the arm was a bit weaker, the weakest of all the provinces. But, nevertheless, we did have that advantage. Also, the federal government has imposed quotas on garments coming into Canada; this has given the textile or the garment industry in Manitoba a great deal of protection and it has caused them to be able to expand. So, there are some basic reasons for some upward increase which we welcome, but they are no credit to this particular government.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the rate . . . I'll just look at this one last area of statistics, the real rate of economic growth, which members opposite say is expected to be 1.8 percent next year and this is the third highest in Canada. Well indeed it is, according to the Conference Board in Canada. I must say though, as an aside, the same source, the Conference Board of Canada, was subject to a great deal of attack, a vicious attack incidentally, by the First Minister of this province a year or so ago when they put out figures he didn't like. He didn't like the figures; he had no use for the Conference Board. Now the Conference Board shows us the third rate of growth, then they are a good source.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's be honest with ourselves. Let's get out of the cave, looking at those shadows and out into the daylight and see what's happening. That 1.8 percent that's forecast for 1980 is an abysmally low level. We've been going, last year was 1.4; now, it's 1.8. Mr. Speaker, we've been operating on one or two cylinders, like a car going down the highway on one or two cylinders, and now the other cars, because there is an economic recession hitting North America and Ontario in particular is affected by it, including the automobile industry particularly. It has caused, because of its size, the Canadian cycle to come down; unfortunately, we are on a downward swing. But because some of the other cars on the highways are having difficulty with their engines and they are not going at four or six cylinders, and they're down to one or only a part of a cylinder, we're all of a sudden crying, well look, we're going the third fastest.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be the third fastest at that rate. 1.8 percent is totally inadequate and if you look in other years, you will see we've had some poor years, too, but we've also had some better years. So 1.8 percent is totally inadequate and I say, Mr. Speaker, we should take that . . .

Nevertheless, regardless what you think about that estimate, we'll have to take it with a great deal of caution because, Mr. Speaker, so much in that estimate depends on agricultural output. The goods-producing element of that real growth, that real domestic product growth, is so important and the agricultural sector of that real goods portion is so important that if you get a downward drop in farm income that growth rate could disappear. It could even be negative. If we have a drought — and, Lord, help us, I hope we don't have a drought; I hope it rains and rains heavily in the next couple of weeks; I hope we have a good rainfall and I hope we'll have a good crop — but if we have a drought or a semi-drought and if farm prices fall and farm incomes fall, then that forecast of 1.8 will disappear so fast you won't know what happened to it. It will be a negative figure. There will be a minus figure in front of it or, Mr. Speaker, if oil prices are allowed to go sky high, that's going to have a negative impact on that growth rate. Or if the U.S. recession begins to . . .

A MEMBER: Or to the world level.

MR. EVANS: Or to the world level. Certainly, if it goes to the world level. That's why we're against the oil prices going to the world level because if we get to the world level then it is going to have a more negative impact on our rate of growth, or if the U.S. recession begins to bite into the Canadian economy more rapidly. Incidentally, the drop in interest rates are a reflection of the weakness in the economy; the demand is dropping. The demand for loan capital is dropping and the market is responding, and I say that's a direct reflection from what's happening in the United States.

Okay, but let's put these figures from Stats Canada aside. Let's look at what's happening out there in the society or let's take the Minister's own budget — and these are the actual figures that I've got out of the budget — on national equalization payments. Equalization payments are an index of welfare payments to the province. They are a welfare index from Ottawa to the provinces and our welfare index went up. From 1977-78 it was 13.3 percent of the total revenue was national equalization payments; 1980-81, the Minister suggested it will be 16.8. We've gone up 3.5 points and, Mr. Speaker, this means that we're more dependent than ever on welfare payments by Ottawa, by the federal government. That, Mr. Speaker, is a clear indication to me that we're in a relatively worse economic situation and population situation now than we were a few years ago.

But forget about the figures. I say walk around the city, walk around the province and look at the factory closures and factory layoffs, or go and talk to your friends or your relatives or your neighbours and see who is leaving. I'll tell you, you don't have to do that; they would tell you that they're leaving: Friends across the way, neighbours down the street, relatives. I've had a couple of relatives leave for Calgary, young people, good people, just recently and I have other people who are going to B.C. and some are going to Saskatchewan. You don't need any figures; there they are. Look around at all the empty buildings in the city of Winnipeg, the for sale or for lease signs on them.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this government is so obsessed with debt and deficits. I say, the fact that they have had deficits now three years in a row means that they're failing by their own standards; by the standards that they've set up, they have failed. But, Mr. Speaker, regardless, this is nowhere near a stimulative budget; there's nothing in it that will create jobs. In fact, it's not even a progressive budget. As I said, it's become apparent that it's more of a PR snow job in the area of welfare payments and the private sector has not moved in to fill the gap of the public sector withdrawal. It has not moved in, the figures show that.

The Premier of this province said a couple of days ago or the last session, I guess, that the private sector was on trial under his government; that the private sector was being given the opportunity and it was on trial, it was being tested. Well, the Premier has put it on trial; we've never put the private sector on trial, but the Premier has. But I say, Mr. Speaker, it's the Premier and his government that is on trial, and I say the people of Manitoba will judge them and they will judge them in the near future; they will find them deficient and they will decide, if they haven't decided already, that Tory economic policies, to the extent that they have a bearing on what happens to job creation and industrial expansion in this province, that those policies are a failure and that the only solution is to get rid of the government, the government must go. Thank you.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I asked for permission to withdraw to obtain a copy of Hansard, which I have done. I would like to read it into the record. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the new members, the Member for Fort Rouge is not in her seat. I would also like to congratulate her as she is my member when living in the city. True to the fashion of the former Member for Fort Rouge, she has ensconced herself very firmly on both sides of the political fence but she has added a bit more to it. She has also climbed into the political bed with her socialist friends and, like a June bride, is giggling and tittering and seems to be enjoying her position there.

I have a further statement, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks were not directed in any manner whatsoever to any personal or moral conduct of the Member for Fort Rouge but were meant to refer solely to the political relationship between the Liberal member and the NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot therefore, on those grounds, withdraw my remarks. If, however, the Member for Fort Rouge, as a female member, has been offended by my remarks, I want to apologize to her.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, is it permitted that I be allowed to ask a question of clarification? Is he suggesting that he is apologizing because I, as a female member, might be offended? Would he say of

any other member that another member, such as the Honourable Minister for Culture or any other member of this House, is giggling and tittering like a June bride and refer to that member while in bed with other people?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. One of the problems that I have found and that is, I would strongly urge any member of this Chamber who seeks to raise a point of privilege to apprise themselves of the facts rather than to raise a point of privilege on the basis of a newspaper report. I have looked at the report. I listened to the remarks that were raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and I have also perused the actual report as printed by Hansard, and I find there are some discrepancies. So I would urge members in the future to be very careful when they raise points of privilege and make sure that they are apprised of all the facts before they raise them in the future.

BUDGET DEBATE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on this morning when we've had a number of things before us which I don't believe should detract from the some 2 billion that we're indicating in this particular budget that we will be spending in a proper and prudent manner for the people of Manitoba. I believe that it is our job, as the members in this Chamber, to have a good look at this, debate these particular expenditures very carefully because, as the Premier has said constantly and reminds the Cabinet always, is that we are but trustees of the public purse. Not a nickel of the money that we spend within our department is our own and I think all too often the people involved in government, as well as the people throughout the province of Manitoba and in our democratic system, forget that. Governments have no money of their own, Mr. Speaker, except that which they raise and derive from the people in the province, in this case. All too often, Mr. Speaker, we hear somebody say, well, let the government do it or the government's got the money, let them do it, and I think we lose sight of the fact that the only way that governments can get money to do the things that they want to do is to collect it from the people that they represent. I believe that, even though it is of such a simple nature — and that is how our democratic system is founded — we have a tendency of forgetting that; and when we go ahead and spend moneys within our departments or when we advocate the expenditures within government, we very often lose sight of the people who we will be directly affecting with that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all, compliment the Minister of Finance and his staff for what I believe is an excellent budget. All too often in the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in this Chamber, since 1973, we have been branded by the members of the opposition, the then government, as being a heartless group, not having concern for our fellowman and, Mr. Speaker, that we lack compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a riding which many of the people here know is a riding which is concerned about their fellowman, is concerned about the social programs, the social concerns that we have within this province; and not only within this province, Mr. Speaker, but within an international system. The kind of people I represent, Mr. Speaker, are the kind that during the last tornado that we had which ripped through Greenland and Ste. Anne in my constituency, applied and received after the whole clean-up was done, something in the neighbourhood of about 12,000 assistance.

Mr. Speaker, almost a third or two-thirds of the damage done within that area was in my riding. There was over a million dollars worth of damage done and the total assistance, the cost to the provincial taxpayer was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 12,000.00. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was because the people got together and helped themselves. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Caisse Populaire movement moved in and helped with low interest loans. The people, the Mennonite Disaster Services rolled up their sleeves. The people donated time, energy, trucks, equipment and, Mr. Speaker, did not put in a voucher asking for government assistance and that is the kind of people I represent. They have a social concern. They have a very high regard for their fellowman and concern for their fellowman but, Mr. Speaker, they are not socialists, they are not socialists. As a matter of fact, they are far from that because they still believe in the principle that if somebody can look after themselves, they should be encouraged to do that. Mr. Speaker, that is the type of people that I represent in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, after having said that, let me just briefly pull out a few rough statistics or amounts of money which we have, as government, spent in the last number of years with regard to the social programs. Mr. Speaker, the myth that the members opposite are trying to create throughout this province of the lack of concern as far as we are concerned, is precisely a myth. We have been bombarded by accusations of health cutbacks, Pharmacare cutbacks, hospital cutbacks, personal care home cutbacks, but let's deal with them on an individual basis, Mr. Speaker. We are into a mentality in this province, created by the gentlemen opposite who, when somebody comes in and asks for a 20 percent increase and you give them 12, it's an 8 percent cutback. Mr. Speaker, that's the type of mentality that we're dealing with with members opposite.

