

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 29 May, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

### OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, I'd like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students of Grade 6 from the Earl Grey School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Mel Hanna. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne.

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

We also have 40 students of Grade 11 from the W.C. Miller Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Al Schmidt, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Child Welfare system - improvements to

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Community Services. I would ask her if she would undertake to the Assembly to review the debate and comments that occurred in this Assembly yesterday, and the positive comments made from both sides of the House as to improvements that could be made in our child welfare system, as well as the questions that have been asked over the past few days, and undertake to provide answers and indicate a course of action that she intends to take to the House tomorrow, or as early as possible.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I have already reviewed the debate and I must say I welcome the Chamber-wide interest in the issues of child welfare and child abuse. It is an area where the needs are growing, partly because of major social shifts; many more one-parent families; a lot of in-migration to the city. The issues raised are ones that are going to tax all of us no matter what our background, therefore, I look forward to very productive debate during the Estimates and invite all members to take part actively.

The system has been undergoing a lot of development, fresh funding and new programming and, certainly, at the meetings I attended in Vancouver where all the Provincial Ministers were discussing these very issues, the same types of problems are being encountered nationally, and the same directions for dealing with these problems are, in fact, emerging in the different provinces.

In many ways we are out ahead; in other areas we have something to learn, and it was a very productive exchange. But there are new social patterns out there that are going to tax all of us. I think, again, the individual questions will be debated in the Estimates process.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, the time for consideration of the Minister's Estimates is some weeks away. In view of the fact that the Minister has read the questions that have been raised over the course of the past few days, and the debate that took place in this House yesterday, can she indicate today, then, what course of action she is prepared to undertake immediately to do something with respect to the large numbers of infants who are at — certain alleged to be — at risk. The situations where young children are being returned by social workers to homes in which they have been abused, despite the recommendations, in one instance, against that by Dr. Ferguson, all the others very serious incidences, and problems that have arisen during the past seven days; is she prepared to indicate a course of action that she is prepared to undertake now, not defer this to a debate some weeks away?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I have already announced that I will be reviewing both the specifics of the individual cases, that there will be a review of any system issues where we can fine-tune the protocols at the local level and, if there are any alternate plans required, should there be any disruption or failure to conclude negotiations satisfactorily, contingency plans are being developed, Madam Speaker.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, I have given to the Minister, prior to question period, a copy of a letter from legal counsel for the Foster Parents Association of Winnipeg and Manitoba, which was delivered to me earlier this morning, complaining about the division of the Children's Aid Society into community-based groups is being totally destructive to any form of support for foster families, in referring to a complete lack of training, overwork, destruction of foster families, not providing any form of resources, and concluding that the result is that excellent foster parents no longer wish to be involved as they are tired of being abused and ignored, and children may be at risk since there is no ongoing supervision and support.

Madam Speaker, they asked me to ask the Minister of Community Services to direct the Director of Child

Welfare to undertake a review of the fostering system in Manitoba and, until a budget is provided that will allow training, education and support for foster parents, they will be providing substandard care to Manitoba's needy children. Will she undertake that review?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I applaud the development of the Foster Parents Association, whereby that group of people are identifying common problems and recommending improvements in the type of care they give. They are a very important part of the total child service system.

Madam Speaker, over the years the foster care was based on the old pattern of the family, and only out-of-pocket expenses were given for children placed there. Recognizing these needs over the past year or so we have been giving special-rate foster care in quite a rapidly accelerating amount. The training development, I think, is going to be called for more and more in the future because we are finding that there is a greatly increasing load in the teenage group and teenagers with much more serious problems. So we are undergoing ongoing relationships with that group and are always reviewing the program.

I think that when the Estimates are dealt with, in detail, the members opposite will be able to find out just how much development has been occurring to date.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert with a supplementary?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

Would the Minister explain what is going wrong in her department so that it is necessary for legal counsel for the Foster Parents Association of Winnipeg and Manitoba, with whom I have had no connection whatsoever previously, to find it necessary to write to a Member of the Opposition to ask that this type of review be made and express their concerns about the present situation?

What kind of a department is the Minister running?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I think one of the interesting things we are discovering is that, as we have conducted a more open system, and whereas we have tried to move into new areas of support, that the groups that are coming to us are raising their sights. The fact that they want training, that they are looking at the fairness of supporting for parenting, remembering that most parenting in our society, traditionally, was done by people at home for free, it was done by women, in large part. Extended families were still together and could pick up some of the slack.

That is no longer the society we are living in, Madam Speaker. If more had been done in the four years when the Opposition were in power, there would not be so much catch-up to be done. I think if you look at the increasing funding, the numbers of services, training opportunities that have been built into the child and family service system during the term of this government, that you can see that we are moving ahead, Madam Speaker.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. A final question.

In view of the statement in the letter that it was the division of the Children's Aid Society into community-based groups which has been totally destructive to any form of support for foster families, which is what this Minister and this government implemented, would she undertake the review of the fostering system in Manitoba that has been requested?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I think the member did not hear what I said; that we have been aware of problems and undergoing review for some time. We have been actively helping them to recruit and to train. There is a whole new area of special needs support, respite care, and I think what we are seeing is a group suddenly becoming very conscious and wanting to speak out to improve the system. I think the best way for that review to take place is through dialogue within the department. I certainly am available to meet with them today, if necessary, Madam Speaker.

### Liability insurance coverage

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

**MR. J. MALOWAY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Given that businesses and municipalities in Manitoba, either cannot place liability insurance or face skyrocketing rates, the latest example being the case of the Clear Lake Marina, in the Winnipeg Sun today, would the Minister include in his options for action; (1) that an insurance pool be set up involving the MPIC and private insurance companies; (2) that legal limits be placed on liability claims, such as, in some U.S. states; or (3), more importantly, that the MPIC be allowed to have a complete takeover of liability insurance in Manitoba. Such an act would provide a sole market for liability insurance in this province.

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question.

I recall that the Honourable Member for Riel has been asking questions in respect to liability insurance, as well, and I have indicated that there are a number of options that government can consider, and certainly those suggestions that the honourable member included in his question are worthy of consideration.

In respect to the situation at Clear Lake, which is a matter of concern for many number of reasons — the tourism involved, the small local enterprise involved — we regret that very much. I would point out, however, that operation is in a federal park. Boat operations in this country, and not just in this province, are regulated by the Federal Government and we are not in the position, haven't been at this time, to take on, as I understand MPIC, take on those risks. I would assume that with all of the regulated boating operations throughout Canada, it should be possible for the Federal Government to convince one of the national federal insurance companies operating throughout Canada to provide adequate insurance. But certainly the

suggestions that the honourable member makes have to be considered along with any other solutions that are offered. This is a very serious situation for small businesses in Manitoba, and in Canada generally.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a supplementary.

**MR. J. MALOWAY:** My supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker, could the Minister give us a rough timetable for consideration of these options?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I could add some flippant remark to that heckle that came from across the side, but I know we're not supposed to hear those, Madam Speaker. I will say to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I am not certain of the time frame. We will be considering those questions on a priority basis, but the time for response I couldn't speculate on.

#### **Workers Compensation files - access to**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Environment, Workplace, Safety and Health.

The committee reviewing legislation governing the Board of the Workers Compensation has been refused access of the files of some individual compensation claimants. As this committee is sworn to secrecy, why are they refused access to these files?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Workplace, Health and Safety.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you Madam Speaker. I thank the member for that question.

I have discussed this issue already once with the members of the committee. I am meeting with the members of the Board and, as well, I've sought advice from legal counsel, as to whether the provisions of the act, on the one side, allow the committee that type of access, or prevent the committee from that type of access, and I expect to have an answer on that tomorrow for my meeting with the board.

#### **Nuclear Waste Repository**

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, under a heading in the newspaper today: "Radioactive waste repository for Manitoba planned by agency." I would like to ask the Minister, has he entered into any discussion with the Atomic Energy of Canada concerning the storage of additional nuclear waste at Pinawa?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** First of all, let's make the distinction between disposal and storage, Madam Speaker. The storage of nuclear wastes in Pinawa has

been taking place since there is a Pinawa Research establishment because there is, and has been, there for many years a research reactor which has been producing a certain amount of high level radioactivity, which has been stored in Pinawa since that time in concrete bunkers that are there.

The research establishment is looking at establishing a new type of research reactor which would produce way less nuclear waste. At this point in time, we are talking in terms of the theoretical and it is only after the research has been done on this model, "slowpoke reactors," it's called, that the industry will be able to establish whether that type of reactor, first of all, can be used; whether it can lend itself to remote areas, etc. But there have been no specific discussions at this point in time as to whether such wastes will be stored and where they will be stored.

#### **Mosquito fogging**

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Madam Speaker, my final supplementary question to the same Minister responsible for mosquitoes, has the Minister joined the small group of people in the City of Winnipeg who have taken advantage of the buffer zone of not spraying within 100 metres of his own property in the constituency of Niakwa?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Madam Speaker, my initial reaction is to say to the member that I am not going to ask him what he has done, and I could answer in kind. But, Madam Speaker, I will repeat for everybody here that there's a lot of misconception and misstatements that have been made around this issue.

**A MEMBER:** Answer the question.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I will answer the question, Madam Speaker, as well. I will extend my reply until I am told that I can no longer reply and I shall provide that reply. Madam Speaker, as I said, there's a lot of misinformation that has been provided out there. First of all, there is nothing that prevents . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member who asked the question cannot determine what the answer to the question is. If the answer is not satisfactory, the honourable member can ask a different question.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's exactly how I thought it was. As I was saying, Madam Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is to abide by the number of mosquitoes in traps as they did before. They have given an indication that these mosquitoes have been trapped in large numbers. The question, I wonder, is if they believe that the spraying is as effective as they have been saying that it can be, why have they not been spraying.

In reply to the specific question, yes, I have exercised my right to have limited protection, because that is all anyone can expect from the exercising of the right to be protected by the 100-metre buffer zone. Having said

that, Madam Speaker, the city has said itself that this spray extends 90 metres, so I expect I will get it as well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** May I remind honourable members that both questions and answers should be brief, and I have allowed a lot of latitude already this afternoon. In terms of supplementary questions, I would like to bring to members' attention, as an example, that while I was expecting the Member for Niakwa to raise a supplementary question, he has had the opportunity to ask three different questions on totally different topics.

A supplementary question, for the edification of all members, Beauchesne, Citation 371 is: ". . . further questions, as may be necessary for the elucidation of the answers that have been given, within due limits, may be addressed to a Minister."

So if all members, when they are seeking the floor to ask a supplementary would bear that in mind it would help the process muchly.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

#### **Ft. Garry Women's Resource Centre - contents of letter**

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services. I understand that the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre will be closing tomorrow if it does not receive additional funding. I also understand that you have, in fact, couriered a letter. Can you divulge the contents of that letter to this group?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, the funding of resource centres was one of the election promises Core funding. It is not a program that was in place before. We are developing the criteria for that program, and Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre would be one that would fall under that. They have been informed that we are moving as quickly as we can to come to our conclusion of that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights with a supplementary.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Yes, Madam Speaker. Can we be assured, Madam Minister, that in fact the Resource Centre will remain open?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, as a member of a collegial group on this side, I am not at liberty to prejudge the decision. I do want to recall to the member though that the reason we're in such difficulty with centres, such as, the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre is that the Federal Government unilaterally withdrew funding that they were receiving and, along with the passing on of a lot of areas for which they took responsibility before, they are now expecting the Provincial Government to pick up all the pieces.

Madam Speaker, we are moving as quickly as we can, and we have communicated that to the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A final supplementary, Madam Speaker, Madam Minister, if you can't give us that assurance, are you going to accept the fact that it may close tomorrow?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Excuse me. Could the honourable member please address her questions to the Chair, not to the individual Minister.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Sorry, Madam Speaker. Can the Minister assure the House that she and her department are willing to accept the blame for the closure tomorrow.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, anyone who knows me and my interests would not feel that I would be in a position of trying to block the delivery of services to women through such organizations as the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre. As a matter of fact, the fact that they have been able to carry to date has been largely the result of the work of myself and my colleagues.

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

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

In light of the fact that this government did allow the Fort Garry Resource Centre to close last fall for lack of \$21,000, and then proceeded to give the money; and in light of the fact that the Premier, during the election, promised to fund the women's resource centres and went on to say how successful they were, how can the Minister sit there in her seat and now suggest that it isn't their fault in closing?

What I would ask the Minister, is the money in the Budget to keep these resource centres open as was promised during the election campaign?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, what I'm hearing from the other side is that if we managed to keep something alive, that we're somehow at fault, because another partner has withdrawn funding.

We kept this centre open because we provided funding. We promised that kind of generic program in the Budget. There is money in the Budget, Madam Speaker. What we are working on are the criteria for the programs so that we have a fair and equitable way of allocating funds.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** A supplementary question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Would the Minister explain to the House how often centres like the Fort Garry Resource Centre are going to have to close while they come up with a criteria? Surely the Minister must know that the hiring of staff and having to lay them off, let them go, retrain, is just costing more money and more time and we're losing the services.

Could the Minister assure us that centre is going to stay open so they don't have to lay off their staff tomorrow?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, this government does not negotiate through threat and guilt. We're

developing a program; we've explained it to them. We've explained the process that we must follow in order to design a program and to flow the money.

It's their responsibility now, Madam Speaker, to take what we have said, assess it and make their own determination, but we have explained to them the process and told them that our election commitment was a very real and sound commitment, and there is money in the Budget, Madam Speaker.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** If there is money in the Budget, as the Minister has just indicated, why is she allowing the centre to lay off staff? Why can't she come to an interim agreement so that they can hang on to their staff and not put the centre in danger again. This is foolish planning.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, we have informed them that the process of developing an interim agreement is something we are willing to go that step prior to the general program, but that it would be better for all concerned if we got the criteria for the overall program clarified.

Madam Speaker, they know that. Now if they choose, knowing that information, to close, not take the chance of the program coming through very, very shortly, that is their responsibility, but we've given them our commitment. We've told them there's money in the Budget, but that I am not in a position, in an ad hoc way, or before I have got it cleared through the appropriate government authorities, to promise money.

Madam Speaker, I do not promise money before I have got full authorization for it.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I have one last question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

If the money is there, but the centre doesn't have the money, and the Minister won't assure them that they're going to get the money, how are they expected to stay open?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, they have been told what the probabilities are and the likely timing; it's their responsibility how they handle that information.

### Northern Flood Agreement - settlement outstanding liabilities

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Can the Minister indicate to the House that he and his department are fully committed to the obligations under Article 3 of the Northern Flood Agreement respecting land transfer to Indian communities affected?

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

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, the Premier had taken a question on May 16th from the Leader of the Opposition on that specific question.