Let's just look at the health care and social services which we are involved in. In 1977 there were roughly 630 million spent on Health Care and Social Services. This year, Mr. Speaker, in 1980 we're looking at spending 793 million. Mr. Speaker, that's an increase of some 26 percent, that's no cutback.

Mr. Speaker, income security; in 1977 the members opposite spent 66 million; we will be spending 82 million this year, a 24 percent increase. That's not a cutback, Mr. Speaker. If the members opposite want to call it a cutback, that's fine. But I'm just going to point out a few more here, Mr. Speaker. There is not one area in these few statistics that I'll quote where the funds haven't been substantially increased.

Hospital expenditures, Mr. Speaker, 1977, 265 million; 1980, 330 million, a 25 percent increase. Personal care home expenditures — here's an interesting one, Mr. Speaker — 1977, 59 million for the members opposite; 78 million we're going to spend this year, an increase of some 32 percent. Pharmacare expenditures, Mr. Speaker, we're catching up, Mr. Speaker, and this is precisely the type of falsehoods the members opposite are spreading as the Leader of the Opposition tours through the province. Pharmacare is being deteriorated; it's not providing the services and the funds that it used to. Mr. Speaker, here's a dramatic one, to show the ludicrous position of the members opposite, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba will find out the type of shammery, if I can use that for lack of the other word that I would use except for the parliamentary concerns. Mr. Speaker, in 1977 the members opposite spent 5 million on Pharmacare and, Mr. Speaker, as I said, it wasn't the members opposite, it was the people of Manitoba spent 5 million on Pharmacare. This year, Mr. Speaker, we'll spend 9.1 million, an increase of some 82 percent on this one program alone. Now, Mr. Speaker, as long as I've been around and the upbringing that I've had, 82 percent increase in funding — if you go from 5 million to 9 million — isn't a cutback. In my wildest imagination, I can't consider that a cutback. That is a pretty substantial commitment to that particular program.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on in this particular field of health care, education and other things which show precisely that this government has shown their concern for the people of Manitoba, for the people who are in an unfortunate position of not being able to look after themselves, and this government is and has shown compassion to those people.

Mr. Speaker, further along that line, I want to say to the members opposite that one of the things that we always forget is that it's the average, the middle income earner that pays the majority of taxes in this province of Manitoba. In 1976 when the former administration brought down their budget and announced a surtax on larger incomes, they said at that time that it is the estimated indication that the surtax will apply to approximately 3 percent of the total tax filers in the province. In other words, 97 out of every 100 tax filers in the province will be totally unaffected by this measure. Mr. Speaker, that surtax clicked in at 25,000 which means, Mr. Speaker, that if you're talking about taxing the rich in the province, they are a very very small minority compared to what you're talking about in the total realm of the thing. What is happening, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about social programming, when we talk about other things, the majority of taxes are carried by the middle income earners of this province.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in listening to the Leader of the Opposition, he would have us believe that this budget, the White Paper that was tabled, does absolutely nothing to help the people in the lower income. Mr. Speaker, that is an absolute distortion of the facts. Mr. Speaker, in 1977 a family with two children making 6,000, which is not very much money these days, got — and I'm quoting from a table, a summary of the 1977 Manitoba Tax Credit

Benefits for Selected Taxpayers by Gross Income — 6,000, received under that program in 1977, 516.60. Mr. Speaker, under these White Paper proposals they will now receive 2,055.00. Mr. Speaker, that is an increase for that family of 1,538 or close to a 300 percent increase. Mr. Speaker, a family making 8,000, a family of two, in 1977, according to their charts, received 477.80. Under this new program introduced by the Minister a couple of days ago, they will receive benefits up to 1,368, or an increase of 890, close to a 200 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be said by the Leader of the Opposition that the people of Manitoba are not receiving benefits from this particular budget. Mr. Speaker, the people in need, the elderly, the people who through unfortunate circumstances cannot look after themselves, in this particular instance are going to receive substantial increases in their levels of support from the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is showing concern for the people who are underprivileged and, Mr. Speaker, that's what it's all about.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and bring in some other statistics. No real benefits from the SAFER Program. Mr. Speaker, the SAFER Program has been very well received by the pensioners of this province and, Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Minister of Finance has now extended that to include our people who are pensionable over the age of 55. Mr. Speaker, I think that's a positive move forward. Many people have found themselves in circumstances which they could not control and I believe a program such as the SAFER Program and the other programs announced for people 55 and over, is a positive move and will make life a little easier for some of the people that are hardpressed to making ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, I know all the members in the Chamber have had people come to us, and I think the Member for Gimli mentioned it yesterday, my colleague, the Minister of Education, with regard to problems if a spouse happened to be under 65 and the other spouse is over 65, what would happen very often is that if the older spouse passed away, the younger spouse would then be placed in the difficult position of being unable to make ends meet because of the spouse's allowance. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that this program will alleviate some of the hardships faced by many of the women in the province who found themselves in that particular situation. I've had a number of people, and it's been a real hardship for these people to not only face the loss of their partner, but then be faced with this financial crisis right on the heels of a pretty serious personal loss. I'm pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that this budget addresses that particular concern and some of the concerns of the people that are faced with that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot said by the Member for Brandon East and the Leader of the Opposition, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, with regard to the increases and how the government is piggybacking on different taxations. I found that very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because, as a new member in 1973 and into the Session of 1974, I was concerned by some statements made by the Leader of the Opposition at that time, more or less indicating and blaming that the increase of alcohol

prices was due to the increase of the suppliers. Mr. Speaker, at that time I wrote him a letter — and I just haven't had time to dig it up but I've got it in my files — I wrote a letter to the then Minister in charge of the Liquor Control Commission, the Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition. He indicated to me in a reply that, yes, there had been an increase, but he had to admit that close to 65 percent of the profits of that increase — in other words 65 percent of every dollar — goes right back to the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. Mr. Speaker, let it not be said that there have been any changes made with regard to that. He was doing precisely the same thing. It's been a practice that was established. In order to maintain certain margins the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission does that, so let it not be said that he is talking about tax upon tax and things of that nature. Mr. Speaker, he did precisely the same thing, and I've got the letter on file, back in 1974 when he was in charge of it, where he indicates exactly what it does and that the province benefited more than 50 percent on that particular increase.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Brandon East, of course, have really caught onto is the gasoline issue. Mr. Speaker, I have to relate to the gentlemen opposite that I have a brother who lives in California and being down there, he lives about 80 miles north of Los Angeles, and this last Christmas when I went down to see him with my family, we were going to go out and take my two younger children to Disneyland. It was at the end of the month and most of the service stations had run out of their allocation and, Mr. Speaker, we spent two days looking for some gas to drive 80 miles to try and show the kids Disneyland. Mr. Speaker, until you have appreciated that particular situation, you can talk about pricing, you can talk about what the price should be and everything, but I'll tell you the problem that's going to hit is when we cannot get supply, Mr. Speaker, is when the real trouble is going to hit; when the farmer won't be able to get supply to cultivate his field; to harvest his crops; that's when the crunch is going to hit. The position of the province, as enunciated by the First Minister, has been very clear, Mr. Speaker, very clear, that we want to hit self-sufficiency. Mr. Speaker, the price the commodity, the gasoline, the motive fuel, should attain is one in which we can encourage such developments as Syncrude, and other things to happen, because, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members opposite that if that is not done they will find themselves on an allocation basis and, Mr. Speaker, then we will see what the real problems are. Then the problem does not become price anymore, but just availability. The people in the States have appreciated that and as a result, now pay a substantially higher price for gasoline than we do. If you convert the difference, I think they're something like 60 cents higher than we are, if you convert the difference in the dollar and the gallon. Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty substantive difference.

I believe that unless a policy is implemented in this country of ours, which will see us being self-sufficient in the near future, we will, Mr. Speaker, be in serious difficulty. I think the low energy platform on which the members opposite would like to ride into the government with is one that is doing a disservice to

the people of Canada and will be proven out in the future if we don't move in this direction of self-sufficiency, will prove out to be a very very wrong-headed approach to our energy problems in this country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that's one of the main problems that we faced in the last election in February of 1980. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it was an interesting exercise to see the reaction of people to a measure, which I believe was necessary but the semantics of which were not accomplished maybe in quite the right way. I think we, as legislators, can all take a lesson in public knowledge on that. There were a number of issues throughout that campaign, Mr. Speaker, which having been involved in the political process for a number of years, sort of made me sit back and smile and realize that whoever got elected there were certain things that were going to happen and no matter what the politicians of the day were going to say, were going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, it was foolhardy for anybody to suggest, for instance, that we weren't going to boycott the Olympic Games. I think everybody around, on this side of the House at least, realized that that was inevitable and I think in discussions of my estimates the Member for St. Boniface realized that same thing and has made certain suggestions, which I believe are good ones, namely, the establishment of an area where we could hold these Olympics every four years, such as has been suggested, in Athens, Greece, where the first Olympiad was held, where there is a permanent setup and where the participants, as well as the countries involved, could hold the games. I think the political problems of hosting the games in the different countries, whether it be the problems we had with the overruns in Montreal, the problems that they're going to have down in Moscow right now, as well as in Los Angeles in the coming years, I think it's time that we had a serious look at the establishment of a permanent site for the Olympics.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, is the question of interest rates. It was interesting to note the attack on the then Clark government about high interest rates. No sooner did the Liberals come into power — and you must take your hats off to them — they devised a system where instead of the headlines reading, The Government Has Increased The Interest Rate, it was now a floating rate and they washed their hands of it, so it was a pretty good political move, Mr. Speaker, it didn't affect the position at all of the interest rates and we saw them climb. It had no bearing on the government, even though they were of a different political stripe, had no control over it.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the increase in the gasoline prices, I predict the government has no choice but to maybe in a little different manner, we will be arriving at the same thing, if not higher prices, within the next short while. We are providing substantial subsidies to the eastern seaboard provinces, as well as to Quebec and eastern Ontario and, Mr. Speaker, that is coming out of the taxpayers' pockets of Manitoba and everybody.

The 10 percent excise tax, or 10 cents a gallon excise tax, which was supposed to look after it, Mr. Speaker, is not covering that. Mr. Speaker, the subsidy that we are taking out of our tax dollars — and you know this is the ludicrous part of it, we're

borrowing money to pay for something that we're burning up. It's not even going into any infrastructure but, Mr. Speaker, we are paying for that, the Canadian taxpayer is paying for that foolhardy policy. Mr. Speaker, I guess the whole problem that we will face over the next little while is to see to it that we put that on a proper footing and that we develop a policy which will see us being self-sufficient.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that we have had happen in the last little while of course — and we've seen some resolutions come into the House and one has been withdrawn by the Member for Churchill dealing with the Manitoba Hydro — one of the things that I find amusing, and I think the members opposite have sort of backed off from it, but we're using that in a very nice subtle way, and that was the closing down of Limestone. They would have everybody in Manitoba believe that it was the Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, who, when they came into power, turned off the tap up there and forced everybody to leave northern Manitoba because of their restraint program. Mr. Speaker, the record is very clear, very clear. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the final decision, as close as I can find out and that's documented, is that on, I believe, the 14th of October, three days, Mr. Speaker, after the election, the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Hydro got together and made the final determination that the generating station should be rescheduled for in-service sometime in the fall of 1984 or a later date.

Mr. Speaker, that was October 14th. October 11th, Mr. Speaker, the member who sat on that board at that time from the Legislature, the Member for Radisson, Harry Shafransky, sat on that Board three days after he lost the election, Mr. Speaker, and was involved in that decision. On the 24th of October this particular government took over, inherited the decision at the time, which was arrived at by the board, and I would only have to surmise led up to by the necessity that we were over-constructed, and I don't argue that point, because I think we all realize that here, that we have an over-capacity and we don't have a sale for it right now because we don't have the interconnects and everything, but, Mr. Speaker, let it not be said that it's the Conservative government, which came into office on October 24th, 1977, closed down Limestone. That decision was made when the members opposite were in power.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to be very clear, very very clear, and I would caution the members opposite and tell them, don't go around and spread a story that is not true because we did not close that one down. Mr. Speaker, I want the record to be very clear on that.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I think that the budget is one which is going to prove out to be beneficial to the people of Manitoba who are unfortunate in the lower income brackets. I think there is a certain redistribution that has taken place here, which is necessary. The members opposite can get up and say well, we should have done this and we should have done that but, Mr. Speaker, the money has to come from somewhere and it's the taxpayer in the province of Manitoba who is going to be paying the bill. If you are going to, on the one hand, provide certain programs, you will have to on the other end, tax the people, and as I mentioned

with the statistics that I had here before, only 3 percent of the population in 1977 was making over 25,000, filing taxes over 25,000.00, which indicates to me very clearly that it is the rank and file middle income earner that's paying the tunes in the province of Manitoba. I guess that's one of the problems that I have when I drive down and I see, 'Make the rich pay'. Mr. Speaker, I don't know — the members opposite when they were in government, and I know we wrestle with the same problems, to try and get at some of the tax changes which benefit people who are in a higher income bracket. The average middle income earner has no deductions, has no benefits to try and reduce their tax payable and those people that receive a bi-weekly pay cheque and pick that up and have that deducted right at the point when they are receiving the cheque, really have no option but to pay that and are the ones that are really paying the majority of taxes in the province of Manitoba and if we're talking about increasing taxes, that is the group that we're going to hit and take it from.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to see that there are no major increases in taxes and I'm happy to see that we have maintained our promises to do a number of things which we have done in the past with regards to the reduction. We have made some reductions in sales tax in selective areas and I believe that will serve well for the people of Manitoba and we will continue to go along that path.

Mr. Speaker, it would be, I don't think right of me, if I didn't make several mentions here today of some of the problems that the members opposite have within their own rank and file. I believe, Mr. Speaker, after looking at some of the statements of the Member for Inkster, the former Liquor Control Commission Chairman, Mr. Syms, and others, that there are some serious problems. Mr. Speaker, I would even go so far as to suggest that the Member for Inkster in his statement that he gave to the press when he resigned from the party some time in December, sort of smacks that he sort of feels that the NDP party is in bed with some of the union leaders —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I think that Frank Syms, Mr. Speaker, who said that the NDP party was being taken over by a bunch of radicals, really suggested that the NDP is in bed with the Communists, because he did, Mr. Speaker, in his statements.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to touch on some of those statements at this time. Mr. Syms, Mr. Speaker, made certain accusations in public about what was happening with our friends opposite and who was gaining control of the particular party. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty shocking to, because he really tagged a lot of people, a lot of groups in with the members opposite, who he indicates are playing an important role in that particular party and are leading it down the path, which he felt the party shouldn't go.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that back in August when the Wolseley Constituency Association was having all its problems, there was a resignation of some seven members, Mr. Speaker, the new executive was comprised of some of the very groups that Mr. Syms refers to. Mr. Speaker, it's also interesting to note that a number of the individuals that resigned from the Wolseley Executive are now the ones that endorsed that paper the other

day, saying that the New Democrats shouldn't run a candidate against the Member for Inkster. You've got a number of people that resigned in the Wolseley constituency now supporting the Member for Inkster and his stand. Mr. Speaker, the statement that has to be read in — and everybody in Manitoba has to wonder what's going on over there, because there's some pretty wild statements being made which very few people are refuting and which I might add, Mr. Speaker, have, as far as I'm concerned, had a lot of credence added to them by the move by the Member for Inkster.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Syms said in a statement back in August, he said, Over the past five years or more I have been watching with concern and opposed the takeover of the Manitoba New Democratic Party machinery by representatives from the coalition of militant radical groups. Mr. Speaker, that's Frank Syms. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface says that is the gospel what Mr. Syms says. All I'm saying is that the move by the Member for Inkster, as far as I'm concerned, who knows his position very well, lends a lot of credence to what we are talking about here. Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the members opposite that when the Member for Inkster left the party, you had an interesting situation, where he really said that the position taken by the party, he felt, was contrary to the fundamental principles of freedom, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on the one hand you have a group of individuals, who in Wolseley resigned, who now are saying, don't run anybody against the Member for Inkster. He also says that the party is being taken over by a bunch of radicals, communists, and Trotskyites. Then you have one of the members of this Chamber working very actively and supporting a member who is the candidate for the mayoralty race in the city of Winnipeg, who is a Communist, yet actively working for it. So here you have, Mr. Speaker, somebody saying the NDP party is being taken over by the Communists, you have people working for the Communist party or for the Communist candidate, members of the NDP party working for the Communists. You have, I understand, lists of the NDP Party which were used for the communist's mayoralty election. Mr. Speaker, and now you have —(Interjection)— it's not McCarthyism or anything, and now you have the Member for Inkster getting up in December and saying you gentlemen opposite are working not in a fashion which is in a manner for the freedom of this country, Mr. Speaker. That's not me saying that, that's not a McCarthyism statement, that's the Member for Inkster saying that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, the people of Manitoba have the right to know whose running the party. Is it the big union leaders, as the Member for Inkster says? Is it the Communists? Is it the Trotskyites? Who is really running that party? Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that — the members opposite can shake heads but they know one thing, there is a member in this Chamber, who is respected by all the members, he's one of the senior members in this Chamber, who hasn't, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. . . . who has made these statements. It isn't some member of the opposition, it's somebody who was their own, and I think in talking to the Member for Inkster, still believes in the principles that the gentlemen opposite should stand for, but he is saying, Mr. Speaker, that is not happening. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlemen opposite will have to live up to some of the problems that they face within their own group.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the people of Manitoba wonder right now, after the sequence of events that has happened with the supporting now of the Member for Inkster, that they won't be running a candidate if he runs as an Independent. You have a number of members of this very Legislature that are supporting his position, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I guess we just have to say, we just wonder, there was a question asked of the House Leader the other day, whether or not he had received application for a new party status here, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are enough members on the other side who are discontent, who know the problems within that party and really sit back and wonder themselves who's running it. Are the big union bosses? Is labour exercising undue influence in their decisions? Is the Communists supporting it, like Frank Syms says? Who is it?

All I know, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Manitoba are concerned, and I believe that the members opposite are in a position where they are going to be scrutinized by the electorate very carefully, and I say to the members opposite, when they get up and think that the whole country is swinging to the NDP because they're unhappy with the Conservatives, this budget, there are big problems because, Mr. Speaker, I don't care what anybody says, I don't want to have somebody get up and call me a Communist and have members of my party — if some of the member of my party worked for a Communist mayor for the city of Winnipeg, I would not sit on this party. I would do exactly the same as the Member for Inkster has done. I would sit as an Independent. The members opposite would like to say that some large corporation controls this party, but, Mr. Speaker, this party is made up of farmers, small business people and there is no undue influence from some higher up board of directors, from either any union leaders or anybody else. Mr. Speaker, the credence that the Member for Inkster has lent to this analogy, which I have just spoken about, and this scenario, is one which the members opposite can't refute, because the integrity of the Member for Inkster is known in this House and is known by the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, they know that there is something rotten in the NDP Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank the Minister, who has just spoken, with respect to his remarks concerning my integrity. I hope, Mr. Speaker, I will not give the honourable member cause to withdraw those remarks by anything that I may say in the future, or indeed that I may say within the next 40 minutes. I gather, Mr. Speaker, that the House adjourns at 1:30 and because I cannot be

here on Monday, therefore I will have to complete my remarks today.