I was prepared to table that information today, so I would like to tell the Member for Lakeside that

Manitoba is not the only responsible body for implementing the articles of the Northern Flood Agreement.

Of the 145 claims filed to the arbitrator's office, 59 of the claims are solely the responsibility of the province, and 10 of them have reached final settlement.

Manitoba's responsibility lies primarily in the area of wildlife management and we have been training some students of Keewatin Community College for that program; also, in the area of land-related matters, we are making progress in that area as well, and also in economic development. We have offered some funds for the Nistum group as well.

I'm prepared to table all this information at this time.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. A supplementary question to the same Minister.

My concern arises from information gathered this morning at the Standing Committee for Natural Resources and Public Utilities. We received information from Manitoba Hydro that Hydro was not in any way impeding the settlement of some of these outstanding land claims.

The agreement calls for a four-for-one exchange - four acres for every acre that has been flooded as a result of hydro-electric development.

My question to the Minister directly then is, why, of all lands previously identified — and there have been some 47,000 acres that the Indian communities have said, this is the land we have chosen under the agreement — only 147 acres, less than 1 percent, have in fact been transferred. This is going on now for three years, Madam Speaker.

We have a Minister without Portfolio, responsible for our Native Affairs. I ask the Minister, again, how can he explain that record of performance?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, as we have indicated previously, the agreement has been filed since 1977, and we did not receive the land allocations from the band until 1983.

Since that time we have mentioned, on previous occasions, that there are four bodies involved in negotiations. Any time you get four bodies involved, it takes time to come to some conclusions as to what lands are being affected and who else is being affected by the land transfers. So we're moving as quickly as possible; we are very close to settling several other parcels, which we hope they will accept very shortly.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate what the Minister is saying. I know that the Indian bands involved

. . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a supplementary, which needs no preamble?

**MR. H. ENNS:** I have a supplementary.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Ask your supplementary.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs is, will he confirm, will he agree that the communities involved, identified in 1983, some three years ago, 47,000 acres which they

requested in this transfer, and to date, only one parcel involving 147 acres have in fact been transferred. Is that satisfactory performance of a government that has been loyally supported by members from the North, representing all of the Northern seats, having the first Minister of Indian ancestry in this Cabinet, and is this Minister going to be satisfied with that kind of performance?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** May I remind the honourable member, first of all, that question period is not a time for debate and, secondly, Beauchesne Citation 357(d) states that a question should not "repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." That one was suspiciously exactly the same as the one before.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

### Fire hazard - degree of

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the continuing hot weather can he tell us the degree of fire hazard in Manitoba at the present time?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As Acting Minister of Natural Resources, I'm happy to provide the information to the House. It's not happy information, but it is important that members of the House know what the fire situation is. There are eight fires active in Manitoba, seven of which are under control; one is not under control. It's a thousand hectare fire located five miles east of Garden Hill on Island Lake. It is being actively engaged by 100 firefighters, three helicopters, and one water bomber. The clear skies, the above normal temperatures, and no precipitation are expected for several days.

I would also like to indicate that the department is providing information to the public in the best way possible, by media, of the high fire hazard that exists in Manitoba. I'm sure that honourable members want to have detail of that. — (Interjection) — The fire hazard in Nopiming, in Whiteshell Parks is extreme because of high temperatures and low humidity. There's no expected precipitation over the next few days and the fire is — (Interjection) — . . .

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

I think our experience yesterday with a question answered by the Honourable First Minister, and the answer from the Minister this afternoon, indicate that kind of information should be transmitted to the House in ministerial statements, rather than using the valuable time of question period.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker, to indicate — (Interjection) — On a point of order, Madam Speaker, to indicate to the speaker that the information that I endeavoured to give the House

— (Interjection) — that I endeavoured to the House was transmitted to me after I had arrived in the House, by messenger, and I sought to give that information to the House in a manner which I thought was reasonable through a question put by a member in the House.

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

If any Minister feels that the information they want to transmit to the House is important to be transmitted, they should find methodologies within the rules to transmit that information. I am suggesting that using question period for minister statements is an abuse of the rules.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

### Seat belts - crackdown on use

**MR. C. MANNES:** Madam Speaker, yesterday's announcement in the paper said a police crackdown on seat belt use. My question to the Attorney-General, who initiated the action that is causing the police forces in this province to more rigorously enforce the seat belt legislation, was it the Attorney-General or was it the Road Safety Research Unit at the University of Manitoba?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Neither, in fact. It was a program initiated by the Manitoba Traffic Safety Committee which Committee, on analysis of a study that had been done on seat belt usage, came to the conclusion, the an inescapable conclusion, that the degree of usage in the province had slipped below an effectively operative level and recommended this program; indeed, one that was enthusiastically welcomed by law enforcement authorities who also realized from experience that seat belts, when used, have saved many, many lives and have prevented many serious injuries.

I'm proud of that program and I, on the recommendation of the Manitoba Traffic Safety Committee, together with the Minister of Highways and other Ministers involved, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the Hon. John Bucklaschuk, we enthusiastically welcomed that initiative. We support it wholeheartedly; this House passed that legislation; it is the law in the province. All statistics demonstrate the viability of buckling up and I think that no member in this House should question appropriate law enforcement activities to save lives. That's what this debate was about in the House yesterday. How can they on the one hand talk about steps to save lives on one day, and criticize the same kind of steps, in a far more pervasive way, the next day?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris with a brief supplementary with no preamble.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Madam Speaker, I take it that the Minister then, the Attorney-General, did not issue instructions to the police forces within this province?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General with a brief answer.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I do not issue instructions to the police forces in this province and the honourable member ought to know that. The police forces in this province, whether it's the RCMP or the Winnipeg Police Department, in fact, know that they have a duty to enforce the law. They establish priorities. Sometimes, provincial policing priorities are discussed with me on a yearly basis and that's appropriate.

### Seat belts - reduction in deaths

**MR. C. MANNES:** A new question, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation.

When the bill bringing in seat belts was debated in Committee, Mr. Dalke answered in Committee to a question posed by the Member for Pembina that he expected there would be a one-third reduction in the deaths of motorists if the seat belt law was brought into place. My question to the Minister, can he indicate whether or not there was a 30 percent reduction in motor vehicle occupant deaths in 1984 versus 1983, than the number of 78 that existed in 1983?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, the member should know that statistics certainly do not always hold true from one year to the other. We cannot measure from one year to the another exactly and precisely the numbers, but the fact is that 75 percent of the traffic fatalities in the last year involved motorists who had not buckled up, who were not wearing their seat belts, and that is a very telling statistic.

The fact is there are more cars, more vehicles registered, more miles driven in the Province of Manitoba, so obviously, there would be greater risk, particularly if people are not buckling up. That is exactly what the Attorney-General was alluding to and the need for enforcement, because the fact is that the number of people who were indeed buckling up and using their seat belts had dropped into the mid-50 percent range which, of course, is not acceptable in order to have any kind of statistical projections hold true.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, we're prepared to grant leave to the Minister of Labour to make a Ministerial Statement if he wishes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is that the will of the House? (Agreed?)

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I was going to indicate wherein the past the Official Opposition, when they were then government, followed the same practice, where it is considered an urgent matter to provide information to the House.

However, Madam Speaker, I want to assure members that I left the Chamber to get copies made so I could table that information to you, Madam Speaker, then all members would have access to it. I know the media will be interested in it and I'll have copies for them.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Labour has 12 minutes remaining.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Honourable members will recall that the last we had the motion before us, I had given members an indication of my concerns in respect to a number of areas that touched the fiscal well-being of the province and have a bearing on our budgetary practices. I talked about the need for tax reform, the need for our society to face up to the reality of the challenge of tax reform, the need for our society to face up to the challenge of growing corporate power, and when we last met, I was discussing the need for greater fairness in income standards throughout the country. I had pointed out that this government had initiated pay equity in this province and there was still a great deal to be done to provide reasonable levels of incomes to Manitobans and to Canadians generally.

Madam Speaker, one of the concerns I have and I wish to share with colleagues, is my concern about the growing disparity of income in this country. We know that many people have to get by on wages like the minimum wage or wages very, very nominally above the minimum wage. Yet at the same time, Madam Speaker, we read in our newspapers of the fantastic salaries that are being received. I had alluded earlier to the salaries that were being paid to civil servants in Ottawa beyond the \$100,000 a year and now a bonus plan.

But in private industry, Madam Speaker, the salaries are astronomical. I read from the *Globe and Mail* of May 3 of this year of the fantastic salaries that are being paid to corporate directors and corporate managers, salaries that don't involve \$100,000 or something slightly over \$100,000, but now go beyond the million dollars. But that isn't the whole picture.

If honourable members will share with me the concerns that have been made and registered by people like Allan Fotheringham in an excellent article that I have to share with you, if I can find it. Yes, here we are. Allan Fotheringham is not considered by I think the majority of Canadians to be a flaming socialist, but this is what he writes in his column, and he entitles it: "The Docility of Canadians. The docility of the Canadian public is incomprehensible to behold. The rugged land of bush and rock is populated by 25 million sheep who do not even bleat. Canadians abide abuse and contempt from those on high that would cause riots in the street anywhere else. No one complains, no one protests."

What he is talking about, Madam Speaker, in this article is the tremendous, rapacious greed of corporate executives who are taking enormous salaries, enormous bonuses and exercising enormous stock options.

By leave, Madam Speaker, I would like to incorporate the entirety of this article in my remarks, but I need leave to do that rather than to read it into the record. Do I have leave?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member does not have unanimous consent.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't have leave, Madam Speaker.

Well, I'm going to read some portions of this article therefore into the record because maybe honourable members otherwise would not have the temerity to read it.

He says, he goes on: "We are talking here of those at the top who make the big bucks and how they thumb their noses at you and how a docile government, Tory as well as Grit, is too weak-kneed to even keep watch on them. There are two executives in Canada who seem likely to make \$40 million apiece. There are at least six executives in Canada who made more than \$1 million last year. How do we know? he asks. Because the Americans tell us so.

"The United States, which is a democratic country, requires by law that companies must disclose all the goodies that they heap on their pinstriped types from cars to golf clubs to retirement benefits to golden handshakes. In Canada, which is not quite so democratic, gutless Liberal governments before and a gutless Conservative government at present cosily protect the fat cats and will not let the public at such embarrassing evidence."

And he goes on, Madam Speaker. He said: "Let us take a look, for prime examples of greed and blind corpulence, at Ross Turner and Angus MacNaughton. They are at the top of the Genstar Corporation and chummily switch jobs annually as chairman and president. With Imasco's successful \$2.5 billion takeover of Genstar, they stand to make some \$40 million each in a combination of salaries, shares they hold in a private partnership and stock options they have garnered over the years."

Then he goes on. He said, "You want another screamer, the Daffy Duck act of Canadian corporations? Dome Petroleum had to file its annual report this month with the SEC in Washington. Only then could Canadians discover details of a deal in which Dome, in effect, is in receivership and has passed all its assets over to the banks which are owed some \$6 billion. Dome is now a joke. But an even better joke is the golden parachute arranged by the guy who runs it, Howard MacDonald, a Scottish accountant who is treasurer of Royal Dutch Shell, second largest oil outfit in the world. MacDonald was hired by Dome in 1983 to save it. He, first of all, being a good Scot, negotiated a personal service contract. Basic wage? The SEC, not gutless Ottawa, tells us it was \$812,768 last year. Better still, \$4 million in a trust fund that he will get if he quits or gets fired if Dome fails or thrives."

That, Madam Speaker, is the kind of corporate greed that I'm talking about. Manitobans and Canadians everywhere should be as angry as Allan Fotheringham is about a society that tolerates and seems to worship this lust for more and more economic power in this country.

Madam Speaker, we have a society that cries out for social change, for basic change in income standards in this country. It is simply not good enough that people in Manitoba, people in Canada, have to survive on \$4.30 an hour as a minimum wage. Ours is the second highest

in this country, but that's not a meaningful wage. But is it a meaningful wage for someone to get over \$1 million a year? Are they worth that kind of money?

We had in this province a Premier who dared at one stage, Madam Speaker, to indicate a concern about the levels, the disparity in the levels of income in this province and in this country, and he suggested an arbitrary figure — I know it's arbitrary — of some 2.5 times as a maximum. — (Interjection) — The Member for Sturgeon Creek says, "Ah, don't talk to me about those things." Surely there should be some reasonable standards of income for everyone in this country. Madam Speaker, what we need in this society is reasonable standards of income.

I conclude, Madam Speaker, by this short piece of free verse. "From honest toil we take reward. While wealth and glory have their day, the fruits of love and friendship in work together need never pass away. Let's share reward and joy of life. Let's work for all fair shares and end of strife."

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise to speak in the Budget Debate. I am sure, like many of my colleagues who have spoken, find that 40 minutes is somewhat a short period of time in which to try to get the message across on how our feelings are towards the mismanagement in the fiscal operations of the province under the New Democratic Party.

I know that when one looks over the material and the record of four years, and one does some projections as to what the possible disastrous long-term implications that the New Democratic Party will have on the taxpayers and the people of Manitoba, one could spend many, many more hours and minutes of debate dealing with this specific subject. Because, Madam Speaker, we are not dealing with people who are forthright, straightforward and honest with the people of Manitoba. They continue to say things, to do things that are somewhat in opposition to one another.

I guess, in putting a terminology on the Budget for the new Minister who, I'm sure, has an extremely onerous task, being a socialist, trying to live up to the whims and the wishes of those left wingers, those socialists, those people that believe that the state not only should control the people but has the ability to take wealth and distribute it in a way in which they, the elected members, are the only ones that see fit to do, will have some extremely major difficult times, some difficult times for this new Minister of Finance.

The legacy, of course, of the former Minister of Finance speaks pretty much for itself, and I think it's a legacy in which no one of us, or any one of this side of the House, would ever want to have attached to their name. The deficit which he has put upon the Province of Manitoba, he and his Premier, is tremendous.

Madam Speaker, the terminology in which this Budget should be classified is, I think best put, would be to call it an Ostrich Budget. I think it's the "Ostrich Budget" of the New Democratic Party because the Minister of Finance and those people who, with any respect or responsibility for those hard-working, whether they be

labour people, whether they be professionals, whether they be house people, whatever walk of life, Madam Speaker, should stop and think of the implications which they are imposing on the people of this province.

It's the "Ostrich Budget" because they have their heads hidden in the sand, Madam Speaker. They have their heads hidden in the sand and there will be a day in which they will have to come to the reality of what they have cast upon the people of Manitoba by their ill-conceived policies and their lack of responsibility in dealing with the affairs of the province in a forthright, honest and responsible manner.