I want to tell, Mr. Speaker, that he may misjudge, indeed he does misjudge, my particular position vis-a-vis the New Democratic Party. I have not changed my position with regard to the new democracy. I have indicated that the party has passed a resolution, has pushed through a resolution with respect to the right of an employer to hire people during a strike. I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, that nobody can believe in public ownership and believe in that resolution. Nobody can believe that there is a necessity to maintain public order, that there is a necessity to maintain health and believe in that resolution. The New Democratic Party has never pursued that type of position until recently and I gather, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of what I have done, and I am quite certain of it, I'm quite certain of my own effectiveness in this area, that resolution will never be pursued by the New Democratic Party. They won't admit it. They won't admit that the Member for Inkster is the one who took us off this resolution, but you don't hear anything more about it and you won't hear it mentioned in the next election and you won't hear it implemented.

What will happen is that certain people who made commitments to the trade union movement will have very red faces, because I told those people that those commitments can not be fulfilled. Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party, on the question of freedom and on the question of that resolution, is not only subject to redemption, I believe it has been redeemed. The Conservative Party on the other hand, with regard to those positions, is irredeemable. They got up to a man, Mr. Speaker, not by the passing of a resolution, but got up to a man in this House and voted against resolutions on the very same question with regard to the freedom of an individual to carry a sign and with regard, Mr. Speaker, to an individual being forced by a judge to go to work. So, there is a significant difference, Mr. Speaker, with respect to my position and other positions that have been taken by other people and with regard to the members who signed a document indicating that they want Sid Green elected in Inkster. There were very few of them that were part of the Wolseley executive; there may have been three, Mr. Speaker, there may have been three. — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know; the chief people, I gather, would be others. But, really, I'm not going to waste my time on that particular area.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to get to the important question before us and that is the budget that was introduced by the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, he inadvertently and, you know, the truth often comes inadvertently, he described it as a blue skies budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, I look at my farm members; I look at my rural members and I say to them, which of those rural members is today looking for a blue sky? We've had blue skies in the province of Manitoba for the last six months. We've had no precipitation with regard to the winter and during the summer, Mr. Speaker, we've got a blue sky today and we've had it since the spring has begun. If there is anything that the members of this House, all of them, Mr. Speaker, are looking for it's clouds in the sky. And what does the Minister of Finance do? He

describes properly, Mr. Speaker and inadvertently, he has used the one description that describes what the people in Manitoba want least at the present time. Mr. Speaker, if you told the people of Manitoba that they should look for a silver lining to the cloud, they would say, Never mind the silver lining, bring us the clouds. We are not interested in the silver lining. This Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, who opens his mouth only for the purpose of changing feet, describes this budget as a blue skies budget and it's a correct description, Mr. Speaker. It's a correct description, given the context of the situation in the province of Manitoba and given what blue skies mean at the present time to our province. Mr. Speaker, blue skies mean drought, mean privation, mean misery and that's what is a proper description of the budget that has been introduced by the Minister of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make certain propositions with respect to this budget and I attempt to make them and then I intend to prove them. So I want the members to think about them as they are being made because I have every intention of proving each one of them. The government, Mr. Speaker, has introduced, number one, the highest budgeted deficit in the history of the province of Manitoba.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to have a deficit lower than any of those experienced during the entire period of the New Democratic Party government that were discussed by the Conservatives in the election of 1977. I intend to prove that, Mr. Speaker. Their deficit has never reached as low a level as we've produced in a total of eight years — budgeted deficits. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I make that and I'll come to it. The government has, by its own admission and with knowledge of the consequences, acted in such a way as to cost the citizens of Manitoba over 400 million by the handling of our foreign debt. I intend to prove that.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, the government is embarking on a program of the further institutionalization of poverty in our society by embarking on a new program of means test social welfare to subsidize low wages, rather than engaging in meaningful economic programs aimed at the reduction of poverty as a feature of our society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first proposition, that is, that the government has produced a budgeted deficit which is the highest in the history of the province of Manitoba. There has never been in all of the preceding years a budgeted deficit of 140 million which has been produced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge that there was a deficit of some 190 million and I'm not suggesting that wasn't a deficit. Those people who have read that into my remarks merely display their own ignorance because I never ever suggested anything, and I don't suggest that a deficit of 190 million is acceptable or should be had. But, Mr. Speaker, no New Democratic Party government budgeted such a deficit and a deficit that is now budgeted, none of my honourable friends can guarantee that it will stay at 140 million. Because if, Mr. Speaker — and this has happened often in the past — the federal-provincial payments have a shortfall of 55 million, which is what was experienced

in 1978, then the actual deficit, if you want to talk about actuals, will be 140 million plus 55, less expenditures that may have been under-expended and plus expenditures that over-expended. So let us accept that as a fact, that the budgeted deficit, Mr. Speaker, and that cannot be pursued, the budgeted deficit is the highest deficit experience in the province of Manitoba. I won't dwell on that because it's patent from the material.

Mr. Speaker, the second proposition, the government has failed to have a deficit lower than any of those experienced during the entire period of the New Democratic Party that were discussed by the Conservatives in the election of 1977. Because these promises, Mr. Speaker, about reducing the deficit, and it wasn't reducing the deficit; what they said was that we are debt-ridden, that we will bring in a balanced budget and we will reduce the debt. But when they found, Mr. Speaker, that was impossible, because was anybody talking about deficit financing under the Conservatives; they were talking about reducing our provincial debt, which they described as overbearing and which they couldn't live with. They have answered that promise by producing three successive budgets of over 100 million deficit in each year. Budgets, the actuals we don't know yet, Mr. Speaker. The Minister now says that last year's actual budget may only be 50, but we don't know that. What we know is that they sat down in Cabinet conscientiously planning, with malice aforethought, deficits of over 100 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members know that if you take in 100 million less than you are paying out, you cannot reduce your debt. The Member for Morden knows that. What it means is that at the end of the year you will have to add 100 million to your debt, and they have, Mr. Speaker. They have now added over 300 million dollars to the provincial debt. Now they said, after they found themselves in this impossible position of suggesting that it's the deficit that they were going to reduce, not the debt, they looked at the deficit of 180 million.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the deficits for the full eight years of New Democratic Party government, the budgeted deficit. What will my honourable friends say? In 1970, the first budget provided for a current surplus of 825,000; the second budget, Mr. Speaker, provided for a current surplus of 281,000 and capital, which my friends have suddenly discovered. You know, the first year they came in they said, We're eliminating this capital deficit because capital is the same thing as current. You are going have to pay it out anyway, so let's forget about this capital and show the actual deficit. When the Minister of Finance said, and several speakers have now come up and said the only deficit is on capital account, there were cheers, Mr. Speaker, from the honourable members. They suddenly rediscovered capital. All right, the capital deficit in 1971 was 38 million, so we still haven't reached any of the Conservative deficits. In 1972, Mr. Speaker, the current deficit on current account, 2.7 million budgeted deficit; 2.7 million. Capital, Mr. Speaker, 92 million, 94 million — still less than 100. Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives learned. They never used to say what is the total budget or what is the percentage or what is the inflation, they used to say that you have doubled provincial spending from 300 million to 600 million

regardless, Mr. Speaker, of what happened to inflation.

So let's continue, because they are now using actual figures. They said we're going to bring the deficit below what the deficit was. That was their belated statement. 1973, Mr. Speaker, the current budget, 1.1 million deficit, 1.1 million, capital, 62. Take the total if you want, 63, Mr. Speaker. 1974, current account, a small surplus; capital account, 77 million deficit. Nowhere near 100 yet, not near 130, almost half of 130. 1975, current deficit — they're not liking it — 6.4 million; capital deficit, 62 million; total of 68 million, still lower than 130 million, by half, Mr. Speaker. 1976, current deficit, 12 million; capital deficit, 87 million; total deficit, 99 million.

Mr. Speaker, not one of the deficits in the total of eight years reached any of the deficits budgeted by the Conservative Party since they have been in power. None of them, Mr. Speaker. Yet, these people who were caught with their pants down, saying that they were going to reduce the deficit are still in a position that not one of the budgeted deficits that they were talking about reached 130 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, what were they talking about? Well, I know what my honourable friends will say. I mean, they must have an answer. They say that 140 million is less than our deficits. How come? How come, Mr. Speaker? Where does it come from? Well, they say that they were talking in the election campaign about the deficit that they didn't know about, that all of that time during all of the eight years when they were complaining about deficits, they were talking about the one that they were going to discover when they came into power. They were going to use that one deficit as their bench point, Mr. Speaker, and it's interesting.

I heard such terrible things said about the New Democratic Party government but today I hear the Minister getting up: We are doing exactly what you did. We have not become, Mr. Speaker, a rat-infested nest; we have become the model of good government that we have deficits similar to theirs. That they are spending now, they are getting up and bragging about their spending. So, Mr. Speaker, they must have been talking about the 180 million actual deficit, not budgeted deficit. Now how, in 1977, in the election campaign, did they know that there was going to be a 180 million and that they promised that they would reduce that deficit. Is there an answer to it, Mr. Speaker? Well, do I hear an answer? Mr. Speaker, I will give them an answer, I will give them an answer. They are brilliant people; the Minister of Finance is a genius. He knew when he was running around saying that they were going to reduce the debt, and meant the deficit, that when they came into power there would be 180 million deficit and they were forecasting the deficit that they were going to come below. So, isn't that the answer? It's his brilliance; it's his brilliance, it's his foresight. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, is such a bright boy that he can see the future and that is really the strong characteristic of our Minister. Our Minister now knew before the deficit arrived that there was going to be deficit of 180 million and he has the power of knowing these things.

I'll show you, Mr. Speaker, how he has the power of knowing these things. His next statement is to the effect, and this is the most outrageous statement of

all. You know, the Conservatives have been looking for that knockout punch. 40 million on Saunders, that was the first knockout punch and it went wild because the figures show that the moneys invested by the Conservatives in industrial development, invested and lost, exceeded all of the amounts put together that were lost by the New Democratic Party government.