Madam Speaker, the new Minister of Finance did a job, a very politically acceptable job for their party. The reviews, they were somewhat raging. I noticed the Member for Kildonan the other day tearing the devil out of one of the local newspapers because of some feeling that one of them had been wrongly mistreated, or reported on incorrectly, and that they wanted to have some control over the press. That's really what I got out of it, complete control of the press.

Madam Speaker, I would take the press to task because of some of the headline reporting. You know, when I read the Brandon Sun and I read the Winnipeg Free Press and see that agriculture, you would almost think by the headlines that the farmers' problems were over, that the New Democratic Party, with the Budget of 1986, everything was golden roads and clear skies ahead.

Well, Madam Speaker, I'm going to get into it because I can put on the record here today to prove that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of this province have again misled the people of the Province of Manitoba and it has been carried out, their message in that way has been carried out by the press of this province.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I am sure the honourable member is aware that accusing members of deliberately misleading the House is not parliamentary.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I will withdraw that comment at this particular time and consider later on in my speech whether or not I should use it or not. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for bringing that to my attention.

Madam Speaker, let us talk about — the finance critic from our side of the House, the leader of our party, the speech which he gave pointed out that there was a brick wall before the government and before the taxpayers of this province. Well, I have to agree and agree wholeheartedly. What I am going to try and do is point out what the brick wall is, and I hope that members opposite are serious, that government members sit and take it seriously as to what some of the numbers will increase to and what the brick wall is. If they have opposition to it, rather than getting up and tearing us apart on our philosophy, tell me that I am wrong.

I challenge the Member for Lac du Bonnet who has been responsible as a municipal reeve, Madam Speaker, who didn't have the privileges as the New Democratic Party have in not being restricted to deficits. He ran a municipality where he couldn't allow a deficit to occur.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we have the former mayor of the City of Steinbach who sits on our side of the House,

who was restricted by legislation from incurring a deficit on their taxpayers, Madam Speaker. I think that the Member for Lac du Bonnet should pay attention to this particular part of it because I would hope he is as responsible in the role which he is carrying out now as he was in that role dealing with those same taxpayers. He is nodding in the affirmative and I am pleased to see that he is taking his job responsibly.

The brick wall, Madam Speaker, what is the brick wall? I'm not going to try and be too boring with numbers, but I think there are some numbers that have to be put on the record to substantiate what I'm talking about.

When this government took office, we had actually, during the Lyon administration, to a major degree, cleaned up the spending policies of the former NDP administration. Yes, we had some difficulties with drought and some problems which increased our spending in the latter part of our term. When we left office, I think there was an accumulated deficit, collectively through our administration, of some \$250 million, not anything that is terribly alarming in today's terms because, as my colleague from Lakeside just indicated, that compares to \$2.5 billion in the last four years, Madam Speaker. Again, the brick wall.

Our leader again pointed out that the carrying charges, that's just the interest on the debt that they have incurred, Madam Speaker, are \$380 million. Our deficit in the fourth year was \$250 million and that was the roads and all the things that we had spent money on, not the interest on it. The interest, at 10 percent, would have been \$25 million. Their carrying charges this current year, at \$380 million, Madam Speaker, are intolerable.

Let's just add the numbers up, and anybody that has borrowed money or invested money has to look at this number. The number is 72. You take the interest rate, you divide it into 72, and if you either don't take the interest off it or you don't pay any interest off it, that's the period of time in which that amount of money will double at 10 percent.

The New Democratic Party's record, and the former Minister of Finance, gave us a \$2.5 billion capital deficit and current expenditure deficit on the people of Manitoba. They have structured, Madam Speaker, every year in their term of office, a \$500 million deficit, operating deficit.

Let's start putting those numbers together, Madam Speaker. This is just the NDP-incurred expenses on the taxpayers of Manitoba. There was \$2.5 billion in capital. Leave that money for seven years at 10 percent, Madam Speaker, and it comes to the total of \$5 billion. A \$500 million structured deficit, over the next seven years, comes to another \$3.5 billion.

Madam Speaker, in seven years from now, if they don't come to grips with the situation — they won't be here seven years but it's pretty hard to reverse the kind of multiple roll that we are on on an economic downturn — add those figures together and it's \$8.5 billion or \$9 billion that the Province of Manitoba owes. That's capital; that's not adding the interest that is rolling on.

Nine billion dollars, Madam Speaker. Let's just put that in relative terms. At 10 percent interest, which is a fair estimate of what the interest rate might be, the carrying charges, Madam Speaker, are \$900 million a

year. That's the interest, Madam Speaker, on an annual basis. That is intolerable. That's the brick wall, Madam Speaker. Let's relate that so that the average citizen, so the students of this province can understand what it means when they go to the grocery store. As I understand it, one point on the sales tax raises \$75 million.

**A MEMBER:** Right, \$75 million.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Okay, \$75 million. We now have a 6 percent sales tax, so that's \$500 million that would be raised — that's what would be raised through the sales tax, okay — you put \$800 million to \$900 million more, you'll have an effective sales tax on the people of Manitoba to pay the carrying charges on the interest alone of 10 to 12 percent.

When you go to buy items, whether it be an automobile, a bicycle or anything you need that is taxable in this province, you will have to pay a 12 percent sales tax, Madam Speaker, to carry the debt that was given to us by the former Minister of Finance and the Premier of this province under a New Democratic Government, Madam Speaker.

Those, Madam Speaker, are the numbers and those are the brick walls that we'll be running into.

**MR. J. MALOWAY:** What are we going to do with Hydro? The Hydro isn't even included in that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, the Member for Elmwood says, "What are we going to do with Hydro?" That isn't even including Hydro, Madam Speaker. That's another total story.

**A MEMBER:** A horror story.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Madam Speaker, a horror story.

But this is a typical socialist program. What are you going to sell? Madam Speaker, what generates the revenue from the people of the province? It's people who work, Madam Speaker, people who roll their sleeves up, take their lunch baskets and go to work, and when they look at their pay cheque, I guess there's a great chunk taken out of it called "taxation." That taxation will go up a lot faster than the other side of the cheque because the people who are creating the employment don't have the ability to pay them, Madam Speaker, that's the brick wall, the taxation will go up. It's not that the people employing them won't want to pay it, it's that they won't be able to, Madam Speaker.

So the brick wall is the multiplication of all the capital debt, all the accumulated interest, Madam Speaker, that relates to probably 10 to 12 percent on the sales tax, without giving our children and our adult people and our senior citizens one bit more health care, one better bit of day care, one better bit of home services; that will all be on top of what I'm just talking about.

That's the brick wall, Madam Speaker, it's there and it is very real. It is very real and they will run into it, not necessarily these New Democrats, because I don't expect many of them to hang around very long particularly if they carry out the responsibilities in which they were sent here to do and, that's in trust, handle the taxpayers' money in the best interests of those taxpayers.

I challenge the Member for Lac du Bonnet to stand here and disagree with my debate. I challenge the Minister of Highways who says, "What are you going to cut?" I'll tell him, Madam Speaker, that there are some cuts, but not cuts that are going to, in any significant way, take away the brick wall because the brick wall is coming. It doesn't matter who is in, as far as the New Democrats are concerned, on the roll that we're on, the brick wall is very real and coming forward.

Madam Speaker, what am I going to cut? Madam Speaker, that brings me to another part of my comments and that's the irresponsible leadership of this government. Madam Speaker, I'll get to the cuts. I don't mind saying how I would plan to deal with it. I don't mind telling that side of it because I do have some options. I do believe that there are some ways to do it.

But before I do that, the other day when the First Minister of this province was speaking, he chastised the President of the United States. He said that his government, and I quote from the Hansard, "The New Democratic Party administration has of the very real human concerns that exist within the province of Manitoba."

The next very day we had an emergency debate on the abused children in this province while his Minister of Community Services, Madam Speaker, won't take a hold of the issues. That's humanitarian. That's caring about the people. That's a real people Budget, the day after he spoke, Madam Speaker. How does he expect the respect of the people of this House when he gets up and says such a thing and his Minister can't handle her responsibilities?

Madam Speaker, he made reference to me in being an apologist for the Federal Government when we've had a Conservative Government. I've got reason to be an apologist for our Federal Government, because I'll tell you our Federal Government dealing with our people, have been pretty fair.

I am not prepared to get into the debate of equalization at this particular point because the current NDP Government have entrenched in the minds of Manitobans that the Federal Government are terribly unfair — and I think it's a tough argument to win on right now — I think the federal politicians have to come in real terms and show them what real cuts mean if they continue and perpetuate that argument. They'll show them in some quiet way what it means.

But I'll tell you, Madam Speaker, what I think the Federal Government — and I can relate more directly to the agriculture community and I will — record payments out of grain stabilization under the Progressive Conservative Government. This Minister of Agriculture wants to make some changes, wants to change it. He doesn't want it based on the western region, he wants us to go on our own. Under his proposal, Madam Speaker, Manitoba would have probably not got one nickel in the last year or two, or a very small amount of money, under grain stabilization. It triggered because Alberta and Saskatchewan didn't have as good a crop as Manitoba, but yet this Minister of Agriculture wants to change it.

Madam Speaker, the fuel tax reduction, it came about because the Progressive Conservative Party in Ottawa wanted to do something. They froze the freight rates. Yes, they froze the freight rates. The Liberal Government

did, Madam Speaker, raised the freight rates and the domestic wheat price is being worked on by the Federal Government.

Yes, I don't mind being an apologist, but who is he an apologist for, Madam Speaker — and I want to put this on the record because I think it's extremely important. The first term of office that the New Democrats were in office I want to say that the Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Manitoba, under the New Democratic Party — and for some of the new members I think this is extremely important and I'm going to quote from Hansard because I'll just show you how close the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Government were with the New Democrats in Manitoba and the Minister of Agriculture — and I am quoting from Hansard, Tuesday, 13th of April, 1982, and this is the Minister of Agriculture for the New Democratic Party. This is dealing with the Estimates of Agriculture.

"The very system that the Leader of the Opposition," — meaning the former Member for Charleswood who was our Leader at that time — "speaks about that he is so opposed to, Mr. Chairman, we will eventually come about and what happened in the Soviet Union, we are slowly coming about to that." Okay, we're coming to the Soviet Union system, subscribed to or alluded to by the Minister of Agriculture.

"Mr. Chairman, we are moving a full circle. Their hang-up is that the people of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, we have great freedom of those who have a lot of money in their pockets, those who have all the freedom in the world to buy up all the land that they want. That's the kind of freedom that the Leader of the Opposition speaks of. I'd like to hear what kind of freedom he really speaks about on this issue, Mr. Chairman." Well, he alludes to the Soviet system of which we're moving to; he's opposed to the free enterprise in the system of which is currently in place, and it's documented here.

But let's go one step further, Madam Speaker. — (Interjection) — No, but I'll substantiate, Madam Speaker, who is an apologist for who? I say I am proud to be an apologist for some of the actions the Federal Government have taken and I've stated some of them. But here, Madam Speaker, is again the former Member for Charleswood, former Premier of Manitoba, who is currently doing some writing and there's the Western Report article and here's an interesting paragraph that I think all Manitobans, and particularly the members opposite should pay attention to, because they are apologists remember. They are apologists for the former Trudeau Government and are closely tied because they believe in the same thing. I'll quote another paragraph, Madam Speaker.

"Ironically, in the February, 1986 edition of the Soviet News and Views, a propaganda piece turned out by the U.S.S.R. Embassy in Ottawa, there was a comment on a recent visit to the Soviet Union by Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his sons." Now that's interesting. The writer, Mr. Sergio Austromoff (phonetic), quoted our former Prime Minister as saying, and I quote, "I wanted my children, while they are still young and impressionable, to see this country about which so many prejudices are held in the west and which is the object of so much propaganda and counter-propaganda," and quotations on Siberia and Canada. "I think that we can learn from each other's experiences in

environmental protection" — U.S.S.R. are great environmental protectionists but I'll continue the quote — "and probably we have to learn from each other in terms of governmental decisions."

The former Prime Minister of Canada, who this government were so in tune with, again evidenced by their support for the change in our Constitution to make Manitoba bilingual. What kind of support did they give him, the former Prime Minister Trudeau? They were right together, Madam Speaker, to divide this province, to totally take over in a way in which they won't succeed, but that is the connection.

So he would sooner be an apologist for Pierre Elliott Trudeau who gets his impressions and wants his sons to be impressed by the Communist system. That, Madam Speaker, he should be proud of, because I'm proud of the one that I am. He can take his road, and I'll take mine.

Madam Speaker, could you indicate the time that I have left?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member asking for the time he has remaining?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** How much?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** You've got a fair amount. You have 20 minutes.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I have some important things I want to put on the record.

Madam Speaker, I said earlier in my comments that I would make some positive suggestions as to how this could be brought under control, not stop the coming of the brick wall, because the brick wall is coming. It doesn't matter what they do at this point. We are going to see the impact. The taxpayers will see the total devastation of their tax money, the majority of it, going to the repayment of a debt, not the repayment, just the servicing of a debt.

In the United States — and he took off on the President of the United States about tremendous deficits, again spreading the feathers of falsehood, Madam Speaker, to the people of this province. Yes, that's what he was doing, spreading the feathers of falsehood which you can never gather up again, and we all know that. But what are they doing in the United States?

I make reference to the RoyFarm Business Review, Madam Speaker. It's a business letter sent out to the farm community by the Royal Bank. Well yes, I should make comments when I'm talking about the banks, because it seems that this government have been able to capture the political best out of all that. You can stand up and you can kick the banks. You can kick the corporations; you can kick the Federal Government. You can come to the Legislature and you can pick out some nice little selective quotes that support their philosophy, and they love to use it.

They walk in and they say, the Royal Bank, good report; Bank of Montreal, good report; Federal Government, good report. But boy, I'm going to give them a good kick, because they aren't doing, Madam Speaker, what we want. You know, Madam Speaker, you can only do it so often, because some day that

kick is going to come back. Yes, Madam Speaker, that kick's going to come back. That's a boomerang. An ostrich Budget, but you're going to get the boomerang out of it, I'll tell you.

But here is what the United States is doing, and I make reference to the Graham Rudman Hollings formula. Do you know what they're doing? I'll just read two or three lines out of it. They are putting in place, Madam Speaker, in the United States, legislation that, by 1991, will bring the deficit to nothing. Yes, Madam Speaker, this isn't the feathers of falsehood that I am spreading. This is accurate information.

I'll read a few lines. This is U.S. legislation entitled: "The Balanced Budget, An Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985," not a bad name, Madam Speaker. It sets maximum allowable federal deficits in the United States for the fiscal year starting October 1 to September 30, 1987 through to 1991. The legislation is better known by this formula. "Its basic intent" — this is the basic intent — "is to provide for a balanced federal budget by 1991."

Now I call that responsibility on behalf of the taxpayers. I don't call it cheap political shots. I don't call it some hiding from the public. Yes, they talk about cuts.

**A MEMBER:** What are you quoting from?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm quoting from the Roy Farm Business Review, which is a monthly business letter that goes to the farm community — (Interjection) — well they use the Royal Bank statements to support their Budget, and then they use the Royal Bank to go out and slap them around politically, because that's a good thing to do, you see. They try to do it on both sides. Some day, you'll get caught up on that, Madam Speaker, and they're going to get caught up on it.

Madam Speaker, for some reason, there must be some good political marks in them wanting to know what I have for proposed cuts. The first thing I suggest, Madam Speaker, is that the Member for St. Norbert produced a recommendation that would make you people or any government report on the fiscal affairs of the Province of Manitoba in a responsible time period. Well I think I would be prepared, Madam Speaker, to look at this kind of legislation to attach to that, that there be some legislated, organized programs that say we're going to deal with the deficit. Let the people annually see in a legislative way some control, that there is some meaningful effort.

I would be interested to comment to the members opposite if they, in fact, would start to want to put on the line . . . (inaudible) . . . in a legislative way to stop the brick wall from totally smashing us to the ground. That, Madam Speaker, I think is an important point that I would like them to put. Are they interested?

The Union of Municipalities, all the municipalities in this province have to live up to that kind of legislation. They can't run deficits. I'm not saying you do it immediately; I'm not saying you go in and slash and you go in and hack, because we do have — we have had, Madam Speaker, — a fairly good system of health, education. It's deteriorating under this government because they're cheating on it for political purposes, but I'm recommending that there has to be some

legislative consideration given in a responsible way to start to deal with the deficit.

I believe that a legislative approach has to come about. Let them put on the line, in the debate on this kind of thing, why it is wrong; and I again say to the First Minister of this province, he better start smartening up and telling the people of the Province of Manitoba the truth about what's happening elsewhere because he's not going to get away with it very much longer.

Madam Speaker, I think it's also important to put on the record a little bit of what's happened in the agricultural community. The Minister starts talking about cuts.

I can give him a couple of small examples. The first one I guess probably would be to remove the former Minister of Municipal Affairs who's going to be running around the province campaigning for them the next four years.

Madam Speaker, I had a constituent write and suggest, rather than the taxpayers paying for the investigation into the former Minister of Mines and Energy, if he wants to clear his name, that he should pay the \$750 a day, not the taxpayers. That's one of the recommendations that my constituents put forward.

The Farm Lands Ownership Act — who needs The Farm Lands Ownership Act in Manitoba? There's a savings there; and the Jobs Fund, Madam Speaker. If all the Jobs Fund money were to be transferred over to Highways, we may start to build some infrastructure.

There may be some savings in that regard, but I am not in a position here today to try and point it out. I'll have another opportunity to point where there'll be some cuts, but I can point some cuts. I can point them and I'll point them out in a responsible way.

I want to spend a few minutes on the agricultural part of the Budget because I don't have much to talk about dealing with the other areas in which I am critic because Municipal Affairs have had their Budget cut and I'll get into that in Estimates.

Northern Affairs, it's interesting to note — Native Affairs. We now have a Minister of Native Affairs. He didn't even know that there was a report done on the Native communities in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, which I think is a total shame for those people he represents. The report — I'm sorry I haven't received it to this point, but I think it's going to disclose some tremendously glaring shortfalls that the New Democratic Party have let happen within the Native community.

Again they're playing politics. They appoint a Native member, Madam Speaker, and think that will solve all the problems, because again it's cosmetic, as the Minister of Community Services is cosmetic in trying to deal with the difficulties the child abuse portfolio is having. It's all cosmetic, Madam Speaker.

The agricultural part is something that is again very glaring, and I said I would point out why I have some challenges for the headlines in the media. The Minister of Agriculture the other day talked about what were our promises. I'll tell you, Madam Speaker. The Member for Lac du Bonnet was a member of the Union of Municipalities that have been pleading, year after year, to have education taxes taken off the farmland. Where was his voice when it came to the development of this Budget, Madam Speaker? Where was his voice when he joined the New Democratic Party and became a member in which he would have influence, in which he would have major influence?

The Member for La Verendrye, I'm sure was a member of the same body, as an organization. He had influence and he spoke out on behalf of the farm community. We had a policy that said we would take half the provincial portion of the education taxes off the farmers. The Minister of Agriculture says, oh what would that mean?

That means \$11 million immediately, directly to every farmer, not a loan as they're proposing. I challenge this government to say how much real money they're putting into the farm community.

Madam Speaker, in fact, let's look at the record because again we've heard the continued feathers of falsehood being spread throughout the province. We hear daily that they're putting in money to the agricultural community that exceeds anything that was ever done before. That's not true. I have an Estimate book of 1981, of which that was the year the people of Manitoba decided they didn't want us in office. Here is the line that says what the Agriculture Department had - and you're interested, aren't you?

Here's what it was the last year I was Minister of Agriculture - \$75,592,400.00. Do you know what the Agriculture budget is this year, the one that's supposed to be so great, so much money, 21 percent increase? Here's what it is, Madam Speaker, \$70,272,200.00. That's not an increase; that's a decrease from when we were in office. I want the Minister of Agriculture of this province, the First Minister and the Minister of Finance to apologize publicly. I want the record set straight.

I do have to point out why it was high that year, because we had a massive drought, and it's like this year. The farmers have a massive problem with high operating costs, shortage of cash and they need help. We put \$40-some million. It didn't all get spent, but it was in the Budget, and they didn't have to sign a loan to pay it back on an emergency basis. They didn't have to go through a million hoops of red tape and wait until harvest to get it. It was available immediately on a per acre payment to those producers, Madam Speaker, and it was a record amount of money for the farmers of this province and it hasn't been succeeded by the New Democrats.

They've been perpetuating the feathers of falsehood for the last how many years. Yes, Madam Speaker, and it's the way in which they won the government away again from us this last time. The Minister of Community of Services again stands up and says the Fort Garry Resource Centre is short changed because of that terrible Federal Government again.

Well it's short changed because the Premier of this province isn't living up to his election commitment, as he did on the gasoline thing. He defaulted on it, Madam Speaker; he's defaulted on this; he's defaulted on the abused children; he's defaulted on his mandate to carry on and govern this province in a way which should be responsible to the people.

Madam Speaker, I believe that they should look at the records of the Province of Manitoba. I've given them the information which they can go to. I challenge them on the money they've put into the Agriculture Department. How much of it and when will it flow, that doesn't have to be repaid?

They talk about stabilization. I'll tell you about stabilization because here's what the stabilization report

said. Here's what it says the money does. It's repayable, Madam Speaker. "Advance from the Province of Manitoba," and this is in the report, "The Government of the Province of Manitoba authorized repayable advances to the commission of up to \$20 million." That was last year, but here's the important part, ". . . authorized repayable advances."

The only time there's been any money given is when they took the decision to write off the hog advance, when they joined the tripartite organization. That's where they give them an interest free loan, and it has some support for them; but in any massive way, Madam Speaker, it isn't there.

Our record was \$41 million in emergency, straight payout funds to the farm community and you think that you've done something. Madam Speaker, it's despicable that these people have perpetuated the feathers of falsehood throughout Manitoba in the way in which they have and getting support from the press for it.

I believe that the issue of free trade . . . how much time do I have left?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has six minutes remaining.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to again just talk briefly on some of the actions that I think should have been carried out in this Budget and, again, I talked about the education tax, the one that would have had real meaningful effect. I don't think — and I'll say it again and I'll say it again — that any of the money that was put in the Department of Agriculture Budget will flow this spring.

To be quite honest, I wanted to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question in the last day or two but didn't get an opportunity to do so. How much of the seeding was complete in Manitoba? I would estimate that 75 percent. I've got colleagues around me who are well-acquainted with the farm community. I would guess that the farm community had the majority of 75 percent of their crops completed. The Budget was just introduced last week, and now they're giving them emergency assistance. Well, Madam Speaker, if you haven't got your crop in by the 1st of June, then you're pretty near too late. Madam Speaker, if you haven't got it in by the 1st of June, you're too late.

I'll tell you, to get the money, here's what you have to do, because I will bet you, if you go to the Crop Insurance Corporation, they'd say it's a poor farming practice. In fact, there is a cut-off deadline for most crops in the early part of June. I'll go to this book called "The Ostrich Budget," because that's what it is — the "Ostrich Budget." You put your head in the sand, you get a good headline that says you're helping the farmers, and you run off down the road to your little meeting out at Swan River and you lead the parade on agriculture support.

I'll tell you what. There will be some talk on agriculture out there, Madam Speaker, and I'll tell you, it won't be Manitoba that is presenting any positive programs for help. It is the people that are committed to their people that have put the money on the line in Saskatchewan and Alberta. Those are the people, Madam Speaker, that have put some meaningful money and support into place.

But here's what they say. If you are going to get this \$6.5 million in special farm assistance, because these things all have to be tied together, if I go to the corporation or to whoever they're going to have administer this and say I need some of that support, well, they look at this and they say, "Program monies will be directed in particular to individuals with demonstrated production and financial management capabilities." Well, if you haven't got your crop in by the 1st of June, you have failed on that one because, I'll tell you, you haven't been doing your work on time, your crop is going to be too late, and you're not in good shape, Madam Speaker.

I mean, it's all this talk, it's this perception that they are the greatest thing. Madam Speaker, I plead with them to bring in some form of deficit-control legislation. Let's put some discipline on behalf of the taxpayers. Let's debate some discipline in this Legislature as to how we're all going to make a contribution to dealing with the deficit.

The expenditure side, Madam Speaker, should increase, or the income side should increase. But how is it going to increase in any significant way with a payroll tax riding on the backs of those people employing people, with all the other taxations and increases that have to be paid, Madam Speaker? It's pretty hard to lift that load, Madam Speaker, because the ball that's rolling is too big. A million people can't handle it in the way in which they've administered it to them, Madam Speaker.

I would look forward to the debate, the comments. I think that there is some room for following some examples that have taken place. I say, I've talked to many municipal people who say why can't we run up deficits; on the other hand, they say thank God we can't because it's a protection to our taxpayers. But why can the provincial administrators? Why can provincial politicians? What makes it any better for them to be able to burden the taxpayers with massive debt, yet we can't? Why is there a double standard, Madam Speaker? Why is there a double standard?

I think it's the responsible way to go; I don't think it's probably the most popular. I think probably one would lose some votes if they advanced with it, but that would certainly bother the New Democrats. Madam Speaker, we have no trouble with principle on our side. We feel very strongly that right is right and should be subscribed to and carried out. We certainly have paid the price.

They've pointed out time after time the numbers of elections they have won in the last 16 years. It's certainly a proud record to have as far as elections. Are you so darned proud of the deficit that you've hung on the people of Manitoba and the 12 points of sales tax that it will take to carry that debt within seven years? Are you proud of that? Are you really proud of that?

What are you going to do with the payroll tax? Well, the Member for Brandon East, I'll tell you, wouldn't know much about payroll because the only side of it he's ever been on is collecting it. He has never earned it for anybody else, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I have appreciated the opportunity to participate in debate, and would hope that I would get some objective recommendations.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Could I ask the will of the House with regard to turning the air conditioner on? There

have been requests to turn it on. Can we tolerate the noise? Okay, we'll turn the air conditioner on.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, now I'm going to have to not only compete with my colleagues and the regular hubbub in the House, but I've got a couple of monstrous antique air conditioners to compete with as well. I'll do my best. Maybe clip on your earphones and perhaps we can get down to some serious discussions here, Madam Speaker.

I always relish the opportunity to follow the Member for Arthur, Madam Speaker. The Member for Arthur always gives us a speech with great embellishment that's right from the gut. I am going to try and offer somewhat of an alternative today to many of the speeches that we've heard so far. I am going to take a different approach in a way, I believe, to the Budget Speech that we've had so far, and I hope I can offer somewhat of an alternative. I'll step a bit out of character, a bit. I might slip back from time to time, but I want to show perhaps what I feel the Opposition should maybe be saying about this Budget, about the economy of Manitoba.

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

I am going to offer a couple of alternatives myself, something I would dearly love to hear from the Opposition. I am going to try to do some analysis on a financial basis and a fiscal basis of the province's economy and of our Budget, as well as look at some of the commitments and some of the statements that members opposite have said. I believe some of those statements both rang true before and have been somewhat countered by some of their presentations we've heard today.

I would like to begin, Madam Speaker, with going to a quote from the Member for River Heights back in the Throne Speech. I think it was quite a commendable first attempt on her behalf of how she saw her role as a member of the Legislature, and I would like to read from that quote.

She says, "The Liberal contribution to this Session of the Legislature will be a positive one. I will keep my criticisms constructive, and alternatives and suggestions will be offered, not kept secret to be unveiled only at election time. An Opposition that merely opposes does not make a full contribution to the legislative process. The Liberal approach will indeed be to criticize but, more importantly, to contribute. When we have good ideas, we will tell you," she said. She then goes on to say that if their good ideas are accepted by the government, that's all the better for her. It reflects better on her and her political party.

Well I think that was a most — I want to say innovative, but it's not really innovative because it is the approach that we should all be taking in this House on presentation in serious debate in the Legislature. I regret that when I reviewed her Budget speech, she did not offer any ideas, she did not offer any alternatives. She merely opposed, basically backing down on all the comments she had made earlier.

She starts off her presentation calling the Budget with words like "betrayal," and talks of her trust and betrayal of trust. I don't think that is terribly beneficial

or a contributory approach to the legislative process. She talks about if we were really courageous — and maybe this is one of her ideas — that we would have reduced the deficit by some \$250 million. She doesn't give any idea how that would be reduced other than that it would have all been done by expenditure cuts. Controlled expenditures or controlled cuts, she said, or cut costs. "You could have reduced the deficit by some \$250 million."

I am, quite honestly, somewhat disappointed in her presentation; I had hoped for far more. I expect to give her time and I expect, within time, the next four years or so, we'll have a far more valuable contribution to the House.

In my first presentation in this Session, I had requested and urged my desire to have some reform in the House, to have greater participation of individual members, greater liberalness upon the members — small "I" — of their participation in debate, for them to win their role in the Legislature, to reach out, to make proposals, to take firm positions, or to at least propose positions, to see how valid they may be, to offer alternatives.