People saw that and they say yes, you lost 40 million but they lost over 100 million on CFI and therefore, Mr. Speaker, that knockout punch fanned, it missed. So they needed another knockout punch and they decided they would pay 3 million to obtain a political knockout punch from Mr. Justice Tritschler and then the report came out, Mr. Speaker, and the knockout punch wasn't there. Justice Tritschler never identified any losses, no losses did he identify, and we will deal with that. But they still tried it, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance immediately got up and said there's 500 million to 600 million in this report; you can't find it but I can because I am brilliant and I can see what you cannot see and what nobody else can see. So he said it was there but immediately after the report the Conservative support in Manitoba did not go up it went down, so that knockout punch fanned, Mr. Speaker.

Now they need a new knockout punch — 40 million didn't work, 500 million didn't work — so he came out, Mr. Speaker, in this budget with the new knockout punch. Your foreign borrowing has cost us 592 million by borrowing on the foreign markets, and the foreign money having gotten stronger, Canadian money having gotten weaker, you have cost the people of Manitoba 592,000.00. Now this Minister, Mr. Speaker, says, in effect, that if it was there he would have known that the Canadian dollar was going to weaken, that the foreign money was going to strengthen and that the moneys borrowed on the foreign market would have cost us money and, therefore, he wouldn't have done it, Mr. Speaker; that he has the power to know what is going to happen to foreign currency in the future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's give him that credit. Here he is, Mr. Speaker; here is the bright boy; here is the man who can forecast and make promises about future deficits; here is the man who can forecast and make promises about and base his actions upon — and that's most important, Mr. Speaker — fluctuations in the money market.

He accuses the Member for St. Johns and the Member for Seven Oaks — particularly the Member for St. Johns and I've heard it said from that side of the House, he accuses him of being a financial ignoramus — implying that he is a financial genius, that this would not have happened under this administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, those figures are very interesting and they are located on the budget page. They show that in United States dollars — and there's a column and I'm not going to read the entire column — that what we borrowed for 2.1 billion will now cost 2.7 billion to repair and there's 500 million, as of May 1, 1980.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Minister who sees the future, who doesn't make that kind of mistake, who is better than J.P. Morgan when it comes out to figuring what's going to happen to finances and would never have let this happen, he took power, Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1977. Well, he knew at that

time that the Member for St. Johns, in his words, was a financial ignoramus, had made this foreign borrowing which is going to cost us 600 million; he knew that, he is the genius. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, the same amount of money that it would cost 2,707,000 to repay, would have cost 2,367,000. 403 million was incurred in foreign debt elevation after November 1, 1977.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this man is a genius. On the day that he came to power, he knew that if he held on to that foreign debt and did nothing about it, Mr. Speaker, it was going to rise by 592 million by May 1, 1980. Mr. Speaker, what did he do? Here's the man who knows. I agree the Member for St. Johns he wouldn't know; he is just a mortal like the rest of us, but he knew, on November 1. Mr. Speaker, did he go to the lenders and say we would like to pay you out now, we would like to pay you 2,367,000 and therefore save 400 million. No, what he said, we're going to let this money pile up, 400 million accumulate, so I will come and make a budget in Manitoba in 1980 and show that the Member for St. Johns is an ignoramus. I am willing to waste 400 million of the money of the people of the province of Manitoba to confirm that I think that the Member for St. Johns is an ignoramus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member may say, although I don't know it, well these people wouldn't take their money. Did he try, Mr. Speaker? Did he say, I'm now going to borrow on the current market 2,300,000. I'm going to pay you out. I will give you a bonus of 10 percent; I will pay you 2,387,000. Did he say, Mr. Speaker, since he is a genius, that they won't take payout but if I know that foreign exchange is going to up by 400 million, I will buy foreign exchange to the extent of 2,300,000.00. Then that foreign exchange will go up in value and in 1980 when its 2,700,000 I will pay them out. Did he do that, Mr. Speaker? No, Mr. Speaker, this Minister who sees the future, didn't do any of those things and Mr. Speaker, if he will tell me that well borrowing 2,300,000 to buy foreign currency at that time in order to protect ourselves, if that would have to cost us interest, even though interest rates would be coming in on the money that you borrowed to, if he would say that the interest rate was higher and therefore I let it go, but he knows, Mr. Speaker, this man is a financial genius, he would know that interest rates in 1977 being in the neighbourhood of 11 percent, he would know that they are going to go up in 1980 to something like 15 percent; so he would borrow long-term at 11 percent, invest short-term at the going interest rate, knowing that what he was borrowing at 10 percent he would get back 15 percent for and he could have made us 400 million, Mr. Speaker.

The member who is a bank manager is nodding, because he knows, Mr. Speaker, that what I am saying is correct but, Mr. Speaker, isn't it all a fake? Isn't it all a fake? Isn't it a fact that nobody knew. I mean, can I really sustain this charge that this Minister, who now says that our foreign debt is costing us 592 million, more than we borrowed it at; that no one could have predicted that; that people all over the world made investments on that kind of basis and that it was beyond his control, shall we not be charitable to him, isn't it nice to have a little bit of Christian charity and say that on November 1, when

this Minister had to pay 2,300,000 in the total of accumulated debt, that he didn't do anything, Mr. Speaker, because he, the same as the Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Finance, had no way of knowing that in order to pay that debt in 1980 he would have to raise 2,900,000.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many ways of doing it if you know, and this Minister is suggesting that you should know, and if you should know, by his definition, not because we say we know but he knows, they have cost us 400 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the other knockout punch that they are looking for. The Saunders right-cross didn't work; the left-hook provided by Mr. Justice Tritschler missed its mark by a foot and the 592 million, Mr. Speaker, is an outright fake. Nobody has even commented on it because it is so ridiculous and that, Mr. Speaker, has been the position with regard to this budget.

This budget is not so bad, Mr. Speaker, because of the individual items in it, although there are indeed some individual items. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the items, I found a surprise and I'm glad that the Minister has changed it. If we gave property tax credits on the basis of one person's income, rather than family income, that should be changed and was changed. But this budget, Mr. Speaker, in its totality, in its philosophy is a hoax on the people of the province of Manitoba, perpetrated by the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party said they are going to reduce the debt, that they are going to stop spending, and this is not my position, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying that the government should stop spending; I am not criticizing their spending estimates. There are individual items there that I will criticize. What I criticize, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservative Party is desperate and what they are doing is trying to repair their political fences, not by sticking to some type of program, but by saying the New Democrats were right all the time and we have to emulate them. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell him that we were not right all the time and the very things that caused our downfall will cause his downfall.

The beginning of the end of the New Democratic Party was the 1973 Budget, Mr. Speaker. It is the duty of a government to make sure that it seeks revenue for the purpose of paying its expenditures, and in 1973 because we, immediately before an election, and I say because of it, that people got excited, we have to do something, and we yielded 73 million in revenue a year. That was the beginning of the end, Mr. Speaker, for the New Democratic Party, and it didn't result in the massive public support for it. It resulted in a moderate victory based mainly on what we did before the 73 million and not the 73 million, and, Mr. Speaker, this budget won't have that effect for the honourable members.

For those who say it is not an election budget, and on this I differ with my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, this is an election budget, it is absolutely. Do you know why I know, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you now I know: Because revenues and expenditures are going to keep pace in the next year, and they can't bring in another budget, Mr. Speaker. They can't bring in another budget without doing one of two things: Without having another 150 million deficit, or increasing taxes. Therefore this

budget, which has the pretence of doing something humanitarian, is meant to show, Mr. Speaker, that look, we have changed out colors, the leopard no longer has spots. We are now as good as the New Democrats: You used to elect them; elect us, Mr. Speaker.

There are arguments within that Cabinet over this budget. I know what the arguments are. There are some who are saying, we are going to look ridiculous; we either got to cut expenditures or raise taxes, but the weaklings prevailed, Mr. Speaker, as they usually prevail. The cowards prevail. They say, we will do that after we are elected; in the meantime, we have to do something to gain public support. Mr. Speaker, you will always find people in every Cabinet who will find ways of reducing taxes and increasing expenditures, but you will not find people who will reduce expenditures and increase taxes. A government, in order to provide good government, has to do that, Mr. Speaker, when it is necessary. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't Mr. Clark's government. They didn't get defeated because of a strong budget. They got defeated because they were going to charge 18 cents a gallon of tax for nothing, for tinkering with the tax system, for a mortgage deductibility program which would have given the people of the province nothing.

Mr. Speaker, there are always those who think the road to political success are tinkering with taxes and increasing expenditures. Mr. Speaker, that is not the road to political success; it is the road to political failure, but there are weaklings in all parties, and I call them the liberals, who will say that, yes, we can fulfill these things, but we need this to get elected. That is what the Conservatives have done. They think that an abandonment of conservatism will get them elected, just as New Democrats from time to time have thought that an abandonment of their position for a particular election campaign will get them elected. It has not worked for the New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, and I say to you that we did the same thing from time to time. It was the beginning of the end for us in 1973. It is the middle of the end for these people. The beginning of the end started with the first budget. We are now at the middle of end and they are hoping, and we saw them all get up and extol this incredible document which produced the largest deficit, which is filled with quackery and fakery. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine — the Minister of Finance is fond of using a type of eloquence. He talks about the previous government and I've never seen more political statements in a budget than there was in this one. He says under the previous government there was a hemorrhage of money; hemorrhage is a terrible sounding word.

Can you imagine if the New Democratic Party came into power in 1977 and had four successive budgets of over 100 million a year deficit without having the revenues to make up for it? The Minister of Finance, who likes this type of eloquence, he wouldn't have described it as a hemorrhage. He would have described it as financial diarrhea, Mr. Speaker. Financial diarrhea, that's the terms that he would have used, Mr. Speaker, and I throw that term at him, not because I say that there is too much expenditures, but because they, by their own definitions, have from time to time said that there is too much expenditure.

What do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have a Minister who has to do what the kings used to do when they had trouble. In ancient days the kings, who had trouble, they called in the alchemist, and they said to the alchemist, we need money. The alchemist was a man who was reputed to be able to make gold out of other ingredients. It never worked, Mr. Speaker, but the kings used to believe in them. They used to believe that there is somebody who could take a bunch of ingredients and make gold out of it.

So the First Minister called in the Minister of Finance, his alchemist, and he said, I want you to make a silk purse out of a pig's ear, I want you to make a silk purse out of a pig's ear. And the Minister came in and he introduced a budget, which is an attempt to do what alchemy does. It is an attempt to make a silk purse out of pig's ear. Haven't we heard it for the last three weeks in the Chamber?

What are the penny anti-promotions which this Minister is talking about? There is going to be a western power grid — going to be, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be, going to be. There's going to be a potash development — going to be, Mr. Speaker. That there is going to be a mine and this mine comes as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the Conservative Party. What nonsense! Mr. Speaker, that mine was developed under the program of the New Democratic Party, and Mr. Speaker, explored under the program of the New Democratic Party and that's why we have a percentage in it.

Mr. Speaker, those are —(Interjection)— There is no expropriation, Mr. Speaker. We put up dollar for dollar with the investor, and we'll get into that when we discuss the finances. I've only got five minutes and I want to deal with it. I want to deal with this potash deal, Mr. Speaker, because the First Minister said, that's all right. Why is it all right? It's a sure thing. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting what a sure thing is. What did we do with this sure thing? The reserves are ours. We said that in exchange for a sure thing and you putting up 2 million in exploration costs, we will give you 75 percent of a sure thing for 2 million. Mr. Speaker, that's what the First Minister said; that's not what I said. That's what the First Minister said. For 2 million, you can take our known reserves, which we were discussing with Inco and going into a mine on, and in exchange for 2 million, Mr. Speaker, we will give you — in exchange for 2 million of exploration costs, we will give you 75 percent right to the development of a sure thing. That's what they have said.

Mr. Speaker, I don't call that a development. I call that a giveaway and we'll have lots of time, Mr. Speaker, to deal with it when we get to the estimates of the department.

Mr. Speaker, one more thing. The Member for Brandon East touched on it and I want to deal with it a little more and I'll deal with it in two minutes if I can. The New Democratic Party has wrongly been identified as the social assistance party. When I got up and had to announce social assistance increases, I said that this was not my proudest moment. The New Democratic Party believes in a program for the ultimate elimination of poverty as an institution in our society. We do not regard social assistance as the way to patch up the problems of society and the way to subsidize poor wages. That has always been a

Liberal and Conservative doctrine. They know that their programs are going to result in poverty. They cannot stand poverty, Mr. Speaker, being something which could result in terrible things happening in society, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, they propose means-oriented poverty programs. They have always been the party for social assistance; it has never been us. Those who have identified this as New Democratic Party Budget, wrongfully interpret what the New Democratic Party would do in society. We do not regard poverty as something which flows naturally from our system and something which has to be subsidized. We regard poverty, Mr. Speaker, as something that we have to declare war on and eliminate as an institution, and as long as it exists provide only that level of social assistance which is absolutely necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Budget, having done the things that I say it does, and regardless of the individual little improvements that are there, which no government can operate without helping to improve, Mr. Speaker, this Budget demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, the fundamental difference between the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party with regard to state handouts, to the dole, to the relief.

The Liberal Party and the Conservative Party have always regarded the dole, relief, social assistance, welfare, whatever you call it, as something which is built into the institution which has to be subsidized by them as a result of the failure of society to operate. The New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, and from time to time and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that we have done the same thing, but I tell you that I have opposed it everytime it has come up, that we do not believe in means-oriented tests; we fought vigorously Medicare going on the basis of being provided for those who cannot afford it. The Minister said yesterday that he was going to do that, and then he said it was facetious, but it comes very easily to his lips, Mr. Speaker, because that's in fact what the Conservatives proposed. They said, Target in on the poor, and I say, Mr. Speaker, when you target in on the poor, you institutionalize poverty, and that's the position of the Conservative Party that is completely opposed, Mr. Speaker, to what social democracy means, as far as I am concerned.

I oppose the non-universality of family allowance on the federal level, and I do on the provincial level, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of dividing this society into those who have institutionalized and those who have not.

Mr. Speaker, according to my tradition, there are three forms of charity: Charity where both the giver and the receiver know about the gift and the receipt and it has a low effect on both parties. A second form is when the receiver gets it but the giver doesn't know to whom it's going and the receiver doesn't know who gave it him, so he's not beholden to an individual person. That is an improvement. But real Christian charity, Judaic charity, Mr. Speaker, is when neither the giver nor the receiver has any knowledge as to it being a charitable donation. That is the principle of universality, Mr. Speaker. That is the principle that has always distinguished the New Democratic Party from the Conservative Party.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the

motion be further amended by adding thereto the following:

AND this House declares its want of confidence in the present government for the following reasons:

- 1) The government has refused to accept responsibility for its self-identified financial mismanagement and has attempted to blame its problems on non-existent difficulties which it claims to have inherited;
- 2) The government, in projecting further poverty and need as a consequence of its policies, has decided to deal with this condition by traditional free enterprise methods; namely, the expansion of means-based welfare programs, rather than by the formulation of sound economic and social programs which would work towards the reduction of poverty as an institution in our society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take great pleasure in entering this Budget Speech Debate, particularly after the remarks of the Member for Inkster. He's always a pleasure to follow.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster, in his opening remarks to his reply to the Budget Debate, has really confirmed some of the suspicions that have been brewing in the back of my mind for the past several months on what his real position in this House is and what his recent statements and what his recent positions have been, in terms of where they are going to place the Member for Inkster in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Member for Inkster is now sitting as an Independent New Democrat in this House and he has attempted to explain on many occasions why he is sitting an Independent New Democrat, and he again today tried to explain why he is sitting as an Independent New Democrat. Mr. Speaker, that has garnered the fascination of many of us in this Chamber and of the people of Manitoba because, as has been referred to my colleague, the Minister for Fitness, the Member for Inkster, despite the fact that many of us do not agree with his principles, we know he has some. Mr. Speaker, his principles are probably as unwaivering as anybody on that side of the House and the only one that he really will waiver on, and this was borne out just recently, when my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, was undertaking his estimates, the Member for Inkster waived slightly on his principles of flood protection. He threw a tantrum, Mr. Speaker, when Carman was included in the project capital program to provide them with a diversion and flood protection in Carman. But, Mr. Speaker, when questioned by the Minister for Natural Resources as to whether — and as a matter of fact, the Member for Inkster indicated that that was an indication of a corrupt government, that was providing that flood protection for the citizens of Carman, something that they asked him for personally when he was Minister responsible for that

portfolio. Now, he indicated that was the indication of a corrupt government, and where, Mr. Speaker, he waived on his principles was when the Minister for Natural Resources asked him point-blank if he considered it a corrupt government that was providing a similar flood protection for Ste. Rose and for Gimli, he waived. He waived slightly, Mr. Speaker, primarily because he thinks that maybe Gimli and Ste. Rose have some potential as New Democratic Party seats at some point in time in the future.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the record will show that I did not waiver. I said if money was going in that area on the same basis, it should not go. — (Interjection)— No, I didn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, we will check the record, but the slight position and hesitancy, when it's a Carman constituency, which is Tory blue, it is a corrupt government that is providing the service; when it's Ste. Rose, well, maybe it's not quite so corrupt. But I do admit, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Inkster has a greater degree of principle than most members on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has gone through a couple of instances, and he uses that prime word hoax. He used it again today. He used it when he referred to the former Member for Fort Rouge, the now present Minister of the federal government, in his diddling with the overpass and rail line relocation debate, and he accused — and I believe that was correct, he used a hoax in that regard — he accused the M.P. for Fort Garry, Winnipeg, of the most massive hoax that this province has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Member for Inkster using the word hoax, because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I think he knows the exact meaning of it, because, Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest suspicion, I have been wondering, I have been toying with the idea of why the Member for Inkster resigned from the party to sit as an Independent New Democratic. We all thought it was because of principles, because he had a principle involved where the party was deviating from his principles, therefore he will sit as an Independent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that what the people of Manitoba are seeing perpetrated on them by the Member for Inkster is one of the greatest hoaxes in recent political time. Mr. Speaker, I think what we are going to see come the next election, is the Member for Inkster, the man of principle, saying when he sees the New Democrat Party's hopes in the next election fading fast, he will say to the people — he will say it to us in this Chamber, he will say it to the press gallery, he will say it to the people of Manitoba; he will say to those people, I have deemed that it is better for me to bend and accommodate my principles slightly and return to the folds of the New Democratic Party to beat the common enemy in that the Conservatives may well win the next election

and I want to assure their defeat. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, what he will do is, he will say, I apologize. I am bending my principles. I want to return to the folds of the Democratic Party. And what the Member for Inkster will do, Mr. Speaker, he will crawl on his hands and knees back to the New Democratic Party some couple of months before the next election. The Member for Inkster will beg the forgiveness of that hierarchy, that hierarchy that the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports so adequately described, that hierarchy that's pulling the strings behind the scenes, he will beg their forgiveness and he will kiss the boots of the Leader of the Opposition to accept him back into the party. He will kiss the Member for Selkirk's boots to come back into that fold so he can defeat the common scourds of the Conservative Party. We will see what his principles are worth, Mr. Speaker, before the next election and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, he will bend them all, he will crawl on his hands and knees and he will kiss the boots of the Member for Selkirk. That's what we will see, Mr. Speaker, in the next election. That is what we will see. You mark my words, Mr. Speaker, that will happen. That will happen as sure as I am standing here today. Principles, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has more of them than many of them on that side but they can always be bent to accommodate the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to berate the Member for Inkster anymore because I have a certain amount of respect for the man but, Mr. Speaker, we are debating the Budget, except it's a rather one-sided debate because we haven't heard any debate over there. We heard the Member for Inkster just berate the government on a deficit and he's very careful, Mr. Speaker, he's very careful about his deficit definition. He says the budgeted deficit and he says that their budgeted deficit was this, this and this and it was never as great as ours, but he forgot to add the bottom line that they were such poor financial managers they were always over their deficit. They never could come in on their budget. Their deficit was always larger, Mr. Speaker; he forgot to tell us that their fiscal management was so poor they could not stick and adhere to a projected deficit.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, budget for some 122, Mr. Speaker, and it's going to come in at 45. Now I admit we are poor fiscal managers, Mr. Speaker, we cannot budget properly. But my god, Mr. Speaker, we're going the right way. Instead of 122 it's 45. Their example is not a 30 million projected, it's a 70 million actual, etc., etc., Mr. Speaker, and I accept that criticism that we are not proper budgeters in the deficit and I will always accept it when we are having a lower deficit than what we project; that the financial situation of this province has improved such that we do not have the type of deficits that we budget for; that they are in fact, less. I accept that, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition really didn't contribute an awful lot to this debate the other day, and it's unfortunate. He did a better job on the Throne Speech Debate but he's gradually, as the Minister of Government Services has indicated to us before, he is gradually running out of steam. He came in here at the zenith of his glory in political life at the start of this session as a confirmed elected leader of this party and his is a downhill route, Mr.