I noted with some interest during the election campaign, in response to offering alternatives, there was an interview, a couple of interviews done with the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Tuxedo. I thought, I hoped that he would take his words he made during the election campaign in commitments to people and understanding his own personal character, and apply that in this House, as he said he intended to during the election campaign.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** What did he say?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** He said, and I quote, "He feels more comfortable putting forward policy and initiating action. Then it would be up to him to defend and explain his actions rather than to criticize others." A very commendable statement by the Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign.

He also said what he likes least about the House, and I quote. He says, "I least like the gamesmanship and negative aspects, which are to be critical and negative about the other side."

In the same edition of the Sun, they asked him questions, some of the silly questions that you get during an election campaign, about what's the things that he can't stand. What is the one thing he can't stand? He said, "Complainers who don't offer any solutions or people who are apathetic about the democratic process. I have no difficulty with people who say they don't agree with me but I have trouble if they say they don't care who represents them."

Going back to the start of that and talking about complainers. I would suggest that most of the presentations that we have had from the Opposition are exactly that, and two hours of his speech the other day was exactly that, nothing but complaining, primarily on the deficit.

He said what his most irrational fear was — he said he didn't have a most irrational fear. I would suggest that the most irrational fear could perhaps be doing what he can't stand, which is to constantly complain.

Madam Speaker, in the Legislature, in the legislative process of politicians, if we want the public to pay

serious attention to us, we must be truthful in our statements both outside, during campaigns, and also within the Legislature itself. We must want to build public trust and the only way we are going to build public trust and respect for the institution is a more open form of debate, I would suggest, with the proposals of greater alternatives.

This is a forum for ideas and proposals, Madam Speaker. It runs, historically and for some time it's been primarily run on an adversarial basis rather than a contributive.

It seems that members of the Opposition very frequently know the cost of everything but the value of nothing.

Policy in itself is very very much an evolutionary process. A political party's stripes fade from time to time. In some instances, I would say they even change colours.

We look at history in the Province of Manitoba, and I believe it was a Conservative administration that started the first public radio station, which I believe is now CKY, way back — I'm not sure what year it was but it was back in the early days of radio communications. — (Interjection) — Perhaps the Member for Brandon East has that right. The present gentlemen are neo-Conservatives versus classic-Conservatives.

When one looks also at other areas where they were involved, there was the development of the Telephone System. I may be talking 50 years ago. And also Winnipeg Hydro, or Manitoba Hydro in particular; the creation of Manitoba Hydro was done with the support and active participation of the Conservative Party.

In Ottawa, the Conservative Party railed against Petro Canada and yet they just acquired Gulf Canada, a multi-billion dollar purchase, to make a Crown corporation even larger, recognizing the role of a Crown corporation. Unfortunately, that Crown corporation, I don't think is fulfilling its duties very well because it sure as heck has not performed a function of a window on the industry, as the Liberals used to tell us it was to be.

The British Labour Party — I was very shocked just a week or so ago when I read a report of a recent meeting that the British Labour Party had, and they were making commitments leading up of how their party policy is going to change, and some dramatic changes in policy. They were saying that they are not going to renationalize everything that the Conservatives have denationalized. That's a big step. Or privatized, perhaps, for the Member for Morris' edification. That's a big step for them.

They even went further on another issue, as well, to try and clean up their image of being somewhat irresponsible. That is, that they are willing to look and to try and develop some kind of a formula for which one projects government spending and the level of deficit that an economy can sustain. It is something we haven't looked upon here very much, I don't think. A couple of years ago we hired Clarence Barber, Professor Barber, to do some reviews for us, I know. It is something I have never ever heard mentioned of the members opposite, of what is a sustainable level of a deficit is.

It is something that I think we, certainly, as a government and as Members of the Legislature should look very closely to see how meaningful the level of

the deficit is according to the province's capacity to carry it.

For the New Democrats, and changing of party stripes, I can remember back in 1972, one of the most successful federal campaigns the party ever waged was one against corporate welfare bums and the amounts of money that is being dished out into industry. Yet we have seen New Democratic Party administrations — not this one but others as well — being very generous with funds to the corporate community, like David Lewis would have certainly called corporate welfare.

We were very much into, and I regret, along with the Minister of Labour, very much regret that we are into a process now where it seems that governments have to contribute large grants to be able to attract industries, in competition with other provinces. I don't know, quite frankly, how Manitoba and the other small provinces of Canada are going to be able to compete on a straight financial basis with the largesse of the Government of Quebec and the Government of Ontario, in particular, and perhaps a future government in British Columbia or in Alberta, with Alberta's huge Heritage Fund they have to draw on.

One other item I have not yet heard from the members opposite, and it is one of the focal points of this Budget and I haven't heard them comment on it hardly at all, if at all, and this is the issue of tax reform and the need for tax reform and the role that the taxation system that we have in the country right now has contributed to the successive increases and the successive sustained levels of deficits both federally and provincially right across the whole country.

Certainly we cannot look at the financial status of provinces, nor the country as a whole, without looking at what is happening with the revenue collection systems, as well as looking at the expenditure systems.

As expressed earlier, and a lot of members know quite well, I don't like deficits; don't like them at all. I am very much concerned about having a deficit the size that we have here in Manitoba. I have tried to do some research on the relationship of the deficit to the province's capacity to pay and I note that, as a percentage of our gross domestic product, the public debt costs themselves have increased from about .75 percent up now to almost 1.7 percent, slightly over double.

Quite honestly, I don't know what that means. I don't know if it means that we are getting towards the limit. I don't know if 2 percent is the cut-off point, or if 3 percent, or 1.5 percent is.

We look at the percentage of the deficit overall for the gross domestic product. Since 1977-78 — which was the .76 figure I referred to earlier was going back to 1977-78 as well, so I can get a fair time frame to run through different administrations as well. The deficit, as a percentage of gross domestic product in 1977-78 was 1.48 percent; today it is up to 2.5 percent; last year it was around 3 percent. I'm not sure, once again, how critical these figures are but I'm sure that we should be able to pull something out of some macro-economic models to look at the capacity of a province or of any government, to be able to sustain a debt load.

The one thing I do know happens with increasing debt loads is that the province itself comes under a fair squeeze. We've had deficits in the past four or five years now, all in the vicinity of \$400 million, over the

\$400 million mark. They have not increased substantially since we came into office and I think the Minister of Finance, present and previous as well, deserves some credit for being about the only province in the country to have not had significant increases in deficit levels over the past five years.

But something I note as well in the unwillingness of this government to allow that Budget deficit to increase further is that it puts additional constraint on the expenditure programs, many of which are near and dear to us, in the areas of health, of education, of social services, and those expenditures come under far, far greater scrutiny than they ever have before.

You can speak to people who were your employees when you were in office, from 1978 into '81 and you will be able to confirm the exercise that the province goes through now in scrutinizing the Budget is far stricter and regimented than it was previously. I hate to say, even within the days of acute protracted restraint, that the day of acute protracted restraint was not necessarily that rational a program, and I see that you have once again entered into, in your lecturing commitments of just a couple of months ago, to commit another task force of a sort or bringing people from the private sector and other sectors in to review government and government accounts. Once again, are you going to do this every decade, that as soon as you come into office you're going to bring in people from outside to review the administration of the Province of Manitoba?

I was just reading this morning an article by Eugene Forsey in Saturday Night Magazine and he was making a comment of the current Federal Government and the past Federal Government as well, of dealing with senior civil servants and taking people and putting them into positions, who did not necessarily have much expertise in that department or in that area of policy and switching people from one department to another department. He feels that it is probably a disservice because the government's departments were continually being reorganized and with the turmoil that it caused within a department, it took a tremendous amount of energy from those departments and the responsibilities they have to give was spinning and spent on reorganization and trying to realign departmental roles. I don't know how beneficial that was.

I lived through the one in 1978 and there were some good parts brought out of it, no doubt, but overall it was seen almost as not so much of a task force but a government sponsored — or almost a party really — sponsored effort to get the government, to get the civil servants, to get at expenditures.

I can remember Mr. Lyon when he came into office, he thought he was going to be able to dip his hand into the collective government expenditures and pull out hundreds of millions of dollars. I find it somewhat distressing that today we have the Member for Morris, in this day and age, after the restrictions that have been put on government departments in the past 5, 6, or actually 10 years now, almost 10 years — that he is going to dip his hand in and he said in reply to my question yesterday and I quote, "Madam Speaker, we honestly believe and our party honestly believes that there are several tens approaching hundreds of millions of dollars within the provincial Budget that can be rooted out and reprioritized easily."

**A MEMBER:** Hundreds?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Hundreds of millions of dollars that they're going to reach in and grab and pull out and repriorize or redistribute in the government.

**A MEMBER:** Those are cutbacks today.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** In their election commitment on their paper dealing with their social programs, where they were going to promise additional \$130 million worth of expenditures of new money, and at the same time repriorizing \$50 million — at that time of current expenditures — towards improved services in their total of 6.5 percent increase in services budget that they had proposed in the election campaign, I really cannot quite understand how the members opposite, when they're in an election campaign say there is only \$50 million of money worthwhile repriorizing, and now one of their senior members, their Finance Critic, and one of their leading economic lights over there — a person who I don't want it to go to his head but I think is assuming somewhat the role of the former Member for Turtle Mountain, the Member for Morris — and he now turns around and says that there are hundreds of millions of dollars that they can dip in and take and redistribute for their social programs and for their other initiatives.

It just isn't there, and you should know well enough that it's not there, especially when all during the Estimates process for the past four years members opposite have been calling for more money for agriculture, even though they spent a pittance compared to what we have in a commitment towards agriculture since we've come to office.

In Highways, there's not a drainage ditch in the province they don't want to build — you know tens and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new expenditures that they want to load onto the system that they add every year, and yet they want to reduce the deficit — but after presenting during the election campaign, their commitments to the people of Manitoba, it was interesting to note that in response to some of the comments that they had made — and I'd like to read a couple of them back to you, if I may — they talked about a balanced labour market-relation strategy, about fairness in the labour market and consultations with management, labour and the community, fine.

But how many times have we heard members opposite stand in their place and talk about unfair labour laws in the Province of Manitoba, when for the first time ever in the Province of Manitoba the labour laws — are not seen to be onerous here by any stretch of the imagination by anyone other than the members opposite and a couple of narrow friends perhaps of theirs who will — the Canadian Federation of Independent Business who spent as much time about talking in response to the Budget, as the Leader of the Opposition did in talking about social programs — I have never ever heard the Canadian Federation of Independent Business stand up and make proposals other than cuts for social programming in this country.

They have an interest which is to protect the business, and I don't blame them for doing that. I think they're

doing a good job in presenting their perspective, but I don't think that a responsible government or a responsible Opposition to a government should necessarily take their positions and their policies on taxation, in particular, and turn around and base that for their position to fight against the Budget here. I don't think it's a very responsible action.

They talked about this true consensus in exercise. They were going to consult everybody and their dog, and I would like to know in their consultation process, both on economic policy and also on social policy, when they talked about bringing people, experts from the whole economy in to work with, to develop a consensus — they talked about consensus constantly in their election commitments — I would like to know where they were going to get their consensus to dip in and pull out hundreds of millions of dollars worth of expenditures? There wouldn't be a consensus to do it.

So if that was a basis of your economic reform package, I have grave doubts that you would have gotten off first base, because when you go out to consult with various groups, their consultation process as often as not is a request for additional funding. We just had presentations to the government by the National Farmers Union and also from the KAP, both of them requesting the Government of Manitoba to put more money into agriculture.

If you go to the universities, they'll ask for more money. I personally would support them in that. I think the universities and the education in particular partially because of the restraint that we find ourselves in now because of the levels of the deficit and trying to keep the levels of the deficit down, that we are really short-changing the post-secondary institutions of this province — 3.8 percent funding is not sufficient for the universities in the Province of Manitoba. My understanding is that the University of Manitoba is not even going to get a 3 percent increase in funding for their programming.

I don't believe it is sufficient, and I think that we have to address the facts or else we are going to end up in a similar position that the universities find themselves in British Columbia, where now British Columbia has 30 percent fewer students graduating from high schools, going into universities than any other province right across the country, than the provincial average. Thirty percent fewer end up going to university. I think part of that is because of the continued bashing that the universities have taken in the Province of British Columbia from the Bennett government there.

Our community colleges — we have virtually no increase going to the community colleges. I hope that the community colleges will be able to make up the difference therein by being able to charge for programs that they are giving with industry in cooperative programs, that they'll be a revenue source themselves and they'll be able to use some of that revenue to increase their programming. But if we leave it as it is right now, our community colleges are going to be in a very, very confined position to be able to deal with an ever increasing demand on their resources, both in terms of staff and certainly — certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker — in relation to keeping equipment up-to-date in our universities and community colleges.

I had a student come to me a couple of weeks back who was taking a course and they had to actually delay

part of the course because of breakdowns in equipment that they were supposed to be learning to operate. The equipment was antiquated as it was, probably around 20 or 25 years old. They are now, I understand, in the process of getting new equipment, but it has disrupted the ability of that class to learn that segment of the course, the prescribed course. So now they are going to have to make that up next year in the second year of the program.

In the universities, the University of Manitoba, the Science Faculty there is in dire need of additional funds for purchases of equipment to go along, not just with the new Earth Sciences Building, but even in the chemistry department and the physics department. All of the departments are in need of new equipment that will be able to educate our students so they go out into a modern work force with the most up-to-date education in relation in particular to robotics, to CAD/CAM operations — the computer assisted manufacturing and design applications.

We cannot stand by and watch the funding levels for our universities to continue to grow at such a small rate that they are below the rate of inflation and that the universities are going to have to start eliminating departments like the University of Toronto did in eliminating the Department of Architecture; or they're going to have to start laying off staff and I don't think the teaching staff at the universities is at all in excess at this point. They have still tremendous demand for students wanting to get into the programs. The Universities of Manitoba, Winnipeg and Brandon, none of them I believe have experienced any kind of reduction in enrolment. So the pressure is there for them to give the education, but the pressure is there doubly for them to be able to provide the education with the level of funding that is provided.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in keeping with my commitment when I started my presentation here, I said I was going to step somewhat out of line and make some proposals of things that we should be looking at; of areas that perhaps we could get some additional revenues, and of areas where we should be looking at perhaps some expenditure controls as well. Unfortunately, because of the tightness of the last four years that I have been a part of, I know it is not a heck of a lot to find expenditures.

One area where I think we could cut future commitments — although they won't be cut as much as the Leader of the Opposition thinks they will be cut in his presentation to the Hydro Committee the other day. I do not believe that we should be continuing the hydro rate stabilization. There is \$36 million provided in this year's Budget. Since the stabilization fund started, the province has committed — I think it's \$120 million or \$140 million. I had the figures yesterday and I've lost the exact figure at the moment.

But I don't believe it is responsible when you have the lowest priced energy on the continent that the general taxpayer should be subsidizing so that we keep our rates as low as they are when they are cheaper than everybody else's. I think it's a false economy.

I can understand the government of Prince Edward Island subsidizing hydro rates, for their rates are several times ours. That makes sense to me. But when your rates are as low and as competitive as ours are, then it does not make sense to me that we should be taking

from general revenues which are raised more and more on the working class and the middle class taxpayers who have to pay this \$36 million, have to raise these funds, rather than through a user-based system which is what hydro use is.

A person has some control over how much electricity they are going to use, not a lot of control, but some control. With the rates reflective of the actual cost of the utility as well, you then do not have the lower income or moderate income people subsidizing the highest energy users. Those energy users, the industries and whatnot involved, pay according to their consumption. I think that is far more equitable to have them paying their fair price for the electricity they consume, than it is to put it on the general tax system. If we wiped it out tomorrow, we wouldn't wipe out any future commitments because there are still future commitments that will continue, from my understanding of my questions in the Natural Resources and Public Utilities Committee, that there are commitments for many years down the road on the guarantees that have been offered since the program was introduced by the previous administration, the previous Conservative administration, about seven or eight years ago. So there are still going to be commitments there, but I think that is one area, and I'll offer that area up as a possible area for reductions.

No doubt there are others. No doubt there are some other members opposite — I'll give the Leader of the Opposition credit, he did mention some \$55 million worth of areas that he was willing to see expenditures cut as well.

But I would like for the members opposite to take a good look at Page C8, Appendix C of the Budget Address, and I haven't heard one member opposite yet address the concern in regard to taxation of additional funds of where we can raise additional funds. I've seen them wanting to cut money here and there and reduce taxes by about \$40 million or \$30 million, but I haven't seen anything as far as increasing it.

Perhaps it is indicative of something that the Leader of the Opposition, after presenting his programs for economic renewal during the election campaign, admitted again to the Winnipeg Sun — and I'll quote the Sun's article. He says: "Filmon admitted it's only a goal and won't happen within the next four years." That's in deficit reduction. So in the election itself, the Leader of the Opposition admitted that the deficits under their administration would likely continue in the area of \$400 million. That's what he said in the election.

The Member for Morris said he was going to dip in and take up to hundreds of millions of dollars out of the expenditures to try and balance the budget. I'm sure there wasn't an awful lot of harmony in the Conservative caucus when the election platform was put together — I'm sure there wasn't.

The Member for Arthur talked about head in the sand. I think they had their heads and necks in the sand when they made their election commitments of spending another couple hundred million dollars, taking \$100 million worth of tax expenditures out, reducing the revenues with the elimination of the payroll tax. I see they have now modified that somewhat. Now they only want to remove it for corporations with payrolls over half-a-million dollars. I don't know if duplicity is unparliamentary in this fashion. I don't think it is

because it's on both lists. You can check. My House Leader will check for me, but I think there is a certain amount of that in making election commitments which on the face showed an increase in the deficit of some \$300 million and then talk about reducing the deficit and then, at the same time, as well, the Leader of the Opposition admitting to a reporter that the deficit would not be reduced substantially in the next four years.

I would like to look at tax expenditures. Tax expenditures are basically deductions that we have, either exemptions provided to us on our income tax system or it could even apply, of course, to sales taxes, although I don't think most of them we would want to touch. Corporation taxes; the one I'll mention is a property tax credit, a very popular program. I don't believe that I should be receiving, and I don't think that any member in this House should be receiving the minimum \$325 property tax credit. I think it should be phased out as it is in Ontario to a level of zero, and that would probably save us \$25-30 million if you were to do that which we could then apply to other programs in the university, or social services, or in alternative health care. Also perhaps, we could apply some of that portion towards reducing the deficit.

Look at some other items and how much they cost the Province of Manitoba in lost revenues. In total, they add up to almost \$400 million on the personal income tax side alone. On the corporation income tax, it's in the vicinity of \$50-55 million worth of revenues that are foregone in a tax system through various expenditures. Most of these tax deductions, especially the ones on your income tax form where you can deduct a child, or you can deduct a spouse, or you can deduct especially for registered pension plan contributions are very, very regressive. I get full benefit of those at my tax rate. When I have someone in my constituency who is making the minimum wage or is a working poor, they don't get half the benefit that I do because my tax rate is substantially higher. If you have a 40 percent tax rate and a \$500 exemption, I save \$200, where someone who isn't paying any income tax doesn't save anything. The system is exactly opposite to what it should be.

Registered Retired Savings Plans; I can remember seeing some figures a few years ago on Registered Retirement Savings Plans that something like 90 percent of the tax benefit of Registered Retired Savings Plans went to the top 11 or 12 percent of the taxpayers of the country. That is completely unjust. I would suggest that we should be, as a government, and I'm pleased the Minister of Finance as part of his Budget this year has made a commitment to review the tax system to move towards tax reform so that we can eliminate, I would hope, many of these tax loopholes that we have — not just loopholes — but tax deductions, tax expenditures which are incredibly inequitable and build inequities into the tax system. I think there's not less than \$150 million sitting there in the tax expenditures themselves. That's my belief. It's something in that vicinity. I would love to see us apply that to the deficit to get our deficit down to a level where we would at least be covering our operating expenditures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the remaining seconds I have, I have attempted in my presentation today, and I respect and thank the members opposite, and on this side as well, for general quiet attendance and listening to the presentation. I have tried to offer some alternatives on

how I feel that you should be responding and members should be responding to the Budget to come up with something that's constructive, to offer some alternatives. Don't just talk about deficits. Show us how we can reduce those deficits. Don't make promises that will add to the deficit and then talk about reducing it. — (Interjection) — I've offered and if the Member for Brandon West wants to go through the transcripts of a presentation, I could probably speak at least another hour with the number of notes. I'm only on Page 2 and I've got 10 pages of notes here. I'm going to have to maybe follow the notes a little closer in future.

I have offered or attempted to offer an alternative towards debate in the Legislature and I would dearly wish that members on both sides would take an example from this and follow it and add to a contributive factor in the Legislature. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member's time has expired.

The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some members were kind enough to suggest that I received a somewhat passing grade in a history lesson in my last contribution here on the Throne Speech. I will attempt to do likewise in my contribution on the Budget.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair)

Madam Speaker, we're midway through the Budget. I have yet to hear — the speech that I just heard from the Honourable Member for Inkster, other contributions from members opposite, but nobody has risen to try to respond even to the very few and very basic questions that are, of course, central to this Budget, namely, what is this government doing and planning about the deficit? My colleague, the Member for Morris asked the very first question to the Minister of Finance, what are his 5, 6 year projections? The Member for Arthur suggested what the projections may be if we have unbridled deficits proceeding in the next 5, 6, or 7 years; that it may take a 12 percent sales tax simply to service the debt charges.

Madam Speaker, it reminds me, of course, that we sometimes forget that it's the question of voting sums of money to Her Majesty that really is a very central function of Parliament. In fact, Madam Speaker, it is that function that created Parliament and the system of government that we now have. It was, Madam Speaker, the people or more properly said, I suppose, the barons of the day that started to react to the demands of the Crown for ever-increasing sums of money to carry out whatever wars or other activities or adventures the Crown of those days carried out without going to the people that really was the core, the rationale for those people from whom taxes were going to be collected to start the forum together and to start to talk. The Parliament developed, and so the matter of authorizing the government, authorizing the Crown, authorizing the Ministers to spend money is a key central function of any Parliament.

Madam Speaker, it's perhaps to our detriment that in latter years we have allowed the legislative load of

Parliament which, of course, is the other side of Parliament, the other function of Parliament, to play perhaps a somewhat unbalanced role. We're so busy passing legislation about seat belts, or about helmets, or about how many chickens farmers can grow, or whether or not a red cow can be milked in the morning, or a black one in the afternoon — we intrude daily in the lives of people to such a tremendous extent that we have not paid sufficient heed to what, in my judgment, is perhaps by far the most important function and that is the passing to Her Majesty certain sums of money that we then authorize the Ministers on her behalf to spend.

Madam Speaker, I think that accounts, to some extent, why we have become so loose with the people's money, why we pay so little attention to things like deficits, and why it gets so difficult for those who are concerned about it to carry that message to the electorate when elections are called; and to make the question of fiscal responsibility; and to place the question of fiscal responsibility in that high order of priority that it surely deserves.

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased that I have assisting me one of the better research assistants in this building, Mr. Rick Mandy, who probably does more work and gets paid less than any half a dozen that the NDP have as research assistants. But, among other things, he has supplied me with, if I can find it — well, now, just a minute, we'll look for it. He supplied me with — it's right here — and this ought to be of interest again to all members and particularly to the new members just how serious the situation has evolved.

Madam Speaker, we are being asked in this Budget to approve a sum of \$3,869,606,900.00. Madam Speaker, we can argue with the figures. I believe my leader's figures, the Liberal Leader's figures that she put on the record. We are also told that upwards to 380, 383, 385 millions of dollars will not hire a single nurse, pave a single mile of road, will not do any of the services that we normally collect money from our people, will simply go to service the debt, \$380 million.

Madam Speaker, allow me to draw honourable members' attention to the Estimates of the year 1969, the last year that I was privileged to be a member of the administration. The administration happened to be that of Walter Weir, following the decade of Duff Roblin's administration. Total government expenditures for that year, \$377 million, less than we are now being asked to pay to service the provincial debt.

Madam Speaker, surely I know that not all, but there are some — there is the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. There are some, of course, who may not remember '69, having not yet become residents of this country, Madam Speaker, but surely there are some that do recall 1969. Nineteen-sixty-nine was not the Middle Ages; 1969 is not way back in history some time. In 1969, Madam Speaker, we had concluded doing some pretty important things, which I referred to in my Throne Speech. In 1969, we had already built the \$64 million expenditure on public works known as the Winnipeg Floodway. We had built the Portage Diversion.

I make no uncalled-for comment, Madam Speaker. I hear a little by-play going here. I am simply saying that many people are not aware that in 1969 the Province of Manitoba was not doing that badly. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, 1969 was two years

after we had joined the rest of the nation in celebrating our centennial, and it was a grand occasion. Many of us had occasion to enjoy those ceremonies in our little villages, in our towns, in our communities, and some of us even got lucky and got to Expo in Montreal. Madam Speaker, in 1969 we were preparing for the centennial celebrations of the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I am only saying this to indicate to you that when I go back to 1969, and use for comparative reasons those expenditures of the province at that time, it is simply to say that life wasn't all that bad in '69. I'm not talking about the Middle Ages is what I'm trying to say. We had schools, Madam Speaker. Red River Community College had been built. Most of the other community colleges were in the process of being built. The three universities that we have today were established, Madam Speaker. Medicare — no, I don't like to get into that argument with the Minister of Health — but Medicare had been introduced into the Province of Manitoba, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the total expenditures of that day amounted to \$377 million, less than the money that is now being asked for in this current Budget to pay for our debt. Surely, Madam Speaker, that ought to start to concern somebody. That ought to concern somebody.

The insidiousness of this Budget, Madam Speaker, and I speak with a great deal of sincerity at this particular time, because what this Budget is doing is accustoming Manitobans that they can live with this kind of debt and not feel any hurt. Of course, what they're also doing is making it extremely difficult for the process of democracy to continue as we know it.

Madam Speaker, if the New Democrats can successfully convince Manitobans and the coalition of Liberals and New Democrats federally that fiscal responsibility is not important, then, of course, it will become increasingly more difficult to elect in this country a fiscally responsible group of men and women to manage the affairs of this country or this province. Madam Speaker, it grieves me to say that it is entirely possible that the present national government headed by the Prime Minister may well not get re-elected. Madam Speaker, I say this with double sincerity. There has not been a government, has not been a Prime Minister, has not been a federal Minister of Finance that has tackled the most serious problem this country faces, and has not had more success in trying to resolve or move to resolution of those problems.

Do we not remember what interest rates were doing to this country, to farmers, to small business? Do we not remember that it was our friends, the New Democrats and the Liberals, who said spend, spend and we will help them get rid of the unemployment? Well, Madam Speaker, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mulroney are doing the impossible. They are bringing down the deficit and increasing the employment. It was said that could not be done, Madam Speaker, and they are doing it.

But because of the sniping at the heels, because of the irresponsible yapping at any measures of fiscal responsibility, of fiscal control, it is entirely within the realm of possibility that that government will not be able to succeed itself, as indeed, Madam Speaker, it was my bitter personal experience in the Lyon administration, in the years 1977 and 1981, when we carried on all levels of social services as they were.

Yes, we put a halt to some of the expansionary programs, looked at them again and then, in most instances, proceeded with them, with the personal care homes, with the hospital expansions. Seven Oaks Hospital was built despite that protracted restraint program that honourable members like to remind ourselves of. New innovative programs for the needy were introduced by my colleague, the Member for Sturgeon Creek — shelter programs, SAFER programs. All basic social programs were maintained and, indeed, Madam Speaker, enhanced.

But because of the success of honourable members opposite, aided and abetted by the media, we were perceived to be mean spirited, to be belt tighteners and to be fiscally responsible, and were promptly thrown out of office.

So, Madam Speaker, I do believe that I speak of some background and some history when I say that, to me, the insidious part of this Budget is that the Minister of Finance and the New Democrats are quite prepared to bargain away the future and the opportunities of coming generations; indeed, are prepared to seriously undermine the very democratic nature of our system of government to perpetuate their stay in power at the expense of all Manitobans.

That is what's insidious about this Budget because, Madam Speaker, it is a given in Canadian politics — not just in Canadian politics, everywhere — everywhere where some form of democracy prevails — that governments, particularly new governments when they are re-elected, do those things in the initial year, in the initial months that maybe aren't all that popular. Make some of the tough decisions and then hopefully people's memories will fade a little bit, and they come along with some more popular measures towards the end of their term in the hope that will get them re-elected. Madam Speaker, that's fair game; that's the way our system has worked up to now, Madam Speaker, but this Budget is flying in the face of that kind of accepted, understandable, in Canadian terms, method of bringing some responsibility to government financing.

We have a Minister of Finance in a government that brings in a half billion dollar deficit at a time that his Premier and other Ministers say that we are leading the country in economic development, that things are doing very well, thank you, in Manitoba, and yet have no courage to tackle the most serious problem that Manitobans and Governments of Manitoba face.

They impose an additional \$250 million to \$260 million of new taxation in this Budget, but they lose sight of the fact that — well, not lose sight of the fact, but \$80 million of that new taxes does not help, does not provide any social services.

The Minister of Health pleaded a little while ago about some understanding from we members in Opposition that a decade ago the system didn't face heavy expenditures of new innovative medical treatments such as the CAT scan process, and our calls for providing more services were unfair. Where is he going to get the money?

You're collecting \$80 million more from the people of Manitoba that would put 10 CAT scans in the province, if we weren't servicing the debt. Madam Speaker, I'm not unrealistic; I'm not suggesting that can be changed overnight.

I would have even accepted this Budget and these statements from the Minister of Finance if he said we

can't do anything about the deficit **this time** around, but I would like to have heard an answer from him when my colleague, our critic of Finance, the Member for Morris, asked him what are his projections for four or five years. Can he give us any idea where we're heading?

Madam Speaker, we have heard no projections from the Minister, no indications from any members of the government that have spoken on the Budget today. That really grieves me because I really believe that the Member for Morris probably quoted one of the more poignant lines in the debate thus far when he said that what, in effect, you are doing of course is you're denying democracy to future generations. That's precisely what you're doing.

As more and more money is seconded and beyond the control of those of us who are supposed to make the decision as to how that money is spent, as more and more of that money automatically has to go to service foreign debt, we are denying future MLA's the opportunity to sit in this Chamber and decide how best to spend the money that we raise for the common good.

I know that must concern some members. There are some members in this Chamber with municipal experience. It's against the law, Madam Speaker, a law that we passed in this Chamber, for them to operate with deficits. The Member for Lac du Bonnet is well aware of it.

After he finished and left his years of, what I believe to be no doubt, was distinguished service in the municipal field, he did not leave the R.M. of Lac du Bonnet or Brokenhead, whatever the actual municipality was that he was reeve of, with the kind of massive debt that begins to prevent his successors from making their democratic decisions as to how to spend the money they raise locally. Should it be on this road? Should it be on drainage improvements? Should it be on whatever other services the municipality requires?

You see, Madam Speaker, we are slowly but surely being denied those future decisions in this Chamber by the actions of this government. I say to you that while I'm certainly prepared to acknowledge that, perhaps for the majority of members opposite, they truly know not what they do and are relatively innocent in this process.

I'd like to think that the Minister of Northern Affairs, perhaps a few other Ministers fall into that category, but I also suggest to you that there are those who know precisely what they are doing and they're following a game plan that disturbs me and should disturb all Manitobans.

For those who suggest that there aren't forces working in our midst and in this Legislature who would like to see the system collapse totally, in the hope that it is only in that way that their will can prevail in the future, I say that not ill-advisedly, Madam Speaker, because I refuse to believe that the Minister of Finance is stupid. I refuse to believe that others in that Cabinet lack intelligence. I refuse to believe that they can not add just as well as the Member for Arthur can and project what it would mean in five, six, seven, eight years, if we continue on this path.

Surely they can do this, Madam Speaker, but there are those — and I believe we have them in this Chamber — that call for the fundamental change in our approach

and they may well succeed. I at least have the privilege of letting them know that I know what they're about and will, of course, do my best to prevent it.

Madam Speaker, we will succeed; we will beat these fellows the next time around. Pardon me for that chauvinist remark - these ladies and gentlemen, these people, these persons, Madam Speaker. I also know the kind of people that constitute the Conservative Party or have some concerns about fiscal responsibility. We will, intuitively, attempt to do something about the deficit, and not the first year necessarily. We don't do it all at once, but we will intuitively try to do something about it; but the trouble is, look at the lesson we are teaching the electorate by doing so.

They can run a deficit with no ill effect. When we run a deficit, obviously some belt tightening has to take place and it becomes thus that much more difficult for us to succeed politically under this regime.

I mentioned that some people are aware of what they're doing and I don't raise this in any other way, but I sometimes want to recall, and particularly recall to members that are new to the House, that when I talk of a game plan that is being carried out by certain members opposite, I believe in it very sincerely because I can find no other suggestion, no other rationale for their total irresponsibility in facing the question of the Budget deficit that's before us.

Madam Speaker, in 1981, I can recall speaking on the Throne Speech. We had a bit of discussion about one of the new members who had just recently been appointed the Attorney-General of this province, the Member for Wolseley (sic). Some of you will remember that. I recall inviting, in that Speech from the Throne in 1981, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and I encouraged members, if they wish to look it up on Page 50 of Hansard - pardon me, it was '82, the Session was on.

I recognized of course that the Attorney-General at one time had strong Communist affiliations, ran for public office as a Communist. Indeed, the Penner family is well known to me, came from the same part of Southern Russia that my parents came from, came to Canada the same time my parents came. Alderman Jacob Penner is well-known to me, was well known to me and to my parents.

So, Madam Speaker, it was of interest to me to put on the record — my first opportunity sitting opposite — at what particular point in the political life, the evolution of the honourable member, the Attorney-General, did he switch from becoming a Communist to becoming a New Democrat? I asked him that; in fact, Madam Speaker, I said that I did that kindly, because people do change their politics.

I made references to people like Jack Horner who could have been described as a pretty hard-nosed Conservative in the Diefenbaker era. How did he end up becoming a Trudeau Cabinet Minister for the Liberal Party? I made references to other people and I made particular reference to a member who is still with us in the House, who, when first elected, and when I was first elected, sat over here in the Liberal benches, the Honourable Minister of Health, and how he made his conversion to the New Democrats.

It was in that light, in that spirit that I asked — I believe — a legitimate question from a person who — not that many years before — had run for the

Communist Party of Canada, for the House of Commons, and was now a New Democratic Party Cabinet Minister.

Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General took up my invitation. I invited the Honourable Attorney-General, at his time and his choosing, to enlighten the House as to when that conversion took place. Interestingly enough, the Attorney-General, a few days later, also all recorded in Hansard — tells us, and I quote from Hansard, Page 140 of March 4, 1982, "Finally on a personal note, let me say something about the Honourable Member for Lakeside" — whoever he may be, I was not in the Chamber at the time — "and you will remember, Sir, that with that charming mock earnestness of his, he called upon me to explain my personal conversion on the road to Damascus. I say to the Member for Lakeside, in terms of fundamentals like that, I have not changed and I firmly hope I will never change."

Madam Speaker, when I referred to my friend, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Attorney-General, as a Communist, let nobody in this Chamber call that redbaiting, least of all the Frances Russell's of this world, and when I refer to him — and I don't do it that often — but when I express concern about where basic democratic principles lie with members of the Treasury Bench, people that bring in these kinds of Budgets that show no fiscal responsibility, and when I voice concern that democracy is being denied for future generations, then I mean it.

Because, Madam Speaker, surely nobody opposite will tell me that members who affiliate and associate with the Communist Party are democrats as we know democrats to believe. Or is there somebody opposite there that wants to challenge me on that, Madam Speaker? Is there somebody opposite there that wants to tell me that in any Communist nation you have the democratic process that the Member for Elmwood referred to in his maiden speech, the Throne Speech, about the fact that we could have differing opinions; we could express them freely in this Chamber. Is that being done anywhere in Eastern Europe? Is that being done anywhere in the USSR? Of course not.

Madam Speaker, my concern and how I relate this to the Budget is that there is not a concern of budgetary deficits on the other side. They do not share the same concern; the concern that I suspect most people believe that we ought to have about deficits, because they do not have the same concern, they do not have the same belief, nor do they have the same dedication to the system which I've been pleased and privileged to serve for these many years.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I always enjoy listening to my friend, the Member for Lakeside, because he is an excellent orator; he has an excellent way of presenting. I've always enjoyed his speeches. I, of course, don't usually agree with his main points or his logic or his philosophy; but nevertheless, he's really entertaining and I always enjoy listening to the Member for Lakeside.

I particularly enjoyed his reference, as he often makes in a speech of this type, to what happened during the Roblin era and all the great things that went on, the building of — what was it called? — “Duff’s Ditch” at that time, but as we know it, the Winnipeg Floodway, a fantastic system of roads built in Manitoba and also the bringing in of the larger school divisions, the larger school division that we know today, and a lot of great things, a lot of progressive things.

But you know, Madam Speaker, to do that required a lot of spending and I would dare say, if it wasn’t for the fact that Douglas Campbell, former Liberal Premier for many a year in this province of ours, hadn’t left a pretty large sum of money in the kitty, the Roblin administration of the day couldn’t do nearly as much as it did over the years, but that’s a fact. I remember it got to the point, Madam Speaker, that the Conservatives were getting a little nervous about their deficits.

There was one Honourable Gurney Evans, former Conservative Minister of Finance, got up in this House in presenting his Budget Speech, and explained to the House that, in future, capital and current spending would be separated; that we should understand a current deficit was not the same as a capital deficit; and in so many words, that a capital deficit hopefully would pay for itself in the long run because you’re putting assets in place that would give you benefits and were there for long time. I wish I had that particular Budget Speech with me because I’d like to read that one or two sentences that the Honourable Gurney Evans presented to us, because what had happened, the Conservatives were spending at a rate that there were deficits being incurred, there were debts being sustained.

I just say that everybody, at some point, will argue — we all argue that we want to be fiscally responsible — and I believe that the Budget brought in by the Honourable Minister of Finance this year is a suitable Budget for 1986. I hear members opposite railing about doing something about the deficit, doing something about the size of the debt, but I still haven’t yet received from members opposite any clear concise plan of how they would do that. — (Interjection) — Well okay, we’re in the Cabinet, we’re in the government — (Interjection) — yes, we’re in the government.

We can have plans and we can do our research, but also it’s a responsibility of members opposite, Her Majesty’s Loyal Opposition, to come forward in a positive way and say, this is the way you should go, this is what you should do, and I’m still waiting, Madam Speaker, for members opposite to tell us where they would cut spending.

Now I know they make the odd reference to communications officers, or whatever, but you know even if you wiped out all communications officers, even if you wiped out some of these areas you mention, you have a long way to go. — (Interjection) — Well you know what the honourable member is speaking about from his seat is totally insignificant. It’s absolutely insignificant and I am still waiting. The members on this side are still waiting for a plan of action, where the Tories would cut. Where would the Conservative Party of Manitoba propose that the Government of Manitoba make cuts? Or alternatively, Madam Speaker, what taxes would you increase, because there’s only two

ways to go? You either cut spending or **you** increase taxes. I know the argument that we’ve been hearing is, well we’ll have more efficient government, more productivity, more efficient spending, but I haven’t heard those suggestions yet.

I’d like to submit, Madam Speaker, that we are running a fairly efficient, productive ship. I think that the members opposite, however, are misguided when they refer to the Budget deficit in isolation from the economy, in isolation to our total spending because, when you look at it in terms of our gross provincial product, you’ll see that the total budgetary requirement is the lowest that we’ve had it in five years. Surely it only makes common sense when you talk about anybody’s debt, their personal debt, that you relate that to that person’s ability to earn income. If an individual’s debt did rise, surely you have to look at whether their income has changed or not.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that our gross provincial product, the wealth, the goods and services that are being produced in Manitoba have expanded. You have to relate your deficits, you relate your debt to that particular situation.

When we compare Manitoba also with other provinces in Canada, as has been pointed out in the Budget document, we fare fairly well. As a matter of fact, our debt charges per capita are well below the 10-province average, indeed, well below. The only provinces that have a lower debt charge per capita than Manitoba are the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. But every province to the east of Manitoba is in a relatively worse position than Manitoba. So, Madam Speaker, in a relative sense, we don’t fare too badly at all.

But I would like to talk more about what’s happening to the Manitoba economy, because I think ultimately what’s more important is not the amount of red ink that you happen to see on a financial document; the more important thing is how many people are working or how many people are not working, how many goods and services are we producing. What is happening to the production of goods and services in the province? To what extent do we have economic prosperity? That is the important question. To what extent can the Provincial Government have some positive impact on this economic prosperity?

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that while we are not an economic island unto ourselves, many of the positive things that we may do as a government can be offset by other factors, international economic factors, factors in the United States, or indeed actions of the Federal Government. We can spend more money on direct job creation, but this could be offset very easily by cutbacks by the Federal Government. There are many examples of this happening. But regardless, I believe, and I submit that the figures show that Manitoba’s economy has done relatively well under New Democratic Party regimes of the Seventies and again in the Eighties.

Madam Speaker, I have obtained and have tabulated a number of economic statistics and charts. As a matter of fact, I have had some run off in our caucus room. If members opposite would like to share them with me, maybe one of the Pages could distribute some of these to those members who would like to read them. They are a very revealing set of charts and statistics, all of which are compiled from official sources, and at the

back of the set of documents, we have the data sources. So we have the source shown for every one of these charts that is presented. You'll see that, whatever species of economic indicator you look at, Manitoba has done relatively better under the New Democratic Party years than under the Conservative years.

I think we have enough for all members, but maybe not every member wants to look at these. I'm not sure.

But for those who are interested, if you look at Chart 1, we take the overall economic growth, the real domestic product increase in Manitoba as a percentage of what happened in Canada as a whole. As can be seen in the charts, if you want to follow with me, in Chart 1, in the NDP years of 1970-73 and again in 1974-77, our economic growth as a percentage of the Canadian economic growth was 95.5 percent and 87.9 percent respectively, not quite as good as the Canadian average. But when we hit the Conservative years, we drop to 60.5 percent. In other words, we did relatively worse during the Lyon years.

In the past period of time, 1982-85, the Manitoba growth was 126 percent of the national growth of real domestic product. In other words, the last three or four years, Manitoba's rate of growth has surpassed the national average. So I say, Madam Speaker, we are not an economic island unto ourselves, but it's important to see how we relate relatively to Canada as a whole.

If you look at Chart 2, total capital expenditure in Manitoba as a percent of Canada — you look at the NDP years, 46.9 percent, the first period in office; then 87.9 percent. Then we get to the Conservative period in office, we drop to 28.2 percent. However, the last period, 1982-85, investment growth rate in Manitoba is more than eight times the growth of the Canadian investment spending or 817 percent.

If you break it down by public and private, you see the same pattern. As a matter of fact, in Chart 4, you'll note in the Conservative years you can't chart it because it was a negative figure. It was absolutely minus a percentage of the Canadian experience. The last period of time, public capital expenditure increased 878 percent of the Canadian increase.

Going on to Chart 5, looking at employment growth under Conservatives, you'll see we're the bottom province of the 10 provinces. We were the low person on the totem pole. Manitoba had the undistinguished privilege of being 10 out of 10 in the rate of job creation in this country.

Contrasting this to Chart No. 6, employment growth in 1982-85 under the NDP, the rate of increase of employment was such that Manitoba ranked somewhere in the middle. We got up to, I guess, around fifth place, ahead of Quebec, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Alberta and B.C.

You can also see that on the next chart, Chart No. 7, when you index employment. Again, these are Statistics Canada figures you'll see throughout. The Conservative period in office, 1977-81, the rate of employment expansion in Manitoba always fell below the rate of employment expansion in Canada. We never achieved the rate of expansion of jobs in Manitoba that was achieved in Canada as a whole.

If you turn the page to Chart No. 8, looking at the experience under the NDP, it's just the reverse. In every single year, 1981 right through to 1985, the index of

employment is higher for Manitoba than for Canada. In other words, our experience in Manitoba has superseded the Canadian average.

If you look at Chart No. 9, you see unemployment under the Conservatives, we have generally rated fairly well among the provinces in terms of unemployment rates. We were third lowest under the Conservatives in 1978-81. The last period of time, 1982-85, is shown on the next chart, Chart 10, when we dropped down to second place.

But at any rate, I am saying again, we are not an economic island unto ourselves. If conditions get bad in Canada as a whole or North America or the world, certainly they affect us. Unemployment does get worse from time to time, and we can't control it entirely. So therefore I submit, Madam Speaker, the most important thing is to compare what's going on in Manitoba with the rest of the country.

If you look over to what happened in terms of population, Chart 11, total population gained or lost, regrettably Manitoba's population dropped during the Conservative years. We had fewer people living in Manitoba by the time Premier Lyon left office than when he secured office in late 1977. In the last three years, 1982-85, our population increase in Manitoba is well over 44,000 people. Part of that . . .

**A MEMBER:** How many are on unemployment?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We'll get to that. We've got figures on this, but I just told you our relative situation is better in the last few years — (Interjection) — I'll get to the welfare, as well. I've got figures on that.

Chart 12, you can see that one of the basic reasons for our population to decrease during the Conservative period in office is the fact that interprovincial migration soared or dropped, whatever term you want to use, to new depths. On average, we lost 9,582 people per year to other provinces. That's when you take everybody coming in and subtract everybody leaving, the net change. Historically, we have tended to lose people in Manitoba. We lost people in the Seventies but it got so bad during the Lyon period in government that we superseded the natural rate of increase and the births over deaths.

At any rate, Madam Speaker, in the last period of time we have had a net gain, the last three years, of an average of 609. Nevertheless, if you look at Chart 13, in population, Manitoba growth rate as a percent of Canada, again it shows you that we have done very, very well in the last few years. We are above the Canadian average in population growth, whereas in the Conservative years it was a negative situation.

Well, I won't take too much longer with these. There are some other charts. Chart 14, it's the same story; relatively, we have done well in construction. Chart 15, we have done better in terms of retail trade expansion. In Chart 16, we have done better in creation of full-time jobs, Manitoba growth rate as a percent of Canada.

At any rate, Madam Speaker, we can look at this in another way as well. I wonder if the Page could come and distribute some more statistics here. We could look at this again relative to what has gone on in the rest of the country. You see, Madam Speaker, the truth hurts because we have got the Member for Pembina speaking

from his seat as usual. These are from official sources, Madam Speaker, and I would appreciate being given the opportunity to make my speech as I gave honourable members opposite full opportunity to speak without interruption.

I wonder if we have a Page around here to distribute some more charts. I won't take too long with these, but again they compare Manitoba province by province, the economic growth under the Tories and under the NDP. We are looking at public investment, private investment and so on. I think the charts speak for themselves, Madam Speaker, because generally we have been performing very, very well in a relative sense.

I heard members opposite ask me other questions about welfare and so on, and I would like to get to that in a minute, but I want to take a moment to talk about what about now. We have been looking at the past several years. But what is forecast for Manitoba in the near future; what is going on right now?

Of course, we have to go to various agencies to see what they are projecting. I am very pleased to note that the major organizations such as the Bank of Montreal, the Investment Dealers' Association, the Bank of Nova Scotia, the Royal Bank of Canada, Coopers and Lybrand have all recently come out with very positive forecasts for the Province of Manitoba. If you took an average of their forecasts, it would indicate that our rate of growth of the real gross domestic product for 1986 will be 3.6, which is well above the Canadian average forecast at 3.1. Similarly, for 1987 the forecast is for Manitoba to be well above the Canadian average. I know it's very difficult to forecast but these are independent forecasters all predicting strong growth in output and employment, and also with significant reductions in unemployment rates.

It's rather interesting that the Royal Bank in its long-term outlook, which was published in April of 1986, was very positive. I just quote a couple of sentences from their report. "Our current long-term outlook for Manitoba is somewhat more upbeat than it was a year ago. In fact, we expect Manitoba to lead the nation in terms of real growth during the decade to 1994. Employment growth in Manitoba is expected to be relatively strong, faster than any other province and slightly above the national average." They go on to project our unemployment rate to decline from 8.1 in 1985 to 7 percent by 1989 and 5.5 percent by 1994.

Madam Speaker, as I said, you can go to various independent sources. Recently, the Bank of Nova Scotia came out with a special edition, "Regional Industrial Outlook." You can pick it up at any Bank of Nova Scotia anywhere in Canada. Again, Manitoba looks exceedingly favourable in relation to what's going on in the rest of the country. Key economic indicators they refer to on Page 6 — they forecast, 1986, that we will have the largest increase in retail sales of any province in the country.

In terms of employment growth, they rate us second only after Ontario. I might add, Madam Speaker, that Ontario is doing exceedingly well; it's our largest manufacturing province. For whatever reason, manufacturing is expanding at a very rapid pace and, therefore, Ontario is doing very, very well and has probably outperformed most provinces in most areas. But we are right behind Ontario in terms of employment growth and, similarly, in terms of unemployment, we

are rated to have the second best unemployment situation in the country only after Ontario.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that in spite of criticisms of members opposite over the years of our Budget, of our spending, of our administration, and in spite of the doom and gloom we have heard, Manitoba is booming. It has done very well under New Democratic administrations in the past, it continues to do well today, and is forecast to do well in the future.

The members were asking about recent labour market situations, recent information on employment and unemployment and so on. I can report that our labour market has performed reasonably well by historic standards, not quite as strong as Ontario but, generally, we rate fairly well. For example, in Manitoba our employment increased by 3.2 percent between April of 1985 and April of 1986, the last year. This 3.2 percent growth is more than double the province's long-term average annual growth rate between 1975 and 1985. That growth rate averaged 1.4, so we are more than double in this last year.

In terms of the growth of our labour force, we experienced in the past year, the year ending April 1986, an increase of 2.9 percent, again well above the province's long-term average increase of 1.8 percent between 1975 and 1985.

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

The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister might permit a question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, I will be pleased to at the end of my speaking time, Madam Speaker, with the permission of the — so that our labour market generally has performed well in recent months in the past year.

Members opposite have asked — in fact, they were asking just a moment ago — well, what about welfare; what about poverty and so on? Again, I can report that, relatively speaking, our caseload of social assistance in Manitoba has grown like it has right across Canada. It has grown right across Canada. Well, I can tell you from the Federal Department of Health and Welfare, the growth rate for Canada as a whole has been 44 percent. The last information I could get was for the year 1985 compared to 1981. That's the period of time we were able to get from them. Our social assistance, our welfare caseload growth rate is well below that average. It's less than half of the growth of welfare caseloads in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

Well, those are figures that have been given to us by Ottawa. They are not my figures. It means, Madam Speaker, that in a relative sense, we haven't had the same growth in welfare. It has to be relative, because we don't live on an island to ourselves; we don't have guards at the borders preventing people from coming into Manitoba or from leaving Manitoba. We are part of a Canadian nation and if the Canadian nation is hurt by an economic recession, Manitoba cannot escape

that. We are obviously impacted by that. But the question is, how do we do relative to the rest of the nation? I say relatively we have done very well.

Regrettably some provinces have been very tough on their social assistance recipients in the last few years. They have made it very difficult for people in need to get some help.

Again, the percentage of Manitoba's population on social assistance is well below the national rate of persons on social assistance and certainly nothing that we need to be overly concerned about at all. In fact, I would say that we would ultimately like to see nobody on welfare, but the fact is, Madam Speaker, that we have thousands on welfare because they are either mentally retarded and cannot look after themselves, or they are crippled. Regrettably, a lot of the young men and women you see in wheelchairs or on crutches or whatever who cannot work are assisted by our social assistance caseload as are some of our elderly people and some other disadvantaged people.

With regard to poverty — putting aside the welfare caseload as such and looking at poverty — the latest report we have is from the National Council of Welfare which released a poverty profile for 1985 in October of that year. It showed Manitoba has not been affected by the substantial increase in the proportion of Canadians living in poverty in the 1980's. As a matter of fact, between 1981 and 1984, the percentage of families in Manitoba living in poverty increased by only 0.7 percent compared to a 25 percent increase for all of Canada. I think that's a dramatic, refreshing contrast.

I'll repeat that. Between 1981 and 1984 the percentage of families in Manitoba living in poverty increased by only 0.7 percent; whereas for all of Canada, the increase was 25 percent.

Manitoba improved its position among the 10 provinces from the fourth lowest to the third lowest proportion of families living in poverty. Looking at unattached individuals between 1981 and 1984, we experienced a reduction of 1.9 percent in the rate of poverty among unattached individuals compared to a national increase of 1.6. So we were reducing the number of individuals in poverty in Manitoba, while there was a substantial increase going on in Canada as a whole. In fact, Manitoba was one of four provinces to have a decrease in the percentage of individuals living in poverty. We maintained our position with the fifth lowest proportion of unattached individuals living in poverty.

I might add that the National Council of Welfare that produced this report is an advisory body to the Federal Minister of National Health and Welfare.

I might add that the emphasis that we place, Madam Speaker, not only through our social assistance programs but most especially through the employment initiatives under the Manitoba Jobs Fund have gone a long way to providing assistance to people in avoiding poverty and to lifting them out of their disadvantaged position.

I had the pleasure just the other day of announcing a new program to assist single parent families, single parents themselves, to get off welfare and to hopefully get into the work force on a permanent basis. We're doing that through a work experience program. In the City of Brandon, we're involving Assiniboine Community College and our WestBran Project. In Winnipeg, we're

doing it through our Winnipeg Human Resources Opportunity Centre.

But, Madam Speaker, it is a difficult job, nevertheless, while we can see some elements of cooperation with the Federal Government in other areas we are not getting cooperation, in fact, we are suffering some cuts that certainly don't help us in creating employment and stimulating the economy.

I wonder if you could advise me of how much time I have, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The member has nine minutes remaining.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Nine minutes, okay.

The information we have on federal spending for job creation in Manitoba shows a serious decline in the amount of money made available and also a decline in the level of spending. I'm not going to read all these figures, but I can tell you that the allocation for 1985-86 was — (Interjection) — well, I could read all these figures, but I'm going to just use the percentages because I don't want to lose the Member for Pembina because I know he is a rather slow learner.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Hear, hear.

**HON. L. EVANS:** That's what I like from the Member for Pembina. I always get such intelligent remarks from him.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, regrettably, without reading all these numbers, the information we have is that the spending on job programs that the Federal Government committed in Manitoba last year was 29.4 percent less than they said they would spend. So how do we expect to get the same amount of stimulus for employment if the Federal Department of Employment and Immigration does not deliver on what it says it's going to spend in the first place?

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that there has been a serious drop in spending by the Federal Government on job creation in this province. In fact, there has been a serious drop right across the country. The federal allocations have been cut back. In 1984-85 under the Liberals, the federal allocations — and this is public information — for employment department allocations was \$2.2 billion — \$2.2 billion for training in employment. It was cut back by the Conservatives from that 2.2 to 2.1 billion in 1985-86 and to 1.9 billion in 1986-87 and it now being cut back to 1.8 billion in 1987-88.

But even though there has been a reduction in the Budget, what I'm maintaining, Madam Speaker, is that there has been underspending of the Budget so that we don't get that impact that we should have been getting based on what the Budget had indicated to us.

Madam Speaker, the point I think we have to be concerned about when we discuss a Budget Speech or Budget document is to ask ourselves legitimate questions about our fiscal position, but also legitimate questions about the economy. I think I made it amply clear that under successive budgets of the New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba, Manitoba has indeed done better than most other provinces. Certainly we have done better than when the

Thursday, 29 May, 1986

Conservatives were in office. The figures speak for themselves. They are official data from Statistics Canada.

But in terms of our fiscal situation, I maintain, Madam Speaker, that even there we have been acting responsibly because what we have to do is to relate what has gone on here in terms of deficits and in terms of debts to our ability to create well and our ability generally to raise revenue in this province.

I might add, Madam Speaker, I guess I've only got a couple of minutes left, but I mentioned a while ago that the Honourable Gurney Evans had made a statement. This was back on April 10 of 1969, and I guess I don't have it marked, but we've got the documents here, where at that time the Honourable Gurney Evans did state that it was very important to separate current from capital spending and that henceforth his government was going to do that because it wasn't fair, it wasn't proper, it wasn't rational to lump them together, as members opposite are always wanting to do.

However, our document of course, shows both. We've separated them, but we've also shown the total as well. What I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is that there was a period of time when the Tories were big time spenders and I say this partly for the benefit of my friend, the Honourable Member for River Heights. They did it partly with the help of many years of administration by Douglas Campbell and the Liberal Government of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I welcome remarks from members opposite if they are intelligent, truthful and if they speak them from their seats or if they have the guts to speak out so they're on the record; but I have no use for people who make snide remarks that are either untruthful or which are personal.

In fact, if I regret anything in this House, I regret the decline of decorum; I regret the decline of common courtesy and good manners because that, regrettably, is what we've seen in the last few years. The Member for Niakwa is a pleasant exception. At any rate, I think we all should learn something from the past, when there was a little more politeness in this Chamber and a little more respect for one another as individuals, and I have no finer note to conclude my speech, on that admonition.

Thank you.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, the Minister I believe has some time left and he agreed to a question at the end of his speech.

Could the Minister indicate how much was spent in his departmental appropriation to develop these very selective and narrow statistics?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister has two minutes remaining.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, if the honourable member was around — I guess he was — when we were in Opposition, he will know that during those years I spent many hours, many days, many weeks preparing data such as this. I have done the pioneering work in this, but through the assistance of our caucus, in particular, in helping to produce a number of documents, we have this information updated.

I can't give the member a figure; obviously I can't do that, but I'm suggesting, Madam Speaker, that the truth must hurt because the figures are official data, compiled, published and made available to the public of the world, of Canada, of Manitoba, by Statistics Canada. All the sources are shown at the back of the document. I invite the honourable member to go and look up the statistical documents and publications of Stats Canada and see if the data has been correctly compiled.

I remember when I was in Opposition, members opposite had their high-priced economist check the figures that I did, as a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and I invite the honourable member to do the same thing if he has the ability to do it.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if it would be the will of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member adjourning debate?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Yes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m.

The motion will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.