Speaker, a downhill route. And this reply to this Budget Speech exemplifies that because he didn't deal with the issues, he didn't come up with any positive ideas, all he did was come up with the cliché terms, too little, too late, hucksterism, razzle-dazzle, but no meat, Mr. Speaker, that's what he said. Well, obviously if the Member for Selkirk saw no meat in that budget, he's an absolute vegetarian, Mr. Speaker, a vegetarian because there's meat in there that he and his colleagues cannot recognize and they must all be vegetarians, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we've heard in all the replies to date so far is the predictions, Mr. Speaker, of dire consequences for the province, of a downhill economy, the scare tactics. The Member for Churchill came out with a classic one a couple of days ago in question period, where he asked the Minister of Labour about the layoff notice from Dominion Bridge, a layoff notice that because of legislation that his party put in place is required by statute to be in several months ahead of time and, as a matter of course, they had been sending that letter to every Minister of Labour in this province for the last four consecutive years, as a precautionary measure. It proves that all the Member for Churchill is interested in is the scare tactics of promoting the feeling and the scare in this House. He wants the ladies, the wives of the workers at Dominion Bridge to listen to the news reports all day and worry all day about whether their husbands are going to be part of this layoff that's coming, which was a complete farce. Because, Mr. Speaker, if he had investigated one iota with Dominion Bridge he'd know they were projecting one of the better years that they've ever had.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is even more shameful is that maybe he knew that and he is just in here to promote scare, fear, disrupt the system. They call them revolutionaries in some countries and I don't want to give that Member for Churchill that much credit, but, Mr. Speaker, that kind of activity is disgusting, disgusting, Mr. Speaker. But all we've got here in the last little while is an opposition that has been stirring the pot and, Mr. Speaker, I've got to give them credit, they do it very well. They are very effective in their role of bringing issues forward and only half explaining them and leaving innuendo there; I find that perfectly commendable on their part because that's the role of the opposition.

The role of the opposition is to bring out the issues whether they're totally identified, whether they're totally explained or not, if they can bring them out and shotgun them on the public and leave the impression that the government is not doing its job, that's the role of the opposition and they're doing it to a degree on certain issues very well. They're doing it on this layoff thing fairly well. They did it on the vinyl chloride fairly well because they depended upon the lack of knowledge amongst the people of Manitoba to prey upon a fear campaign. I can't blame the press for that because they have to report what goes on in here. It's part of the Opposition and the role of the press to develop that. What, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition are gaining all their hopes on is a completely negative campaign in this House and on the hustings. They hope and they believe that that campaign is going to carry them to victory in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, that's not so; that's not so. You can use all the scare tactics you want. You can make all the statements you want about the health care system being broken, premiums reinstated, personal care homes not there. You can make all of those statements all you want, but when you come, Mr. Speaker, to the election sometime in the future, what you have to do as an Opposition party, which is what this party did so ably in 1977, Mr. Speaker, what you have to do is not only criticize the government for what they are doing, you not only criticize the government and point out their errors and their faults but, Mr. Speaker, you tell the people of Manitoba what you are going to do to replace that government. To date, Mr. Speaker, in two-and-a-half years, we have not heard one single idea as to what they would do should they become government. That will work fine, Mr. Speaker, sitting in these chairs and speaking to this group and that press gallery, but take it to the people of Manitoba and they are going to see the Leader of the Opposition is bankrupt of ideas, as we know him to be in this House. They will find that all he will stand and do is criticize and offer nothing to replace it.

Mr. Speaker, here's the problem that the members of the Opposition have. When they offer a replacement program to the people of Manitoba, what is it going to be, Mr. Speaker? Well, we have heard the Leader of the Opposition and many others say: You should be spending money. Mr. Speaker, accept that as a premise of their next election platform. If they are going to spend more money, they have to do one of two things: They have to either increase the deficit or raise taxes. Which is it going to be?

When the Leader of the Opposition says we do nothing for small business, I just want to gather a little fact here because I want to know which one of these things that we have done for small business that the Leader of the Opposition is going to improve upon or, in his drive to raise taxes, he is going to take away from small business in this province. Is the Leader of the Opposition going to stand up on the election platform next election campaign and tell truthfully, tell the people truthfully that he is going to raise succession duties and gift taxes. I suggest no, Mr. Speaker. He may do it if he is ever Premier of this province. He would do it on a moment's notice, but he won't tell the people. He will not be honest enough to tell the people that he will do it. He will play a dishonest election campaign.

So, Mr. Speaker, is he going to raise succession duties and gift taxes? Is he going to raise from 11 back up to 13 percent the small business corporation tax, as it was when they took over? Is that how he is going to help small business, the way it was when they took over? Is he going to reinstate the no limitation on the corporate capital tax after next election, a move this year alone, Mr. Speaker, which removes 500,000 in taxation to small business in this province. Is he going to reinstate that and burden small business with another half million dollars of taxation?

What is he going to do, Mr. Speaker? What is he going to do? Is he going to eliminate the Enterprise Manitoba Program which, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most successful job creation, small business expansion programs that this province has ever

seen, and I can attest to that from personal experience in my own riding.

I would like to take the Leader of the Opposition down to a photographer, who in 1977 ran a very small shop, and because of Enterprise Manitoba now has an expanded shop, including processing, frame making, etc. etc. in that shop. He, Mr. Speaker, expanded because of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development's Small Enterprise Manitoba Program. Is that the program that the Leader of the Opposition is going to tell the people of Manitoba, the small business people of Manitoba, that he is going to eliminate?

I suggest that he is going to go into the next election with a bunch of hucksterism. Hucksterism, that's what he is going to go in with, no positive program. Quite the contrast, Mr. Speaker, to how this party won the election in 1977. They went in and they said that they would reduce the numbers in the Civil Service; they would bring government spending under control; they would reduce taxes. Mr. Speaker, all of those things have been done and more. We have kept our promises to the people of Manitoba. When we hear what the New Democrat promises are going to be, we will analyze them and we will see in fact whether they are going to live up to them or not. We will see in the election campaign, the next election, Mr. Speaker, how much hucksterism they are going to use and how they are going to try to fudge the issue that, really, we want to destroy business, we want to destroy initiative. We are going to see how they lie their way out of that, Mr. Speaker, on the election platforms in this province come the next election. We are going to see, Mr. Speaker.

It is fine in here to stand up and criticize but, Mr. Speaker, without offering an alternative, our friends in the Opposition are going to be just that, our friends in the Opposition, just that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal ever so briefly with some of the questions that were posed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his reply to the Budget Speech. He said, What is happening in this province in economic development? He said this Budget did not deal with economic development in this province. It did not deal with job creation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Mines and Energy was here to tell us how many jobs are going to be in Flin Flon as a result of the mine expansion at Trout Lake. I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Energy and Mines to be here to tell us how many jobs, incidentally, in the Steel Workers Union are going to be created at Inco because of that announced expansion some two months ago in Inco in Thompson. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition, in his gobbledegook that he gave us the other day, would care to tell us how many jobs are involved right now in northern Manitoba with additional hard-rock mining exploration, a figure of hard-rock mining exploration which has exceeded in constant dollars anything that this province has ever known. That takes people; that's jobs, and that has come about, Mr. Speaker, because we changed the tax laws in this province to bring incentive back into the mining system.

He talks about job creation. Well, there's two areas. I would like the Leader of the Opposition to

tell us, if he knows, how many jobs are involved in oil exploration in southwestern Manitoba, seismograph crews, drilling rigs. He doesn't know, but I'll tell you, we know, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of them. And why are they there now, Mr. Speaker? It is all of a sudden magical that the oil is underneath Manitoba; now that the New Democrats are gone, the oil is there? No. It was always there but under their punitive tax system, it always would have been there. We have once again brought our jurisdiction in line with the taxation levels of other provinces, including socialist Saskatchewan. We now have employment, through seismograph exploration, in drilling of oil wells in southwestern Manitoba. Is that some of the employment that doesn't exist in the province, according to the Leader of the Opposition? I can respect where he has never gone off Number 9 Highway between Selkirk and Winnipeg and he doesn't know what happens in the rest of the province, Mr. Speaker; that's his problem.

Mr. Speaker, how many jobs are going to be involved in the next six months of this fiscal year in the St. Lazare area spending 2 million doing further seismographs and test hole exploration on the potash deposits in St. Lazare. Is that not jobs that are coming into this province? Yes, but he fails to recognize it; he fails to recognize it. It is a pathetic failure on his part, Mr. Speaker, but I blame him not, for he knows not what he does.

Mr. Speaker, since 1977 manufacturing alone has had 9,000 new jobs, manufacturing alone, and that, Mr. Speaker, represents an export of our labour force to other jurisdictions, because manufacturing shipments aren't manufactured solely for this province, the majority go out of the province. We are employing people to export technology out of this province. Those are 9,000 new jobs. That is a three-year New Democratic total job creation record in two years in one sector alone, namely, manufacturing, and bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that manufacturing is real jobs. It is not jobs in government employment where you have to take from every taxpayer in the province to pay them their wages through tax collection. Those are brand new jobs that people in Saskatchewan, Alberta, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, are paying the workers at Versatile for the creation of four-wheel drive tractors. Those are real jobs, bringing in real money from outside of Manitoba, and he says, there is no job creation in this province. My God, the man is blind. He is not only a vegetarian, he is blind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says, what are we doing for farmers? The great friend of the farmer over there in the New Democratic Party says, what are we doing for the farmers? Mr. Speaker, how could anyone sitting on that side of the House, being completely and totally turfed out by the farming community, ask what we are doing for the farming community and have anybody expect to take him serious. What are we doing about the farm community? We removed the onerous competition of the government in land purchase by removing the Land Lease Program and instituting MACC, which loans money for the ownership of land by private farmers. That is what we are doing for the farming community.

We are instituting Crown land sales, Mr. Speaker, to put our land resources in the hands of private

people, because it can develop them and use them for the growth of this province.

Number Three, Mr. Speaker, in what we are doing for the farm community is our efforts saved three major rail lines from abandonment in this province. His efforts let 500-and-some-odd miles go during their administration. That is a third item that we are doing for the farmers in this province is rail line retention.

Four, we are building roads to service areas where rail lines have been abandoned by those people, been abandoned by those people.

Number Five, Mr. Speaker, we have leased 400 hopper cars for the transportation of grain from this province, for the generation of cash flow in this province. That is far better, Mr. Speaker, than any subsidy, toss-in-the-money program that the New Democrats were wont to throw upon the farming community. That is real dollars from the people who can create them, from the farming community. All we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is giving them the dollars that they had in the bin, by providing the transportation facility. That is something we are doing for the farmers, Mr. Speaker.

The sixth thing we are doing. We have removed the burden of the Beef Income Assurance Plan from the cattle producers of this province.

The seventh thing we are doing, and I have to give my colleague, the Member for Rock Lake an extreme amount of credit, Churchill now is a port receiving a lot of attention on the national scene because of incessant questioning by the Member for Rock Lake. Where was the Member for Churchill? He is worried about vinyl chloride; he is worried about supporting Joe Zuken, the Communist candidate for mayor, that is what he is worried about. He is not worried about Churchill, the port, the development, grain movement. The Member for Rock Lake has been. As a result, Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent chance that the MB Arctic will be in there again this spring for the first time; increased shipments; increased utilization; the settlement of a contract in Churchill. Who does that benefit, Mr. Speaker? The farmers of Manitoba, and the Leader of the Opposition says, what are you doing for the farmers of Manitoba? Open your eyes, dear Sir, and you will know what we are doing for the farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we cleaned up the taxation system. We added all kinds of exemptions to the farm population, specifically to benefit the production of food, for not only Manitobans but for the world.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing that we did for the farming community is removed succession duties and gift tax so that the family farm can remain preserved. That is what the Leader of the Opposition will reinstate. He will sneak it in the back door, should he ever become Premier of this province. He won't tell the people he is going to do it, but he will sneak it in the back door, Mr. Speaker.

That is some of the things that we have done for the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker. However, I want to put on the record what the Honourable Minister of Health has indicated. The biggest thing we did for the farming population in Manitoba was win the 1977 election, and there has never been a truer statement said, never been a truer statement said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a couple of items that are in the budget. Members opposite like to pride themselves in this House, on the hustings, as being the friend of the disadvantaged in this province, the champion of the elderly, the champion of the poor. Mr. Speaker, watch who was over at the Labour Congress Meeting, where we have the labour unions en masse saying, we will overcome. Who is marching arm in arm with them? What do the large labour union settlements do to the elderly pensioner? What do they do to the person on fixed income? What do they do to the low income people? Raise the price of their food for one thing, raise the price of everything they buy. And who is arm in arm? They are in arm in arm with the unions, saying, yes, we are going to support you for all the big wages you want, for all the benefits you want, we are going to support you, and on the other hand, they cuddle over here and they say, well, we are the friends of the poor, we are the friends of the elderly, we are the friends of the disadvantaged. They can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways.

We, in this government, through the efforts of the Minister of Labour, have had a stable labour relationship in this province for two years. Mr. Speaker, that should not be if we were to believe the members of the opposition in that their only friends to the union movement are found in ranks of New Democratic Parties. We shouldn't see such a stable labour scene in this province. —(Interjection)— The construction industry just settled this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how does this happen with a Tory Government that hates unions, if we listen to the members of the opposition? It happens, Mr. Speaker, because we understand both sides of the coin; we understand the management side of the coin, and we understand the working person's side of the coin. The Minister of Labour adequately skillfully and efficiently matches those aspirations of both groups, and as a result we have a two-year construction contract settlement, and we will have many more, Mr. Speaker, without the confrontation that their party has to have to survive. They have to have the class warfare, the unions against the business. They have to have the dissension and they have to have people clawing their guts out before they can get the kind of political and economic climate that they hope will spur them to power. They cannot stand stability, they cannot stand peaceful labour relations, because they haven't got a peg to hang their hat on. This Minister of Labour is destroying their election chances day by day, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate him for it.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to some of the steps for the elderly and the disadvantaged in this province in this budget, and I want to go through them very quickly. One of them is from last year; one of them is the sales tax exemptions for children's clothing. If we listen to some of the members opposite, I think the Member for Burrows berated us for that, and he said, oh, that is nickel, dime. Talk to the people that spend 500 a year clothing their children and find out if it is nickel, dime. They appreciate not paying sales tax on children's clothes, anything under the age of 16. That's amazing that this government that theoretically, according to the New Democrats, the

Socialists over there, don't care for the poor people. Good heavens, blind, blind, Mr. Speaker.

Property Tax Credits: The greatest impact of the Property Tax Credit changes that we made, Mr. Speaker, apply to who? They apply to the senior citizens of this province and they apply to the low income people of this province, that is the greatest benefit of the Property Tax Credit, and he says, we do nothing for the poor, we do nothing for the elderly. Mr. Speaker, it won't wash. The Leader of the Opposition cannot go to a senior citizen, who last year paid 200 tax on their home, which we encourage them to stay in and to own, cannot tell that person that we did nothing for them when this year they paid 25.00. He cannot not make that wash, and what he is saying in here, I hope he goes out and says in the constituency, because, Mr. Speaker, he will get laughed out of every meeting that there is, because what he is saying is a joke, Mr. Speaker, an uninformed joke.

Mr. Speaker, another step that we have taken. We have doubled the benefits of the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly, doubled them, Mr. Speaker. Also, what have we done as well as doubling them? We have lowered the threshold age to 55 to accommodate disadvantaged widows or widowers, who no longer have the benefit of a two-couple income because unfortunately their spouse may have passed away. We did that. We, the people who never do anything for the poor and the disadvantaged, did that, and he said we do nothing for them. The man is the ultimate of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, when he says that. He calls it a shell game, a shell game. Incredible, incredible.

What else did we do, Mr. Speaker. Some seven months ago the Minister of Economic Development introduced the SAFER Program. What did we do in this Budget? We lowered it to include people of 55 years of age. Is that something that an unbelieving government, an uncaring government would do. And not only did we lower it to 55, we included low income families with children under the SAFER Program. Is that an uncaring government, Mr. Speaker, or is that political hypocrisy?

Mr. Speaker, we expanded day care services for the working people in this province, so that they can continue to work at their jobs and have their children well cared for.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced the CRISP Program. Does that sound, Mr. Speaker, like a government who cares not for the elderly and the disadvantaged and the low income families in this province? Tell the people of Manitoba that outside on the hustings, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, and we will see how quickly you get laughed at, because the people know where the government is. It was responsible and provides the programming that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, the important part of this whole exercise in this budget is not so much the programs that are in place to help the disadvantaged and the poor, to stimulate business, etc., etc., it is the fact that it has been achieved, Mr. Speaker, by redirecting programs, by cleaning up programs, by providing better fiscal management in the province. That is the important consideration in those budgetary efforts.

I realize that there is an ominous silence over there because they know not what fiscal responsibility is, and they are going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely correct, they will vote against those measures.

Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell for the next few moments on where Manitoba, as an economy, is going to go in the 1980s. —(Interjection)— The Member for Elmwood has just indicated the doom and gloom that he has been used to, he says, down the tubes, and that shows his abysmal ignorance of the depth and strength in this province. Mr. Speaker, this province is going to blossom in the 1980s. It is going to blossom, Mr. Speaker, because of three very important sectors in this province. It is going to bloom because of the mining sector in this province. It is going to bloom because of the energy sector in this province, primarily hydro-electric energy, and it is going to bloom, Mr. Speaker, because of the agricultural sector of this province.

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in the years 1974 to 1977, those glorious days of New Democratic rule in this province, we saw unprecedented Hydro-electric construction, we saw very buoyant agricultural conditions, and we saw mining, metal prices and activity at an all time high. They took those three booming economic activities and they still drove this province into the greatest financial mess that it has ever known in its history.

Mr. Speaker, those were the boom years. We have just taken this province in two-and-a-half years of not such bright agricultural conditions; sure our farmers through their initiative and their innovation and their efficiency have been surviving, but things are damn tough in the farming community right now, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, they have maintained their level of activity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have five minutes.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a change on the Committee for Economic Development. I would like to ask the name of Mr. Hyde removed and replaced by the name of Mr. Brown.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Committee of Economic Development, I would like to substitute the Member for Rupertsland for the Member for The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable? (Agreed)

The hour being 1:30 the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon.