



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 20A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 7 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 7 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. R. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir, I feel compelled to advise you, with regret, that as my leader stated on Friday morning, on behalf of all members of the Progressive Conservative Caucus, that you do not carry the confidence of this side of the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I also wish to advise you, Sir, as my leader did on Friday, that you no longer carry the confidence of the members on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: To the same point of order, I wish to advise you, Sir, that you have acted in an exemplary fashion, that you have defended the office of the Speaker, which must always be defended. It is a duty on the part of all members of the House to defend the office of the Speaker and that is what is at stake. The Speaker has the right to be wrong, as he may from time to time, but the office of the Speaker must be defended, and on those grounds, Sir, and on the exemplary way in which you have conducted yourself, you have the full confidence of this side of the House.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: On the same point of order, I wish to advise you, Sir, with regret, as my leader advised you the other day, that you do not carry the confidence of this side of the House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that is not a point of order. — (Interjection) — It is not a point of order.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: I challenge your ruling.

A MEMBER: We think it is a point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Mrs. Dodick, Messrs. Doern, Evans, Eyles, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Ms. Hemphill, Messrs. Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Banman, Blake, Brown, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 29; Nays, 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement I wish to make.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, Manitoba was hit by one of the worst ice storms in this province's history during the past weekend. All day yesterday, media reports kept us advised of the storm's progress as it tracked eastward across the southern part of Manitoba.

We were also told about the numerous power failures left in the wake of the storm and how Manitoba Hydro crews were on the job working under the worst possible conditions to restore service as quickly as they could. It was no easy task, for I am told that the icing conditions

experienced by Manitoba Hydro were the most widespread ever experienced by the utility, and over the longest period of time.

The effects of the storm were felt in an area ranging from the Saskatchewan boundary to just east of Winnipeg and from the U.S. border to a line stretching from just south of the Riding Mountains to Gimli. Within this large chunk of territory, there was hardly a community or a customer that didn't experience some kind of an interruption in electrical service. Many of the outages were measured in minutes, but there were some which lasted several hours. It seemed that each time the power was restored in one area, it went out in another. With the arrival of colder weather today and since the rain has stopped falling, the electrical system has stabilized itself, but there are still a few communities and some individual services that are without power.

I would, Mr. Speaker, ask that Manitobans who discover broken lines or poles, keep well away from these hazards and contact their nearest Manitoba Hydro office immediately to report any of these occurrences.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity, on behalf of the government and the people of Manitoba, to express our gratitude and appreciation to those Hydro employees who toiled day and night all through the weekend doing what they could to safeguard the supply of electrical energy to as many of Hydro's customers as possible. It was a superhuman effort by a dedicated workforce and I'm proud of them all.

Mr. Speaker, we have proven once again that we have an electrical utility that is second to none and I know that the honourable members join me in congratulating Manitoba Hydro and its employees for keeping the Manitoba spirit alive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do, indeed, join with the Minister in congratulating and extending our thanks to the employees of Manitoba Hydro for doing their utmost to keep electrical energy flowing in this province under conditions that certainly are the worst that I've ever experienced in my lifetime with respect to icing conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Community Services and Corrections for the calendar year 1982.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 23 students of Grade 7 and 9 standing from the Churchill High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sinclair and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

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

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Also, before we reach Oral Questions I have a short procedural statement for the House. I apologize for the delay.

On Tuesday, March 1st, a point of order arose in the House at the beginning of question period. I took the matter under advisement in order to review Hansard.

The Honourable Minister of Health rose in his place to deliver a lengthy answer to questions posed to him on the previous day and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry made a lengthy preamble, presumably to a question, in response. Although both members would have been out of order if Beausnes's Citations were strictly observed, it was my distinct impression, reinforced by Hansard, that the will of the House was to permit both members to speak to the issue. Thus, while the Acting Government House Leader was technically correct in raising the point of order, the mood of the House was such as to make the action inadvisable.

In speaking to his point of order, the Acting Government House Leader said in part, "If the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is indeed going to be sincere to this House . . .", etc. Beausnes's Citation 316 says in part "it has been sanctioned by usage that a member while speaking must not (e) impute bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged to a member." I would therefore conclude that the words of the Acting Government House Leader in questioning the sincerity of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry do amount to an imputation of motives and should be withdrawn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am only too happy to indicate to the House, and to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that to the extent that those words implied any question about the truthfulness or sincerity of the honourable member, they were said during the course of a protestation and I certainly withdraw them.

While I'm on my feet let me also confess to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that I indicated a question he put in respect to probability of flooding was hypothetical. I think I was being too defensive about the rules and I think the question was in order and I did answer it in any event.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Satellite Receiving Dishes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Communications, a matter of concern to my constituents.

Last week, the Federal Minister of Communications announced a series of policy changes which affect the use of satellite receiving dishes, specifically the private

use of such dishes and the use of such dishes in commercial and other establishments was legalized.

I was wondering whether the Minister of Communications received any indication from the Federal Minister what impact that change of policy will have on the use of satellite receiving dishes by cable systems in remote and northern communities where presently they are using such signals to provide service equivalent to that with the south.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's correct, as indicated by the Member for Thompson in the preamble to his question, that there was a change in policy announced by the Federal Government with respect to the use of earth-receiving stations to receive signals from satellites with respect to TV coverage. What isn't clear is to the extent that the Federal Government is going to allow the use of these earth-receiving stations. He has indicated very clearly that individual homeowners or residents that have such equipment will be allowed to use it. However, it is not as clear with respect to uses other than for individuals, in the case of operations that may come into competition with established cable firms, the position was advanced by the Federal Government is that they would be looking at that and that if there was undo competition to the established cable systems than the policy may be somewhat different. I have on receiving that communique from the Federal Minister of Communications asked for clarification of those points. I will in response to the specific question, ask the Federal Minister, the Federal Department of Communications as to what will be the impact on communities in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, given the fact there is some apparent problem in this area at the present, it certainly hasn't been clarified by that statement, I was wondering if the Minister could pass on the concern of northern rural residents for whom the cost of purchasing a private satellite dish would be prohibited. I believe the cost is a approximately \$3,000 per unit, and for whom there is virtually no other alternative to get decent TV service.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I will carry those concerns to the Federal Minister. As the member is probably aware, those same concerns were raised to the Federal Minister, to the Chairman of the CTC, with respect to the situation as it existed prior to this change in policy by the Federal Government, and our concern and our commitment to the availability of comparable television service for northern Manitobans or residents in the north will be the same as it was before; that is, that they should have equal access to such services as people in the south.

Strike - hospital workers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister of Labour being absent, I wonder if the Minister of Health could give us an update on the progress in respect to negotiations in the various health services, and also, in view of the fact that he offered mediation services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a mediation officer was named by the Minister of Labour, and I understand that he has had both management and the worker, the union, meeting together, and I would hope that there should be something to report fairly soon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I very much regret having to address this Budget, which unquestionably is the worst Budget in the history of Manitoba, in the absence of my Leader. I don't think there has ever been a situation in the history of this House where a Leader or any member of a party was thrown out of the House in such an arbitrary fashion, and I believe it reflects upon the government and the Government House Leader for precipitating that type of action.

Some of the members opposite have called upon the opposition to provide what they regarded as positive statements, as positive recommendations as to what the government should do in this Budget and under these times. Mr. Speaker, criticism is, by nature, always negative in form, but the substance of it is something else and the substance of the criticism which members on our side have been putting forward is positive. If the members opposite don't recognize the positive nature of the Nonconfidence Motion, then perhaps I could rephrase it for them in a way which they might recognize as being more positive.

The first point would therefore be, the government should portray its financial affairs forthrightly and accurately; No. 2, the government should gain control over its spending; No. 3, the government should establish a taxation system that encourages job creation through private sector investment; No. 4, the government should recognize that the single greatest factor contributing to government spending is public sector wages; No. 5, the government should seek to re-establish credibility through honestly and forthrightly and forthrightness in its contacts with the public, with the media, and with the international money markets. It is to those people who don't see the positiveness in these statements, or who perhaps might think that the government is already acting in that fashion, that I direct my comments this afternoon.

A year ago, the Minister of Finance tabled Spending Estimates which he said in his press release represented a 14.4 percent increase over the previous year. For

anyone who doesn't remember that that's what the Minister of Finance said, then they can refer to his press release at the time or they can refer to the clipping from the March 10, 1982, Winnipeg Sun where they received a large headline, "Spending up 14.4 Percent."

The figures provided on Page A1 of this year's Budget show that the final spending for 1982-83 will be \$2,871,400,000 or 18.1 percent higher than the previous year. That's 3.7 percentage points above the original statement by the Minister of Finance that spending was going to be up 14.4 percent. I would refer the honourable members opposite and especially the members of the backbench - I suppose I direct my comments most of all to members of the backbench, because perhaps they have not been made aware of some of the facts surrounding this Budget, some of the background to it. I would refer them to Page 11 of the Budget, where the Minister states that for 1982-83, and I quote, "Expenditures are projected to be up by just over 1 percent above the original estimate."

How can a Minister of Finance put in his Budget this year that expenditures are only up over 1 percent from his original estimate last year, when at the time he said they were up 14.4 percent? He now admits, because he has no choice, because the figures show it, they are indeed up 18.1 percent. Why is it necessary for a Minister of Finance to put in his Budget which was tabled in this House on the 24th of February, he says with some pride, they were only up over 1 percent? That statement simply is not true.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 28 of the Budget, the Minister of Finance gives no less than six different measures of the increase in government spending: 9.5, 9.8, 11.6, 11.7, 15.9 and 17.2 percent. Those are the six different measures which he provides to the Members of this Legislature and to the public as representing the increases in government spending for 1983-84. That is hardly what I would call being forthright and honest in his presentation, especially, Mr. Speaker, since the most important measure of all is not used and this is a measure which the Minister of Finance will have no choice but to use next year if he presents his Estimates and Budget at the same time. That comparison, which would be most meaningful, is the one that would compare the first figure that the Minister tabled in this House last year with the first figure that he tabled in the House this year and, if one calculates that percentage, spending is up 19.5 percent over last year, not any one of those six measures that the Minister speaks of, but 19.5 percent.

The Minister has added items of expenditure into Capital Estimates this year which were not previously included. The items among which are included this year are such things as snowplowing, winter roads and salt that would be used for de-icing. No doubt his capital expenditures will be rising as a consequence of this storm. Mr. Speaker, he says on Page 16 of this year's Budget that the changes, and I quote, "were made in consultation with and with the agreement of the Provincial Auditor." Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The Provincial Auditor was not consulted on this item and the Minister of Finance says in his Budget that the Provincial Auditor was consulted and agrees with it. That is not true and I remind all of the backbenchers opposite that the Provincial Auditor is an employee of this Legislature, he is not an employee of the

government, of any one of the departments of those Ministers opposite and I invite you to speak to the Provincial Auditor and see whether the statement made in this Budget, by this Minister of Finance, is true or not. — (Interjection) — And aside from the propriety of the statement by the Minister of Finance, which I will have to leave to the members opposite to judge, the expanded list of so-called capital items contributes greatly to the confusion which surrounds the government spending at this time and I will be dealing with that in some greater detail later.

With respect to the Estimates of Revenue made by the Minister of Finance, he has said that he expects revenues to rise by 15.7 percent over the 1982-83 Estimates. Now that Estimate has been rather widely questioned and I know that when the Minister of Finance spoke the day he made some effort to substantiate that figure. But since the latest Estimates of Expenditure increase of 1982-83 over the previous year is only 8.9 percent down from the projected 14.4 percent of the Budget, it certainly raises grave doubts, as to whether or not that sort of revenue increase will be realized, especially since the average increase in revenues over the past five years has only been 10.4 percent. There seems to be very little confidence among observers of the Budget that the 15.7 percent increase will be achieved, even considering the \$106 million of new taxes and the estimated \$40 million, \$42 million of additional tax, which will be derived by the extension of the payroll tax over the entire year.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that confidence of the public, of the business community, of the money lenders, would have been enhanced had the Minister of Finance seen fit to at least explain the rationale behind his Estimate of 15.7 percent increase. Because in the absence of that sort of explanation there is very little confidence that, indeed, he will achieve that kind of revenue increase and therefore there is every expectation that the deficit will rise higher than the projection.

Another item concerning the Budget, which I find troubling, is that the Minister continues to refer to a problem with revenues, as opposed to one of expenditures. In his press release of February 25th, the Minister of Finance says that "Revenue shortfalls led by an \$84.9 million decline in estimated corporation income taxes will leave Manitoba with a projected 1982-83 deficit of \$495.5 million."

There is not a word about expenditures in that press release. It leaves the impression that the entire increase in the deficit comes about as a consequence of a decline in revenues. Aside from the inaccuracies in projecting those revenues last year, one should not lose sight of the fact that from the time the Estimates were first tabled in this House a year ago to the final Estimate of Expenditure, which appears in this year's Budget, spending rose by \$87,686,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that is an amount of money which the Minister of Finance or the government can afford to ignore and what concerns me is that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues may well not understand what is happening in the economy of this province and of the country, because they have a fixation with trying to portray the problem, as being simply one of declining revenues. I don't think that is true. I believe that the government probably has a bigger problem with spending than they have with revenues.

A further example of their misunderstanding, their misreading of the situation is that we continually hear members opposite refer to the situation that Saskatchewan and Alberta and B.C. find themselves in, because their revenues are down and their deficits are up, somehow that is supposed to make it more acceptable in Manitoba.

I would point out to the members opposite again, especially to the backbenchers that in Saskatchewan, for example, resource revenues make up approximately 30 percent of the revenues of the Province of Saskatchewan, whereas, in Manitoba, resource revenues represent approximately 2 percent of the revenues of the province. And that means today with uranium mines shutting down in Saskatchewan, and potash mines being closed down, and oil exploration down, and oil prices being affected internationally the way they are, and consumption being down, it is small wonder that Saskatchewan and Alberta are suffering revenue declines that are very significant. That is not the case in Manitoba because resource revenues simply are not a very significant amount of the revenues of the province.

What this Minister of Finance should have been doing in the Budget, Mr. Speaker, was at least providing an analysis to show us and to show the public what reason he has to believe that the revenue problem arises as a consequence of the present economic situation, as opposed to some structural thing which is built into the system, and is not going to disappear as time passes. I rather suspect that is the case, that there are structural problems here that are not going to disappear, even if the economy does show substantial improvement, which we all hope it will. But until the government comes to, at least realize the nature of their problem, they are unlikely to be able to deal with it in a realistic fashion.

And that brings me to the further point, Mr. Speaker, which I alluded to earlier, that over half of the money which the government spends, ends up as public sector wages.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Over half.

MR. B. RANSOM: In his Budget, the Minister of Finance speaks, in almost a complaining tone, about the fact that 60 percent of the government spending goes into grants, which he regards as being an area where the government has very little flexibility. Well, with the government's own spending and the proportion of those grants that goes to public sector wages, the government must recognize that over half of every dollar that it spends eventually ends up in public sector wages, and that if they really are to have some control over the spending that government undertakes, then that, of course, has to be the primary area which itself must be kept under control.

I would like to just make a few comments about the settlement, the renegotiated contract with the Manitoba Government Employees Association which this government seems to be so proud of.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, the government were negotiated out of their socks a year ago. I need only refer to the statement made by the Manitoba Government Employees Association. This was a

statement which was sent out to all Manitoba Government Employees Association members covered by the Master and Component Subagreements and it was dated February, 1983. The first sentence in this circular says and I quote, "It was our opinion," - well, I'll read the whole paragraph, Mr. Speaker, so that it's not taken out of context. I quote, "Last June when the Master and Component Negotiating Committee presented a tentative settlement to you, the membership, it was our opinion that we had to settle quickly as the national economy was beginning to move into a drastic decline." Now, here's a situation a year ago, where the Manitoba Government Employees knew what was upcoming and they knew that they were getting a sweetheart deal at that time and they moved quickly to get it. They present information which they sent to their members, this is not my information, Mr. Speaker, where they point out that over 1982-83, for instance, the increase in Alberta will be 19 percent; in Saskatchewan will be 13 percent; in Ontario will be 15 percent and in Manitoba would be 23.3 percent. That was on the basis of the 24 month agreement which was negotiated a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, they then renegotiated the contract this year and the government has an entirely different interpretation to place upon this renegotiation, than is the case of the Manitoba Government Employees Association. The Manitoba Government Employees Association said, Page 2 of this release, that we felt that any bargaining must be entered into with an objective of keeping the 10.3 percent for the second year of the agreement. They then go on to say that what they did, what they were proposing was to extend the existing 13 percent wage increase from March 19, 1982 to June 18, 1983. Then, effective June 18, 1983, the negotiated increase of 10.3 percent would be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, that's the Manitoba Government Employees Association statement. If the government doesn't wish to accept that, then they should say to the Government Employees Association that they have misrepresented the agreement, not the opposition. This is the information which is available to the opposition, and that's the information which we have been working from.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the renegotiated wage settlement, the government lost all their flexibility by bargaining away any right that they might have had to any further rollbacks in wages, irrespective of what might happen to the economy, and to guarantee against any layoffs. Now, everyone would hope that it would not be necessary to undertake layoffs, or rollbacks in wages, but, Mr. Speaker, the government has given up its flexibility from now until September of 1984. The government must recognize that they are setting a pattern and that over 50 percent of all the spending that government does, eventually ends up as public sector wages. If indeed there is to be control over government spending in the long run, they must by definition have control over the public sector wages.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said that his government was firmly committed to the principle of ability to pay. He also said that the sales tax would be somewhat regressive and would hit hardest at those living on low and fixed incomes such as pensioners. During question period a year ago, the

Minister of Finance said that an increase in the sales tax would be disastrous. This year we have an increase in the sales tax, but the people who are now being asked to accept this regressive tax which hits hardest at people on low income and pensioners, are told that the funds will go into a Jobs Fund. That appears on page 25 of the Estimates tabled by the Minister of Finance. It was a statement made in his press release of February 25th. In the press release of February 25th, which goes out to all Manitobans, the Minister of Finance says, for instance, that 72.2 million in budgetary authority from new tax increases will go into financing the Jobs Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal in some detail with the Jobs Fund. I would hope that the members opposite will be listening carefully especially the backbench once again. I challenge any member on the government side to refute the information which I am going to present to them, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Minister of Finance has said that unemployment is the No. 1 problem in Manitoba, and I am sure that he's not going to get much of an argument from the 54,000 people who are unemployed in this province. They, and the taxpayers who are being asked to put up money, pay increased taxes, and this is the tax measures which the members opposite have increased this year, are going to hit the unemployed and the people on minimum wage and the pensioners. All those people, that the members opposite, pretend to be the great defenders of, they are going to pay this tax. They are being asked to do so in order that jobs may be created for other people who now are without jobs. Now the thrust of the Jobs Fund is clearly capital-intensive. The size of the fund is \$200 million. The public believes that there are \$200 million going into a Jobs Fund, of which \$164.3 million are capital, and \$35.7 million are operating. In order to appreciate that, it is necessary to examine the government's total capital spending and job creation spending last year as well as this year. In 1982-83, the government and Crown corporations, plan to spend \$700 million in capital. I refer the members opposite to page 9 of last year's Budget where that figure appears, \$700 million. That was a \$200 million increase last year, Mr. Speaker, a familiar figure because the \$200 million appears again this year; but there was a \$200 million increase in capital spending last year.

Now, on Page 30 of this year's Budget, the Minister of Finance says, and I'll quote again, Mr. Speaker, "The money actually spent by Crown corporations and government departments for capital projects will total around \$840 million in the coming year. That represents an increase of about 20 percent over the total for 1982-83."

That would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that an increase of 140 million is actually going to be spent on capital by Crown corporations alone. Now, that's not as much as the 164.3 million of capital that is supposed to be going into the Jobs Fund, but 140 million is still a very substantial amount, and one might be quite impressed with that much going into the fund; but we have to look at how this year's total 840 million of capital is made up.

It's made up, according to the Minister's Budget, of 520 million, Crown corporation spending, Page 30 of the Budget; 316 million in capital from the Spending

Estimates; that figure appears on Page 1 of the Spending Estimates and I refer the honourable members to it - 316 million. It actually totals 836, not 840, but we recognize that when you're dealing with hundreds of millions, perhaps the government might choose to round it; but the 316 million which the government is putting into the Jobs Fund this year is newly defined capital, 316 million of capital by this year's definition.

Mr. Speaker, if this year's definition of capital had been used last year, we would not have had, as the total shows in last year's Spending Estimates, 174 million in capital; we would have had 306 million, as shown on Page 1 of the Estimates this year. I think you can begin to see what has happened here, Mr. Speaker.

Compare 306 million to 316 million, and where last year it was 174, this year it is called on the adjusted basis 306; but spending in next year's Estimates is 316. The comparable figure to last year would have been \$180 million of capital under the old definition, and you add \$180 million to the \$520 million of capital spending planned by the Crown corporations and you get \$700 million, Mr. Speaker; exactly the same amount of capital as the government was spending last year.

That whole amount of increase of money, Mr. Speaker, comes about as a consequence of a redefinition of capital. There is no increase in the capital spending and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, \$34.8 million of that money was carried over from last year. It was voted last year and is going to be carried over now.

So, Mr. Speaker, we further have to examine what has happened in terms of inflation. What has inflation done to the spending which the government was planning last year? If the government was planning a total capital expenditure program last year of 700 million and inflation has gone up by 8.8 percent, they need to add another \$62 million, at least, simply to take into consideration the decline in the capacity of the money to create jobs as a consequence of inflation. Where is it in this Jobs Fund? It is not there, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, the government last year had an amount of money, and I know that the Member for Wolseley doesn't look terribly happy about what I am telling the members opposite, but if she refers to Page 1 of the Summary of the Main Estimates and Expenditure this year, she'll find there is a figure of close to \$20 million that was in the Jobs Fund last year. So, somewhere between 0 and 20 million, there was capital in there and whatever the figure was, and it was at least 10 million, that has got to be subtracted from the figure which the government claims they are putting anew into job creation this year.

The Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, does not exist as a major thrust, and you will find in this Budget where the Minister of Finance said, "We have the greatest recession that the province has ever experienced in 40 years and the Jobs Fund is our response." Mr. Speaker, the Jobs Fund is no response, because I challenge the members opposite to show that there is one nickel more going into capital spending and job creation than they were putting in last year. There is not one nickel more, Mr. Speaker. There are tens of millions of dollars fewer in terms of the capacity of money to create jobs than was the case last year. This is the government's response by their own statement to the worst recession in 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, they are doing this at the same time as they are turning to the taxpayers. They're turning to the unemployed, to the people on minimum wage, to the senior citizens on pensions who are only going to get 6 and 5 increases; they are turning to all those people and asking them to pay more money and they're justifying it by saying, it's going into job creation. It is not going into job creation. It is not.

Mr. Speaker, what the money is going for is to service the debt. The debt servicing costs over last year are up - I believe the figure is over \$150 million, \$152 million I believe is the increase in debt-servicing costs over last year. The new taxes which the government is imposing on the people this year are expected to raise \$106 million, plus an additional \$42 million from the payroll tax because it extends over the whole year. That's \$148 million which is still \$4 million shy of even servicing the extra debt cost, and they're turning to the taxpayers and saying this money is going for job creation?

A MEMBER: A sham.

MR. B. RANSOM: And that the Ministers over there are going to contribute two or three thousand dollars apiece to the Jobs Fund? What are you going to tell, what are they going to tell the Manitoba Government Employees Association who believe that their \$10 million has gone into job creation, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, there isn't one more nickel going into job creation than there was last year, not one, not a nickel.

There's millions of dollars less than there were because the Minister of Finance chose to juggle the figures and we warned him, we said a year ago - don't change the figures, you are not going to fool anybody. Well, he has managed to fool some people because people out there actually believe, they actually believe that there is a \$200 million Job Fund over and above what the government was doing last year and that this is their response to the worst recession in 40 years.

MR. H. ENNS: T'ain't there.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not there. The Minister changed the method of what's included in Capital and what isn't included in Capital.

Mr. Speaker, if I went out to the public and took money from the public on the pretext that that money was going for a specific purpose and it wasn't going for that specific purpose I don't think that the government would let me away with that.

A MEMBER: . . . run out of town.

MR. B. RANSOM: I wouldn't get away with it.

A MEMBER: You'd be in jail.

MR. B. RANSOM: Now we have a situation where the government is doing that to the taxpayers.

Well, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to provide three quotations to the members opposite and they happen to come in alphabetical order. There is no specific reason for putting them in this order.

The first definition, and this comes from Black's Law Dictionary. The first definition is the definition of deceit

- "A fraudulent and deceptive misrepresentation, artifice, or device used by one or more persons to deceive and trick another who is ignorant of the true facts to the prejudice and damage of the party imposed upon."

The second definition which I would like to present, Mr. Speaker, is fraud - "An intentional perversion of truth for the purpose of inducing another in reliance upon it to part with some valuable thing belonging to him or to surrender a legal right." A valuable thing such as tax money.

The third definition, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to put forward is that of misrepresentation, "Any manifestation by words or other conduct by one person to another that under the circumstances amounts to an assertion not in accordance with the facts."

I leave it, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite to decide which of those fit the circumstance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to contribute to this Budget Debate and as usual, as is my style I will be brief.

First of all I'd like to start by congratulating the Clerk, Mr. Remnant for coming to our Legislature. I'm sure his vast experience will serve us well.

I'd like to also commend the Assistant Clerk for his participation and his stint as Clerk during the absence of our Clerk which was a regrettable incident.

Mr. Speaker, my congratulations also extend to the Minister of Finance for the Budget he has presented. I realize that there are different views on this particular Budget but one cannot get away from the fact that this Budget shows some creativity, shows compassion, and a responsible approach to the economic difficulties that face Manitobans.

It's no secret, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba and Canada as a whole are facing the most difficult economic times in 50 years. Economic troubles that show a million-and-a-half people unemployed in Canada. Some 50,000 of which are Manitobans. There have been bankruptcies and lost output in hundreds of millions but, Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a ray of hope for those unemployed Manitobans. A Budget that we're proud of, I'm proud of as well. This Budget gives security and hope to Manitobans. It works as a support when people need it most.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to kick the crutches out from under Manitobans. This Budget will provide support, it'll give vital support to the people of this province. The spin-off effects of the \$200 million that are being provided are going to have a very good effect on the economy, not necessarily as much as we would like considering that Manitoba is only a province in a sea of unemployment and that we have not as much clout as we would like to have economically. Nevertheless we are working in the right direction.

It shows in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Community Services and Health have received the largest increases of all departments. This is compassion, this is the area that needs it most. Mr. Speaker, this is one Budget that has not and will not cause any panic among Manitobans and for a very

good reason, Mr. Speaker, because we have listened to the people. The Honourable Minister of Finance has shown the best example of the consultative process this province has ever seen. In fact, I have been with him on a number of those occasions. He has visited a great many places and listened to a great many people throughout the province. He has spoken to and listened to labour groups, womens groups, northern groups, native groups. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has listened and that is important.

Of course, we, and he, didn't want to raise taxes. It's never an enjoyable task to raise taxes, Mr. Speaker, but the people of Manitoba are aware of the circumstances because we've been out there meeting with them. We didn't sit closeted up preparing a Budget in isolation that is dropped like a bombshell, like I recall some four years ago, better than that, five years ago, a protracted restraint Budget. Instead it is a supportive, understanding and creative Budget.

We know our responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, and we have provided the best possible means through this Budget to meet those responsibilities. This Budget is exactly what this province needs.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the Tories who aren't sure even what they want, let alone what the province needs, I just recall recently they had a convention. It was supposed to be a policy convention. Unfortunately, the media couldn't find out what kind of policies they were discussing, and they probably weren't. Besides that, I understand that they were having a leadership review vote, and after they successfully carried out the vote and arrived at 67 percent in favour of not having a review, that 67 percent, approximately, were satisfied with the leader they had and they found the leader resigning.

Now, they're going to go out and have themselves another vote and maybe end up with 52 percent for some other person, or maybe the same one, and then they will be satisfied. You know, if that's efficiency, if that's good administration, I don't know, it doesn't make logic to me. There is a policy of confusion from the way I see it. If they were to bring in a Budget, they say that they would cut government spending; yet, at the same time they are calling upon us to spend more. Well, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, they are calling upon us - in fact, the Member for Turtle Mountain just in his speech previous to mine said we have to rely upon the private sector. Well, Mr. Speaker, they relied upon the private sector for four years. They had said the onus was on the private sector to create jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how can the private sector create jobs when they can't sell the products that they have now? They are operating at approximately 50 to 60, maybe 70 percent capacity. There's 30 percent capacity, at least, left for them to produce with what they have now. So, how can they create more jobs if they cannot sell the extra 30 percent productivity? That again is some of the illogic that they are propounding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba support the NDP because we know what we're doing and we are honest and open enough to let them in on it, the fact that times are tough, that we all have to co-operate, that we have to be creative, and that we have to do things together. The Tories have no clear policy at all on the Budget, Mr. Speaker. We've heard criticism and more

criticism, but none of it constructive - not one positive suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government has given unemployed Manitobans hope for the future - \$200 million for a Jobs Fund shows Manitobans that this government is serious in its efforts to create jobs and to create them now. The Jobs Fund will finance a wide range of job creation efforts over an extended period, both on our own and in co-operation with the Federal Government, municipalities, and the private sectors. We have to work together. This Jobs Fund will provide a challenge to the Federal Government to show how serious their efforts really are. We want to know whether they will co-operate, if they will do the same thing. This Jobs Fund calls for co-operation, the kind of co-operation that this government is setting a good example of.

We are not creating the illusion that the Jobs Fund will create full employment. We know it can't, Mr. Speaker, but it will make a difference and we'll make sure that every dollar counts. It is the kind of creative efforts like the Jobs Fund and other programs like it that will make the difference in Manitoba this year.

Another program is the Manitoba Employment Action Program. This program is working so well, in fact, that we've decided to expand it. The Honourable Minister of Labour, Employment Services, announced last week that the funds for this program have been more than doubled to 5.6 million, making it possible to approve 1,700 new jobs for the unemployed, making it up from the original 750, which it had been scheduled for, programmed for.

Mr. Speaker, this government is confident that co-operation will be forthcoming from various levels of government and interest groups right across the board. The MGEA renegotiations are a very good example of the kind of co-operation that we can expect, because people out there are truly concerned about the plight of the unemployed.

The opposition can say what it likes; they can twist it as they desire. This renegotiation was a sacrifice, partial sacrifice, on the part of the MGEA. Mr. Speaker, I've been a trade unionist for many, many, many years. No one that negotiates has a desire to renegotiate and negotiate himself out of benefits. Business doesn't operate that way; unions don't want to operate that way, but when they are reasonable, sensible people and they are explained the situation, then they will have another look at it; and in this instance, we were able to convince the MGEA to reopen negotiations. Maybe some people think it's not much for the Province of Manitoba to have an extra \$10 million which it would have had to spend by contract, because that's what the contract called for, but this was delayed for three months. Consequently, we have an extra \$10 million to \$11 million to spend on the employment fund. No matter how you slice it, whatever else you do, that's what we have.

The contract was also extended by some time. That also means that, renegotiated contract that it was, would not have had new benefits paid at the end of the normal time. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, it shows good faith on the part of the MGEA and it also means that we have been able to accomplish something which has not been accomplished in other jurisdictions.

In other jurisdictions, as you very well know from the news, Mr. Speaker, they have had to legislate people,

they have had strikes, and they have had nothing but misery over the fact that people do not want to lower their standards. Here in Manitoba with our own civil servants, we have been able to negotiate something in a peaceful, sensible manner, and I think that's important. It speaks well of the MGEA, it means they are responsible people, and it also means the government was intelligent and responsible in what it did.

Mr. Speaker, this government is confident that co-operation will be forthcoming from various levels of government and interest groups right across the board. This Budget is a compassionate Budget, one that obviously shows concern for those who have been hardest hit by the recession. This Budget makes creating and protecting jobs our No. 1 priority. Along with dedicating \$200 million to a new Jobs Fund, it will protect and improve our existing services. It will guarantee that the costs of these services are met in the fairest possible way. It is a Budget which recognizes the realities and challenges facing our province, and it is a Budget which deals with them realistically and responsibly. It will help to maintain our economy's solid base, a base from which we can move forward when a national recovery takes hold. It's a creative Budget, Mr. Speaker. The Jobs Fund illustrates this.

The Minister of Finance and his staff have been in the formulation of this Budget and it shows our willingness to co-operate in any way we can to improve the economic condition in Manitoba. We will continue to press the Federal Government to lead an all-out national attack on unemployment. In the meantime, we will carry out our principle of co-operation here at home, as illustrated with the Economic Summit which was held at Portage, and with this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the present difficult situation poses a challenge, not an excuse. Together, we look forward with continued hope to better days ahead for Manitobans.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today, too, to talk about the Budget and such things as the nonexistent Jobs Fund and some of the other things that my colleagues have been talking about, and hope to add a few comments of my own and a few observations which I feel will come to play with regard to this particular Budget.

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned often, and often in this House, when one sits in the Treasury Benches, very often one becomes somewhat sheltered of what is really happening out there and really loses the insight and the pulse of the grassroots people. I suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened, especially to this Minister of Finance and to this government. I mentioned earlier on this last year, in the Christmas Session just before Christmas, that one of the biggest problems this government would face is with regard to the unrest by the people in the private sector when they would be going ahead and providing the type of contracts as we have seen for the Civil Service.

The Member for Turtle Mountain mentioned today that almost half of our provincial spending this year will go to some form or another of public wages; in other words, hospitals, Crown corporations and others. That represents a fairly major portion of the new expenditures that are being looked at. When one looks at the 27 percent increase to civil servants in this province, plus the increments that many of them will be getting - I wouldn't doubt that some are going to be looking at a 35, 40 percent increase over two years when you add the increments that the people will be getting - balance that off against what is happening in the real world, in the private sector. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that there are many people out there who are just struggling to keep their job, who are on the welfare rolls, who are on unemployment, who look upon this new settlement, this so-called heralded new settlement as something that is going to cause this particular government a lot of problems.

How do you talk to somebody who is struggling, your neighbour, who is living in the same kind of house as the civil servant is, who is struggling to try and pay his taxes, trying to keep his job, is maybe working for Schneiders and has ended up settling for 6 and 5, sees a new tax being put on, another percent on the sales tax just to do what, Mr. Speaker? To pay a new contract, to pay a new amount of money to a group of people in society that are totally isolated of what's really happening in the real world. This government will have to live with the problems that particular settlement would create, because I can tell you, it doesn't matter what walk of life you are talking about - the Civil Service themselves realized that it is causing animosities within smaller communities and throughout this province - because you cannot have one sector of society totally isolated from what is happening. This 27 percent wage increase, no-cut contract, when people are seeing the highest unemployment rates - 55,000 unemployed in Manitoba - is something that is really going to haunt this government and has added another big blow to the deficit of this province. So, not only will it cause unrest among the people, among the neighbours of those particular people, it will also cause unrest as far as the deficit is concerned. It's a double-edged sword.

The government has, in this particular Budget, indicated to the people, has held out that glimmer of hope that things are going to be better by indicating that they are going to have a \$200 million job program. As mentioned by the Member for Turtle Mountain, upon close examination of the figures that this government has fudged - and I should add, Mr. Speaker, at this point, my children like fudge - and I would say to the members opposite that if they are looking at getting into the fudge business, that might be one thing that if they collectively sort of sat back and resigned from this, I think they would do a tremendous job of making fudge, because they've sure done a good job with this Budget and the previous one.

Mr. Speaker, what has really happened here and it's pointed out by the Member for Turtle Mountain, is that we have a nonexistent Jobs Fund. When you add up the total amount of capital expenditures by this government, if you'll do a close analysis of the figures, you'll find that what we are seeing here is a con game being played. Mr. Speaker, there is not new money coming into this Jobs Fund. It is a reallocation of existing

capital as well as existing projects, and if you look at the so-called wish list, you can identify a number of projects under normal circumstances would have been in the line departments. All they have done is taken those expenditures out of those line departments, put them in a \$200 million Jobs Fund and heralded that as being something new and fantastic.

MR. D. BLAKE: Ask Lalonde about the wish list. It's not very high on his priorities.

MR. R. BANMAN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that aside from the problems going to be created by the 27 percent increase, this Jobs Fund which has been proven is not new capital, is not a new amount of money - as a matter of fact, the Member for Turtle Mountain pointed out that it doesn't even keep up with inflation; it won't be the same amount of spending as last year. What you are going to see happen is you are raising the expectations of the average man on the street that this is going to really save them and give everybody a job in Manitoba and they are pushing this program, Mr. Speaker, for all it's worth. What you are going to find out is that, given a year down the road, this particular program which is heralded as being such a fantastic thing for Manitoba will really be in the position of not having done anything that is new for this particular province as far as creating jobs. You are going to have to reckon and account to the people, the unemployed, the people on welfare, for not only putting a larger tax burden on them; but for really hoodwinking them when it comes to this particular program. Because I suspect that if we're looking at the unemployment figures now, we will be fortunate if this so-called Jobs Fund will even touch 5 percent of the people who are unemployed today.

So, you're going to have all of those other people out there who expected something from you and who are really not going to get anything because there is no new capital. It's not even keeping up with inflation and what's happening is that the advertising and the P.R. that you're doing on the thing will not really carry you through because in the final analysis the truth will out.

Mr. Speaker, we've been chastised by members in the backbench over there, by Ministers, for not being able to have it both ways. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that there was no question of what the previous administration was trying to do with trying to bring some sanity into, at a time when things were tough and when government spending was on the minds of a lot of people. The problem that we see happening here now, as mentioned by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, is that he feels we were a little bit ahead of our time. That's what he mentioned the other day. Now, they are going to do that. However, you can't have it both ways.

One of the reasons the voters in Manitoba elected this New Democratic Government was that the New Democrats said that the Lyon administration was too tight-fisted. They were not spending money. What should happen is - the hospitals weren't getting enough. People were only getting two strips of bacon, and now what do we see happen? We see the Minister of Health getting up in his seat everyday when we ask him a

question, and he justifies the hospitals and the level of service in those hospitals, by saying we aren't doing anything different than you did. Suddenly, the previous administration becomes the benchmark for the level of care and services in this province. We hear that everyday. You can go back in Hansard and read it. What we are seeing now is, the Minister of Health and the members opposite, who said the health care was a total disarray, are suddenly using our standards as a benchmark. And people out there are beginning to realize it. You can't have it both ways. You can't on the one hand say that it was terrible before and now all of a sudden nothing has changed.

Mr. Speaker, this holds true with other department expenditures. They say now, well the opposition is asking us to spend more money. One of the reasons you got elected is that you were going to change all these things. You were going to spend more money. There was going to be more of everything. So, when the opposition says, what's the problem, how come you're not spending in these different areas? You say, ah, you guys want it both ways. You want us to be tight-fisted and yet you want us to spend money.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the people out there realize that these members opposite were elected last November for basically one reason, for criticizing the previous administration of being too tight-fisted, and they would change that. They would change the problems in education. They would change the health problems. The education problems alone, you've got a horrendous problem. We saw tax increases last year unparalleled to when we were in government. I predict this year, you're going to have real problems again because we all come back again to that settlement of that 27 percent.

Why are the teachers in this province going to accept any percentage less than you've given your employees? Why should somebody settle for 6 and 5 when they can hold up this document that the MGEA signed with this government in which the MGEA says, what a fantastic settlement, no cut contract, 27 percent. How do you expect school divisions to deal with their locals when the government has given their employees a no-cut contract. We've got declining enrolments in the rural areas. It is a fact of life that you can't afford the teachers that you used to have because the numbers aren't there and yet the government over here says, we're going to give you a no-cut contract, 27 percent increase. We're going to give McKenzie Seeds 13.8.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the average guy on the street, not the corporations, not the Civil Servants, but the average guy on the street who is paying the bill and who is working hard, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, is working harder. I have seen an attitudinal change in the last year or so where people are concerned about their jobs. They are taking more pride in their jobs, which I think is a good thing. The productivity is climbing. I see that happening in our little community. Productivity is climbing, because people are ready to go that extra little mile. But when you see things like this happening where you have to see increased taxes to pay for a 27 percent wage package, no-cut contract, people are not going to buy that. The average guy who is working for six, seven, eight dollars an hour is not going to buy that. The person unemployed isn't going to buy that. So, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways.

Here you have the members chastising us for that. I want to say that you have created that particular problem yourselves . . .

A MEMBER: The big lie.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . because you promised to do all these great and wonderful things. There weren't going to be any. Remember those beautiful promises about, nobody would lose their jobs, businesses wouldn't close and it's like a former member said on TV the other night, they were going to bring an Act in which would say that businesses couldn't go broke. He said that was like trying to say that on a bald person's head the hair would start growing. You just can't do that. Just an aside, Mr. Speaker, there are a few members here that probably would like an Act like that passed, but we'll let that one go.

This \$200 million Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, I guess I have to liken that this year to something that happened last year in our Budget. Last year the Minister of Finance, the same Minister that's brought this particular Budget in, talked about the options that they had looked at with regards to taxation. One of the innovative new things that he brought in was what he referred to as a health and post-secondary education levy. At that time, he indicated that sales tax, of course that was a regressive tax, they wouldn't touch that, he had discussed it with the Chamber of Commerce, with the Manitoba Federation of Labour, the Canadian Manufacturers Association and they were all concerned about an increase because it would, instead of help fuel the economy would further retard any prospects of future expansion. That really, he said, was a regressive tax. So, he brought in this Payroll Tax.

Really what he did at that time was say that this particular money, as indicated in the Budget, would be used for, and fully expended on health and education. Later on when he was challenged about that particular statement, he said, well, that's not really true, it's going into consolidated revenue fund and you can't really earmark any particular dollars for these particular purposes. These monies are just going to go on consolidated fund. Here today, as evidenced by the Member for Turtle Mountain, we've seen almost the same thing happen in a matter of a week.

You have a \$200 million Jobs Fund, which he claims and heralds as something new which will be used in an innovative way, and what we see really is that it is once again just an extrapolation of what was going to happen under normal circumstances in this particular province. In other words, it was not any new money. Instead of trying to have the people of Manitoba believe that this has happened, I think you will find out that this particular Minister, that particular Jobs Fund will come home to haunt him in a year or so.

The bottom line of this particular Budget, Mr. Speaker, of course is increased taxes and increased deficit. One of the growing concerns by many Canadians, and I guess not shared by members opposite, is the deficit problem. The deficit, as projected by this government, I believe will prove out to be much smaller than it really will end up being, because this government has done two things. They've underestimated expenditures as evidenced the other day by the questions put to the

Minister of Education. They've also overestimated the revenues, because I don't think from seeing what's happening out there that the corporate taxes and the personal income taxes are going to be what they have estimated. Therefore, I think that the projections, the deficit, will definitely be much higher than the Minister is projecting now, because you're going to have an increase in expenditures above the level that he's quoted and you're going to have a decrease in revenues. So, coupled with those two factors, you're going to definitely see a larger increase than we see today.

The other thing I want to touch on just briefly - and we had a bit of an exchange here the other day with regard to gasoline pricing. Having been in the gasoline service station business all my life, it's an area I guess that I'm very familiar with. Unfortunately, sometimes when you look at the guidelines that we're going to be asked to pass with regard to conflict of interest, maybe some members would say, well, that particular member shouldn't talk about that; but I have difficulty in accepting that rationale because very often somebody that has been involved with something like that has a better insight into it than a lot of other people. But I want to briefly just talk about what is happening with regard to gasoline prices.

We have seen in the last couple of years increases which I guess none of us would have dreamed of four or five years ago. We have seen gas jump now to over \$2 a gallon and we are seeing in the United States it dropping, I believe. I talked to my brother in California last night and he says it's down to 99 cents in California, where we're up well over \$2.00. Well, one of the biggest things that one has to really look at in dealing with this is to realize that 66 percent of every dollar you spend at the pumps today goes into a government coffer somewhere.

For years, the price of gasoline remained relatively stable. Then, of course, with the world oil problem it began to rise, and I don't minimize the concern of the average person to make sure that the oil companies aren't the ones that get their - what should I say - benefit from that particular rise, because they did; and I'm not here to protect the oil companies at all, because many of them during that time made large sums of money and I'm not here to defend those people at this time. Those particular profits, though, I want to point out to members opposite, if they want to get their hot little hands on them, can be taxed without having to take the company over. We can do that by taxation measures. So if there are some larger profits being made by oil companies or people involved in the oil business, one can tax those by either imposing taxes here on the provincial level or on the federal level, so there's no need to take them over.

One of the things that the government, and Ottawa, has used very effectively is they have used the oil companies as the whipping boys to try and get their foot in the door. Now, you have the situation where you have two-thirds of the costs of the commodity going to governments and then you've got additional taxes being levied to buy out things like PetroCan. So you are propping up not only the government, but you're also going ahead and paying for the takeover or acquisition of another company by adding that on to the backs of the consumer.

I remember several years ago sitting on the opposite side and the then Minister of Energy being chastised

for not doing something about the high price of oil. I think all members that sat here at that time remembered the accusations by the then Leader of the Opposition, the now First Minister, about how the Manitoba Government wasn't moving to try and curb some of the exorbitant costs and how the Manitoba consumer would absolutely be in dire straits because of the inaction of the then Manitoba Government. What do we see now, Mr. Speaker? They talk about having it both ways. Did the First Minister of this province now, when we saw a 2.5 cent a litre increase this last week, did he telex Ottawa and say don't put on more tax?

We had something happen in this Legislature last week which unfortunately for the consumer wasn't a very happy thing, but it was very ironical. You had the very people over there who were yelling and screaming at the top of their voices about the high energy costs, then last week brought down a Budget which increased the tax, and then the Federal Government increased it another 2.5 cents. And what did they do? They sat there like a bunch of mutes. You didn't hear a peep. There wasn't a telex that went to Ottawa.

A short year-and-a-half, two years ago, it was all the problems of the then administration that the price of gasoline was going up so high. Now, you don't hear them saying anything; there's nothing, not even the Federal Leader. Not even Mr. Broadbent is saying anything.

Last week, we were served notice that we would get a 3.6 cent a litre increase, and convert that into gallons, you're looking at a 15 cent increase that happened last week in this Legislature that was supported by the members opposite and what have we got? We haven't even got a little squeak out of the members opposite about the high cost of gas because, Mr. Speaker, they suddenly see the revenues that they can grab.

So now we're looking at when that 1.1 percent comes on, I think the last price I checked in Steinbach this morning, you add the 1.1 cent a litre on in Steinbach right now, the governments - Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ottawa - will be getting over 70 cents on every dollar that is pumped at my service station this week - 70 cents. That leaves 30 cents for the retailer, for the transportation, and for the people involved in exploration and the oil companies. So you have got a situation which has developed here in which governments have come into a bonanza.

Now, here we come to the next dilemma. You've got the oil OPEC nations, as well as Britain and some of them, talking about reducing the oil prices. I say to you in this Legislature that I applaud that. I would just hope that some of those decreases could be passed on to the consumers in Manitoba and Canada, but I say to you that with the commitments the Federal Government has made to buy out Petrofina and levied that tax, with the increased taxation as evidenced here in this Budget Speech that we're talking about, with the different wellhead taxes levied by the other Provincial and Federal Governments, we will not see a drop in gasoline tax in Manitoba. We can't, because the governments control the cost. The majority of money goes to governments, so the people of Manitoba and Canada should realize that it is no longer the oil companies that control the price. It is now the government.

MR. S. ASHTON: It's not true up north.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member said, it's not true up north. It is true up north. One of the problems up north - the Member for Thompson doesn't realize that when you go north of the 53rd, whether you be a teacher of whatever, you get usually paid northern allowance - (Interjection) - no, no. First of all, the dealer - if he will go check with his dealer and check what I pump my gasoline for versus what the dealer up there does, he'll find out the profit margin is quite a bit higher because the guy has to make more up there. So that's one of the reasons why it is. It is not the oil company; it's your local guy, because everybody makes that northern allowance. You can't expect to pay no northern allowances up there. There is a reason why you pay northern allowances. It's because things are more expensive up there, so that means the guy that is providing the service - Autopac pays more for repairing cars up north. Why? Because you've got to pay your employees more because it's further up north. That is why, simple. So you've got to collect more for your products. That's right. You're paying more for transportation and also for pumping.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson is protesting the oil prices now. Well, I say to him, why didn't somebody on the government side, why didn't the Minister of Energy in this province complain about the increase we had the other day? Why didn't he? There was an 11 cent a gallon increase by the Federal Government and he didn't complain. Yet, when he sat on this side of the House, it was all the problem of the Manitoba Government. It was all their problem; it was all their doing because they stuck it to the consumers.

Now the other thing I want to talk about is the gasoline tax. I think one of the biggest problems we have with that - and this was the same argument we used when the now Minister of Agriculture was in charge of Autopac and he put a 2 cent a gallon tax for Autopac on it. What is happening with the tax? The Member for Thompson should listen to this because the people who are really hurt by increased energy costs are the people in rural Manitoba and Northern Manitoba. When he is part of the government that levies another 1.1 cents a litre or 5 cents a gallon tax, it is you northerners and it's us rural people that are going to bear the brunt of that. What is happening is you are further deteriorating or further reducing the chances of you getting an industry up there, because the cost of doing business in rural Manitoba is more because you've got to transport your goods, and everything that comes into those communities is more because of the energy costs.

In Winnipeg, you can make deliveries within the city without having to travel the 80, 90 miles, but you talk to the people in Roblin who get a lot of their commodities from Winnipeg. It's those people that are hurt the most. What is happening in this particular situation is that this particular energy tax is actually hurting the rural area much more than the members opposite realize. Yet, they were very vocal when they were opposition and now, Mr. Speaker, instead of arguing it, what do they do? The same week that the Federal Government adds 10 cents a gallon on, they slap another five on, too. You can't have it both ways, and they're trying to have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson is protesting, but he is part and parcel. He's part of that mob over there; he's part of the gang who are doing it to the people of Manitoba.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order.

Does the Member for Thompson have a point of order?

MR. S. ASHTON: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Just for clarification of the member, I asked him to read my comments again. I think he is misrepresenting what I said.

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

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you. Let the record show that the Member for Thompson did not say anything when the Federal Government put a 12 cent a gallon tax on federally and did not say anything against a 1.1 or 5 cent a gallon increase in Manitoba. He sat there last week. We saw 15 cents a gallon added on to our taxes and let's see if he is going to vote against it. Let's see what the constituents of Thompson are going to say about him voting for an increase in gasoline tax when he has been complaining that gas taxes are too high here today. Let's see what he is going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before that this Budget is one of increased taxes and increased deficits. It's an increase Budget and it's also going to have one of the largest borrowings in this province. Now, the largest borrowing is another thing that concerns me. It has been pointed out that all the tax increases - the sales tax, the gasoline tax which we've just talked about, the tobacco tax, the alcohol tax - all these new taxes levied in this particular Budget will not cover the increased cost of servicing the debt. Now that's pretty alarming. When we have a deficit of the magnitude that we have right now and we are increasing sales tax, increasing gasoline tax, doing all these things, and then we don't even come up with enough money to cover the increased cost of servicing the debt, I think that Manitobans should be alarmed.

I think, talking to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, they have indicated to me that the sales tax and some of the tobacco taxes, liquor taxes, and those particular taxes, they can live with if they could have seen some hope or some light at the end of the tunnel on this deficit business. But what have we got? We've got record tax increases and we've got a record deficit, largest deficit in Manitoba's history. And we see provincial borrowing now going to skyrocket to - what? - some \$7.5 billion. We are going to be looking at a close to 7,000 per capita debt in Manitoba for every man, woman and child on a total debt basis. So, I say to the members opposite, that is a growing concern out there and the people of Manitoba will hold them accountable for their actions with regards to this particular Budget.

The whole Budget really, in summation, Mr. Speaker, reads like somewhat of a fairy tale, and I guess when you were growing up and you watched Walt Disney, they had this one song there, "When You Wish Upon A Star."

The whole Budget is predicated on one thing and that is, a recovery. If the recovery does not happen,

members opposite are going to be in big trouble and they know it. They have hinged their whole Budget and everything, hooked it to a star, a comet, and hoped that particular turnaround will happen. If it doesn't, they've got real problems, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the real problems will have to be borne by - not this generation in Manitoba - but future generations, because of the type of deficits that they are running.

A MEMBER: Gone with the wind.

MR. R. BANMAN: One of my constituents referred to this particular Budget as sort of a "Fairy Tale" Budget, sort of a "Cinderella" Budget. The members opposite are hoping for the recovery. They're sitting there in their new coach, waiting for that, hoping that clock does not strike twelve and that their coach won't turn into a pumpkin. But I suggest to members opposite that they better have a very close look at what is happening, because I don't think that the people of Manitoba are ready to accept the kind of deficits, the kind of taxation measures, that this particular Budget imposes.

The people of Manitoba want jobs, they want responsible government, and they want a government that will make sure that their dollars are spent in a proper and prudent manner. This government has not shown any leadership in that particular respect and has, by a series of different changes within the Budget, by throwing out all the different figures, by confusing people, has managed to befuddle many an individual.

But I say to you that only will last so and so long and that in a year or two, the people of Manitoba, the ones that haven't realized it, will realize what this government has done to them and I have no hesitation in saying that I fully believe, as many other people do, that they won't be here the next time around.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. P. Eyles: The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise under provision of Rule 46, to explain to the honourable member that, first of all, I did make reference to the concern about the high price of gas. I did so in this House, in December; and second of all, that in my speech on this very same Budget, I indicated my own concern about increasing gas taxes in northern and incidentally in rural Manitoba, given the fact that Northern and rural Manitobans pay so much for gasoline as it is.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I just reiterate what I said before. I think we will all find it interesting to see what this particular member is going to do with regard to voting for this Budget and seeing that people in Thompson will pay 5 cents a gallon more for their gasoline because he voted for it. Let's see him vote against it.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I point out under Rule 46 that is not debatable. No debate shall be allowed upon the explanation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Deputy House Leader.

Is the Honourable Deputy House Leader speaking on a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proceed.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa says that perhaps I haven't got too much to say because my notes are very short. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I were to consider trying to rebut all of the nonsense that has been introduced by the members opposite during the course of this debate, the exposition of my remarks would be beyond the time limits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me first congratulate the Clerk for his assumption of office. I know already he has been invaluable in this Chamber because regrettably there have been times when members on both sides of the House have strayed somewhat from the Rules and his advice both to you, Sir, and to the Speaker, I'm sure have been invaluable.

Let me say that I enter this debate with some degree of enthusiasm because it does give me an opportunity, as a member of the Cabinet, to reflect on some of the policy decisions that are implicit in this Budget. First of all let me say, however, that I regret the fact that the tone of the debate has been relatively low. I think with the exception of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that debate has been not only low, but it's been flat from the opposition benches.

Let me say also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, however, that some of the debate has been very revealing. It has revealed the kind of thinking that honourable members have towards the role of government in society and that is very, very significant and that is very, very valuable for the electorate, to be able to understand the attitude that politicians have towards the role of government. And what is that attitude?

Well, I didn't hear any of the members opposite taking alarm, or disagreeing with the remarks of one of their colleagues, the Honourable Member for Emerson. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to read again into the record what the Honourable Member for Emerson had to say about government, speaking in this debate, on Thursday, March 3rd, in this House. He said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on page 506 of Hansard, "Government and bureaucracy is like cancer. Would you believe it? It is like cancer. It keeps growing and growing and suffocating the freedom. Every time we pass a bill in this House we take away more freedoms."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, government evolved in our society to effect rules, rules of order, so that men and women in society could be governed by logical common sense rule of conduct, so then we would be freer, free from the fear of the jungle, where there would be order - law and order. And when the Honourable Member from Emerson attacks government as a cancer, he attacks law and order in society, which I had understood prior to this time, was one of the things that people in the Progressive or the Conservative Party believed in. Now we have a demonstration that when they are out of office, government is something that is completely

distasteful, implying that law and order is distasteful and some of the conduct that has happened in this House adds credibility to that point of view, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me say a few more words about political integrity. Members of the Progressive Conservative Party - and I, with some great reservation, use that adjective, members of the Conservative Party met in our fair city not too long ago and they had a meeting. They didn't talk about policies, they talked about leadership and we saw what happened, but during the course of that scene, they distributed some material and one of the documents is called, Fighting the NDP. It has been referred to by the Honourable Member from Thompson, and he did a very eloquent job of describing that kind of propaganda. Well, I am going to talk about the Budget, but I am talking about political integrity in respect to government and Budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this document which I have in my hand, and I'll be happy to table but I think every honourable member opposite has one under his pillow every night - it's coaching, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how they should try and get at the NDP. What do they say? They say NDP policy is a totally impractical alternative for the solution of Canada's problems. Pretty strong statement, eh? Listen, it goes further. Their simplistic unworkable strategies would only drive the country further into the ground. But it gets better, Mr. Deputy Speaker, listen to this. Listen to this gem. They trade their votes in the House of Commons to the Liberal Government in exchange for liberal programs that are similar to NDP policies.

You know, I have to agree with that. I have to agree with that in part but I am going to say something else about that too. That is true. It is true that back in the 30s, back in the early 40s, the CCF, the Co-Operative Commonwealth Federation, the forerunner to the New Democratic Party extracted through their few votes in the House of Commons, old age pensions in this country. They also extracted, by their votes, voting with Liberal Governments, unemployment insurance in this country. They forced a minority Liberal Government in Ottawa to bring in comprehensive hospital and medical care in this country. The honourable members are going to be critical of New Democratic Party spokesman voting with Liberal Governments to bring forward Progressive Social legislation. Let them carry on with that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask, what about the current scene in Ottawa? What about the Progressive Conservative Party and I shudder when I use the adjective "progressive"? They voted 75 times with the Liberals in Ottawa and their representatives on this side of the House and I am pointing to the Conservative side of the House, Mr. Speaker, they're espousing the same jingle that their colleagues in Ottawa are saying in adopting Liberal Party policy. They're saying 6 and 5. The Conservatives in Ottawa voted to put a cap on old age security pensions. That's the kind of thinking. Limit the underprivileged, the poor in society with a 6 and 5, but that's great so far as they're concerned.

They're the people, Mr. Speaker, who don't recognize that 6 percent on a salary of \$30,000 is quite acceptable presumably. But, what about 6 percent on those workers in society who are earning 12, 14, 16, 17 or 18 thousand dollars a year? Six percent is all they will give them. They adopt Liberal strategy and they accuse New

Democrats of voting with the Liberals for Liberal policies. My word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of attitude on the part of Conservatives in Canada indicates that they have no political integrity. Mr. Speaker, New Democrats in Ottawa, Democratic Socialists in Ottawa will continue to fight and vote for old age pensions, family allowances, workers compensation, veterans' pensions. We will vote unashamedly as a party for progressive legislation, and that party opposite, so-called Progressives, will continue to decry social programs that provide a better base for living in Canada.

You know, in that same document, Mr. Speaker, the Tories - and that's a better name for them - go on to say, they criticize and they say, such as the Liberal Energy Program more nationalization of Canada's economy, higher government deficits, more regulation and increased inflation. They're still hung up about inflation. They're still worried about nationalization. What's their response, Mr. Speaker? Are they critical about a Liberal Government that wants to pour billions of dollars into the Canadian Pacific Railway, a private corporation? Not at all. That's the way the government should operate in the Tory fairyland. Yes, pour money into private enterprise. That is their attitude because that is the attitude represented by members over there who are critical of government involvement in an energy program in Canada. They would prefer to pour money into private enterprise. That is their position, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, also we've heard in this Chamber honourable members using a new catch word, a new key phrase when they talk about employment and jobs in this province. They talk about meaningful jobs. Meaningful jobs. Now, what do they mean by meaningful jobs? They mean jobs in private enterprise. That's the only fuel of the western economy. That's the only engine of the western economy, private enterprise. They disregard public enterprise, Mr. Speaker. They believe that public enterprise is offensive and their very attitude, their speeches, their arguments underline that concern. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of old line party governments, both in Ottawa and in this Chamber the public purse has been the fuel that has fired the engine of private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite formed a government, but recently where again the plan was to fuel our economy through massive injections of public money, through private enterprise. Mr. Speaker, that's the techniques that have been employed - I mentioned the CPR - massive amounts of land, massive amounts of dollars to provide that wonderful private enterprise to get off the ground.

Mr. Speaker, mega giveaways have been the hallmark of private enterprise governments in Ottawa and in this province. I won't review, Mr. Speaker, the sordid details about Churchill Forest Industries. The record is clear on that. I won't review the terribly embarrassing giveaways that have occurred in this province under private enterprise governments. Mr. Speaker, our government is not prepared to see the public purse used as a well from which government will subsidize private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, for some time has referred us to a little book that he had which decried the role of democratic

socialism in Saskatchewan. I don't seek to emulate the honourable member in referring to him a book that he would find terribly dull reading, but I do want to encourage members opposite to take the opportunity, if they will, to look - it's a little dated now - at a book that was written by our former national leader, David Lewis, entitled "The Corporate Welfare Bums." Honourable members will recall that book.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the introduction to this book which was written by the way in 1972, Eric Kierans, a former Minister in government, in his introduction to this book wrote these words, "While Mr. Lewis's figures," and he's talking about Mr. Lewis's figures written in this book about the degree of subsidy given to private enterprise, "While Mr. Lewis's figures deal with the '60s, as the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance have pointed out, they are the only figures available, but the exact same state of affairs pertains today." And he's referring to 1972, Mr. Speaker. "When Mr. Lewis speaks of three point billion in corporate income taxes unpaid at no interest cost in 1969, I would estimate that this amount will be approximately 4.7 billion at the end of this year." This is 1972, Mr. Speaker. "Of this amount, about 3.2 billion will have benefited the 200-odd corporations with assets of more than \$100 billion, and about \$25 million will have been received by the 160,000 corporations with assets of less than \$250,000.00. The new firm, of course, gets nothing. Its loans carry the normal bank or IDB rates."

Mr. Speaker, that was the reflections of Eric Kierans in 1972. The situation is far worse today. Private enterprise, these large corporations, are in serious trouble and what have we seen in this country? Have we seen a Federal Government saying, all right, we will give you some assistance, but we will get some equity position in return? Never, never. We'll bail out Dome Petroleum; we'll bail out Massey-Ferguson because it's good for our economy, but they never get anything back in return. It's give, give, give to the private friends of old line parties in business. That's been the history in Canada; that's been the history in this province.

A MEMBER: . . . willing to take back his campaign contributions.

HON. A. MACKLING: I wouldn't comment much on that.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that we need jobs in this country, but jobs, whether they be in the private sector or whether they be in the public sector, should be jobs that will give someone a feeling of satisfaction that they have done something worthwhile. But, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, we have thousands of people - 50,000 people in Manitoba, it's estimated - over 2 million people in Canada who don't care if they can see a monument after they finish their day's work. They want some money to take home and buy their groceries. They don't want welfare. The members opposite are critical of a government that shows leadership in allocating funds for jobs. We have heard very little positive evaluation of our endeavour to find money to create employment. It's been niggling, carping, criticism, all during the course of the Debate on this Budget.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain will question, well, you know, is it really \$200 million. Some

of that money you would have spent anyway. We made a conscious decision not to have money that otherwise could have lapsed for capital projects. We made a conscious decision to insure that there would be \$200 million freed up for job creation. So, no matter how he wants to describe it, the money is there for job creation.

Mr. Speaker, we are under no illusion that, no matter what our efforts, there will continue to be serious unemployment in Canada, serious unemployment in Manitoba, but we will do our best to try and alleviate the harshness of unemployment in this province. We will try and we'll, I hope, demonstrate to the satisfaction of the people of Manitoba that we mean to find ways in which we can stimulate the economy to produce more jobs and to create more public good.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things to be done. The honourable members may criticize the so-called wish list that our Minister of Finance filed with the Federal Government. There may be projects that some members would prefer to see in place of others there, but the list itself, Mr. Speaker, is public formal demonstration of the multi-millions of dollars of public need that exists in this province. It won't be done by private enterprise. It is the responsibility of government to marshal the forces of government, utilize the the borrowing capacity, the financial capacity that government has, to provide for that development of public infrastructure. It is needed; it's costly, but it is essential.

Who, in the opposition benches today, will decry the kind of investments that have been made in this province over the course of many years, even when there have been old line party governments in power, necessary public infrastructure. Are they critical of our government now in advancing further public infrastructure? If they are, let them say so.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to build public infrastructure, yes. Some of it would have been built maybe in 1990. Some of it maybe would be built in the year 2000. Maybe that's the kind of time frame that the honourable members opposite would want but, Mr. Speaker, we will do our utmost in a pragmatic way to fuel the economy of Manitoba. Yes, with taxpayers' dollars, but not with any giveaways in the development of sound public infrastructure that will continue to have value for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about taxation. It's that time of the year when honourable members opposite, honourable members on this side, citizens throughout this country feel some degree of hurt when they have to make a contribution to the Federal Government and the Provincial Government when they prepare their income tax return. I share in that concern, Mr. Speaker, because we all have some degree of criticism about a system that seems to take more and more from the individual taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, that uneasiness, that critical feeling, that attitude that we have is absolutely well-founded.

Do you know that, Mr. Speaker, in 1950, revenue from corporations and personal income tax contributed evenly to gross revenue. Let me underline that. One-half of the gross revenue received by the government in Ottawa came from corporations. In 1980 - listen to this, Mr. Speaker - in 1980, the revenues of the Federal Government were 76 percent from personal income tax

and 23.6 percent from corporation taxes. Wasn't David Lewis right about the corporate welfare bums? Wasn't Eric Kierans right when he described the kind of tax holiday that corporations in this country have had, not for a few years, Mr. Speaker, but decades?

Mr. Speaker, in 1979 - and you know this isn't depression time; 1979 was a good time. Members opposite were in government. Oh, there was restraint on, mistakenly, but the days weren't bad. In 1979, 413,000 businesses and corporations filed corporate taxes. They filed corporate tax returns, but only 200,000 of them paid taxes. Less than 50 percent paid any tax. I wonder why, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if you or members opposite are filing your income tax returns - perhaps it isn't a very complex return. Maybe it's a simple one, maybe even hire H&R Block - but, Mr. Speaker, we have developed in this country such a complex series of laws dealing with our income.

A MEMBER: Use generic terms.

HON. A. MACKLING: All right. You will hire a tax consultant.

A MEMBER: Frank Johnston.

HON. A. MACKLING: The honourable member suggests Frank. I don't think Frank is in that kind of business.

Mr. Speaker, I borrowed of copy of Stikeman from the library here. You can judge by the volume of this book that it's a complex matter. If honourable members would look at the sections and subsections and qualifications that are imposed by the Government of Canada in respect to income tax, it is more than mind-boggling. If you've got any kind of a complex income, you've got to hire a tax expert to file your return. So we have developed in this society, Mr. Speaker, a whole industry of tax experts who do nothing else but find ways to avoid payment of tax. It costs a lot of money, a lot of wasted effort, a lot of energy that is being dissipated in our society. Why? To avoid the payment of tax.

Why should we have a society in which we have so much effort, so many people spending their days and even their nights finding ways to avoid payment of tax? Well, honourable members will say, it's the best kind of society to have, a low tax society. Is it? They've got a low tax society in the United States. Any one of the honourable members opposite, when they go to the United States, knows that when they go, they're sure to take out hospital and medical coverage because God help them if they took sick or were injured in that mighty United States. They would be, Mr. Speaker, in a desperate situation because of the high cost of hospital and medical care in the United States where the citizens do not have coverage like they have in this province. They have that coverage, Mr. Speaker, in this province because social democrats, democratic socialists, fought and worked and pleaded and pushed and finally, reluctant Liberal Governments brought that kind of legislation into being.

Honourable members opposite, I'm sure, sat - some of them were in this House - I know the Honourable

Member for Birtle-Russell was in this House - and cringed and fussed and fumed when we eliminated the medical poll tax that existed in this province. We did away with hospital and medical premiums. If you want them, you can find them in Alberta. You can find them in Ontario. That's the kind of fair taxation, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members like. They don't like to be reminded of poll taxes, Mr. Speaker, but that's the kind of tax they like to use.

Mr. Speaker, they like a low tax society; a low standard of income society too, because they're almost synonymous. If you look, with the exception perhaps of beleaguered Israel, that spends so much money on defense, if you look at the high tax economies of the world, they're the ones that have the highest standard of living. Honourable members opposite used to - they've stopped saying it now - tell us about Norway and Sweden and Denmark. Oh, the high tax they pay there, those democratic socialist countries. Look at the Who's Who on the highest incomes of the world, the highest standard of living in the world and you will find them there, Mr. Speaker. You'll find the Scandinavian countries there, but my honourable friends opposite won't reflect on that fact.

Mr. Speaker, what we need in this society are members on both sides of the Legislature who are committed to fair and just taxation in this country and in this province, taxation based on common sense and on justice and equity, not based on loopholes and ways in which to avoid paying tax on income.

You know, Mr. Speaker, at one time a Conservative Government in Ottawa did have the intestinal fortitude to consider the matter. I have from time to time said some kind things about the late John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of this country, and I will continue to say those things and shame members opposite with the kind of leadership that man exhibited in some areas. He certainly did in respect to medical and hospital care, certainly did in respect to rail transportation in this country, and to their shame they have sat silent so long on that question.

A MEMBER: He also cared about pensioners.

HON. A. MACKLING: He also cared about taxation and under his leadership, under his government, there was a royal commission appointed; that royal commission reported in 1966 was called the Carter Commission. They made sweeping recommendations for a fair equitable tax policy in this country. We know what happened - sidelined, discarded, because the big business interests that support old line parties lined up to lobby against fundamental change in tax policy in this country because it wasn't in their interest, Mr. Speaker. The interests of the big corporations, they are the ones that prevail. They are the ones that call the shots, Mr. Speaker, with the so-called Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party in this country.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we hear the honourable members opposite indicating their concern about business in society. Haven't heard them defending the banks recently, maybe they will. I think I did hear one note of concern that we had continued the tax on the banks - ah, pity that we taxed the banks. What a great pity. They only had a 30 percent profit increase in the

Royal Bank last year. Another bank, the Bank of Nova Scotia - I bank at the Bank of Nova Scotia, a pretty efficient bank because we don't have a state bank - they only had 61 percent, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — So that's the six and five. That's the kind of business that the honourable members opposite like. That's the kind of six and five treatment that rings music in the ears of members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that in this country we had a taxation system that was simple, that was dignified, that was reasonable. I hope that before this government, our government, goes to the people once more that we will have addressed this problem in some way, either through the Minister of Finance — (Interjection) — yes, trying to persuade his colleagues across this country and the Minister of Finance in Ottawa that fundamental change is necessary, or that in some way we force a reconsideration of the tax maze that exists, all sorts of ways in which people can avoid paying their just share of taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we must do is in respect to job creation and job involvement is ensure that in the process we will involve workers themselves in discussing the kind of jobs, in discussing the kind of projects that should be developed in the public interest. I'm proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in our approach to job creation we have started to do that. We have started to ensure that workers have representation on the boards of Crown corporations. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we discuss not only with workers, but we also discuss with business our plans and our objectives.

I won't repeat again the comments that my colleagues have made in elaboration of the Summit Conference we had in Portage la Prairie, but that's the kind of meaningful consultation that cries out for repetition in our society. Let's stop, Mr. Speaker, having the confrontations and let's have consultations.

I've the boards of Crown corporations. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we discuss not only with workers, but we also discuss with business our plans and our objectives.

I won't repeat again the comments that my colleagues have made in elaboration of the Summit Conference we had in Portage la Prairie, but that's the kind of meaningful consultation that cries out for repetition in our society. Let's stop, Mr. Speaker, having the confrontations and let's have consultations.

I'm proud of the fact that the Minister of Finance went out and talked with people about tax policy, about spending constraints, about the problems that government faces in trying to determine appropriate taxation policies. That's the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that enlightened government must do. We must adopt and try to establish in our society a much more open, a much more understanding environment in which to create and develop our economy. Where instead of there having to be confrontations in strikes or lockouts, that businessmen and their workers will sit down and share responsibility for the enterprises they either own or work in. That is possible, Mr. Speaker, in an enlightened society and we, for our part, are going to do our utmost to try to develop that kind of an environment, develop that kind of a framework because that's the kind of open dialogue we need, a dialogue that indicates compassion, concern and co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate I've been proud of the contributions made by my colleagues, particularly those of the backbench who reflect that dedication to a society in which tax policy will be such as to provide for the fairest distribution of income, because that's one of the hallmarks of good government.

Mr. Speaker, I alluded to the change that was made by an NDP Government in this province when we wiped out medical and hospital premium tax. That was a significant shifting of tax from the burdens of low-income people. That is the kind of social justice that can result in effective and planned tax policy.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite have been highly critical of our taxes in this Budget, but what alternatives have they demonstrated? I won't repeat the pointed observations of my colleagues, and not one of the successive speakers who have spoken subsequent has been able to say that they were wrong. There have been no specific suggestions. I should correct that, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry is now in his seat and he made a suggestion - a specific - bring in a new Budget. That's the only specific I heard.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we won't be dismayed. We won't be discouraged by the problems we face, problems that are heightened by the irresponsible and often very destructively negative comments that are made opposite. We will persist. We will not find it easy to find sufficient jobs for people in Manitoba, but we will do our utmost to make of this very difficult time a better time for as many people in this province as we can.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to speak on the current debate before the House and I'm really very sorry that the previous speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources, didn't find much time to speak on the Budget himself.

I rise to speak on this Budget and my leader's amendment to it and I very much regret the fact that my leader was not given the privilege of attending to vote on that.

Many of my colleagues who have spoken on this motion, pointing out to the government some of the problems the adoption of this Budget will create, most, if not all, of the concerns and advice from this side of the House have been ignored by the government side, if they ever even heard it.

One by one, the government members have risen to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and a curious similarity has appeared in their speeches, with the exception of some of the Ministers, not including the Minister of Finance, the members of the government side have launched an attack on - or I mean including the Minister of Finance, excuse me, I was ahead of myself in my notes - have launched an attack on the remarks and personalities of the opposition. They speak on almost any topic but the Budget. We've had dragging back in Hansards to 1966; we've had speeches from 1970 - anything - they will do anything, but speak on the Budget.

As a new member, Mr. Speaker, I find this very curious. I thought the members would rise, one by one, to defend the Budget brought in by their colleagues. Why has this happened? Because this Budget is almost impossible to defend. The \$200 million allocated to the Job Creation Fund would be welcome news if it was not so dependent on the Federal Government.

Then we had the Premier with his suggestion that the private sector contribute funds which they have saved on wages. If the private sector had extra money to donate to the government, we wouldn't be in this problem, Mr. Speaker. In saying this, the Minister of Finance and the Premier are admitting in a roundabout way how dependent the province is on the private sector. This is something they don't readily admit. In fact, we have just heard testimony to that effect in the recent speech.

In the "Wish List" the Premier tabled in the House on Thursday, March 3, there are listed some very interesting projects, not of great interest to the Constituency of Gladstone, however. There is one project listed re the Yellowhead Highway, which is nothing but a reshuffled allocation of a project that would have evolved anyway in the Highways Department. Mind you, if the Premier and the Minister of Finance can get the Federal Government to build a provincial highway, we'll be glad to accept it. I wish them luck, but I think luck is what they're going to need, Mr. Speaker.

Last spring I referred to the financial activities caused by the payroll tax as "The Schroeder Schuffle." While the Minister of Finance is still dancing around the Province of Manitoba, this year's version is the Job Creation Fund. The Job Creation Fund was announced with great fanfare and with great posturing on the part of the government as to how this so-called Jobs Fund is going to ring in a new era for the unemployed in Manitoba. If only it were true, Mr. Speaker, if only it were true.

We'll be looking with great interest to see just how the negotiations go with the Federal Government, because most of these proposed projects depend heavily on the Federal Government if they're going to come about, and we haven't noticed that there has been great results by the Minister of Finance in collecting the payroll tax, so we hope he has more luck with this negotiation.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government does partially fund these projects, the source of revenue is almost the same - it is the people of Canada, the people of Manitoba. The Federal Government does not have a money tree any more than this province has. The taxpayers are the same. The pockets may be different but the taxpayers are the same, and the way the economy is going, there'll be fewer and fewer people able to pay taxes.

Government backbenchers and Ministers have risen to speak in this debate and suggested that the opposition should be giving the government suggestions on how to run the province - an interesting development. Why should they scorn us for not coming forward with help? Have they forgotten that they are the government? It is up to the Premier and his crew to provide the programs and the leadership to this province.

When the people of Manitoba elected a government in 1981, they thought they were electing a government

who would provide leadership. In fact, they were promised great things. Remember the promises? They promised help and the harsh effects of the economy would be turned around. Instead of leadership and turnaround, what have they got? What, indeed, have they got? The people who elected this government expected action and effective leadership. Instead, they got handholding, mouthing words like compassion, caring, consulting, concerning. They are all very important, Mr. Speaker, but it is more important to put the consultation, the caring and the compassion into concerned action. Words means little to the people who are losing their jobs, their farms, or their businesses, because of the policies of this government.

This so-called caring government who professed to have a monopoly on compassion, they have the nerve to think they have the monopoly on compassion. When the people of the province elect a government, they expect them to take over the business of governing, to conduct the business of the province in the best interests of the taxpayers. Then why do we have to put up with a government which will not fully shoulder the responsibilities of government? This government is forever pleading for help from businesses, labour, and financial leaders to help them with the decisions which they were elected to make. Before they were elected they knew all the answers. What this province needs, and desperately needs, is a government which will show real leadership and fiscal responsibility in providing a favourable climate for business and industry.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what we need in Manitoba is a government strong enough to make its own decisions without handholding and pleading for help every time the going gets tough, strong enough to negotiate responsibly with its own employees, thereby setting an example to other employers in the province.

Why should municipal officials have to plead in vain with the Premier for restraint in wage settlements? Advice has been offered from this side of the House but has fallen on deaf ears. One piece of advice which has been ignored by the government is to spend less. The government has a spending problem and more than the revenue problem. Hire fewer high salaried people; face the realities of the times during wage negotiations with provincial employees; follow the advice of municipal officials who suggest in vain that we have wage controls.

Another bit of advice to this government, which went unnoted in the recently tabled Budget, concerns the payroll tax. This side of the House warned you of the problems of the payroll tax when you announced it in the Budget of 1982. When these problems became evident even to yourselves, you could have repealed them; instead you chose to leave it in place and to further erode the business community of this province.

Then we read in press releases the magnanimity of this government when they announced that they will give a 1.65 percent local government general support grant. What is this grant? It's their own money being recycled. They paid into the payroll tax and then they get it back as a grant and they announce with great fanfare in their news releases, they're getting a grant. Big deal!

Now this side of the House is waiting with interest for the report of the Assessment Review Hearings held earlier this year by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hopefully, he will immediately move to act on at least some of the recommendations of the Weir Report so that some of the great inequities in assessment may be addressed. At least let the Minister take a position on this and tell the people of Manitoba what he intends to do, if anything.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs told us before the Main Street Manitoba Program came out that he was waiting to get a perfect program, and we all know how it turned out. It is to be hoped that he doesn't try to do this with the assessment recommendations. They would be more difficult to perfect. I am afraid the people of Manitoba cannot wait that long.

The Minister of Finance, in his tirade in the House on Friday, criticized the Member for Arthur for his remarks on the Beef Program. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and all those on his side of the House would do well to remember that when the farmers of this province are doing well, both in production and in prices, many many more of our friends in the city have jobs because of it. They have jobs in agricultural-based industries such as machinery and manufacturers, sales and services; they have jobs in the meat packing industry, the railways; they have jobs in many service industries. In short, Mr. Speaker, when the farm community of this province prospers, everyone prospers. The cities and towns in this province rely heavily on the farm communities to stimulate the economy, so why is it such a terrible request to ask the government to help the farmers?

Now, in looking through this Budget, I felt that I really should say something positive about what it would do to my constituency. I looked and I looked and finally I came up with a blank page. I searched again - oh there, we have it, guaranteed loans to farmers. I do hope that the guaranteed loans to farmers will be of some help to some of the people in my constituency. They'll be welcome news to some who face financial problems as we move into another crop year. But the ground rules are quite restrictive as I read them. The impression that I got is that you would almost have to prove you did not need the money in order to have your loan guaranteed. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that these loan guarantees, together with the funds for the Beef Program, will give some help to the farmers in my constituency.

On the other side, the negative side of what it does to Gladstone constituency, Mr. Speaker, we have gasoline taxes up, which has a direct effect on living in rural Manitoba; diesel fuel taxes are up; tobacco taxes are up; liquor taxes are up; sales tax is up. So, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the negative side of this Budget is far heavier for my constituency than is the positive side.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must in all honesty break the news to this House that I will be voting for the amendment to this Budget and not for the Budget.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to take a few moments to speak in this Budget Debate and address some of my remarks to those that have

been made by other members in this House and take issue with some of the remarks, even those that were made by the Member for Gladstone.

First of all, I would like to welcome to this Chamber our new Clerk. I have had the privilege of meeting our Clerk in the early '70s at a parliamentary conference in - I believe it was in Halifax when we first met, and recently had the occasion of seeing him again in Victoria when the Honourable Member for Virden was the Speaker of the Chamber and we attended the Parliamentary Conference in Victoria several years ago. I certainly hope that in his new role within this Assembly that he will find his role both enjoyable and fruitful over the years ahead. We certainly welcome him to our Chamber and to our fair province.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone in her remarks raised a question in debate about the Budget and about our assistance to the farm community. She indicated that if the farm community is doing well, then the rest of the province is generally doing well. She said, why is it such a terrible request to this government to assist farmers, Mr. Speaker, is it such a terrible thing that we should ask for assistance to farmers? Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. In fact, the whole thrust of this government's policies and programs in agriculture and rural Manitoba has been to provide the kind of stability, the long term stability, and the viability for our family farms and our production units within this province.

Mr. Speaker, we raised only one portion, one small part of our total policies pertaining to agriculture within the Budget, and that related to the Loan Guarantee Program. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that you pretty well have to be in great financial shape to be able to qualify for this program. Both she and the Member for Arthur, who was the agricultural critic, said that, "I challenge them to point out the farmers that they will help with this program," Mr. Speaker.

It reminds me of the commentary that the members opposite spoke about when we introduced the first Interest Rate Relief Program that this country had to assist farmers, homeowners and small businessmen facing the plight of high interest rates and putting them into bankruptcy. They said, you will not find a farmer in the Province of Manitoba in this income category that you have now put in this program. You are not going to help anybody. Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the farmers that we are assisting come from the constituencies of the members opposite, who spoke that we couldn't find any of those farmers. In fact, Mr. Speaker, more than 600 farmers, more than 600 farm families, have been assisted under this program in the last year.

The bulk of those farm families come from the ridings of the members who criticized the program to the highest degree, Mr. Speaker; the Member for Pembina, the Member for Arthur, and other members in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa indicated that he didn't criticize the program. I'm pleased that he acknowledges that he was one of the few that didn't criticize the program, Sir, but I tell you that the official position of the Tory agriculture critic and several key members of their front bench in the opposition did. In fact, the Member for Fort Garry, when the announcement came, indicated that the program didn't go far enough, it was nothing, it was worthless, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I have to agree in one part that we couldn't provide the kind of money that we would have liked to provide for our program, but to say that it was worthless and wasn't enough, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of reality. Because we have and are attempting to assist many hundreds of farm families under this program and there is between 600 and 700 on the program today, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that the assistance will be able to maintain those farm families in agriculture for years to come.

The Loan Guarantee Program is another level. Mr. Speaker, is another step in that direction. What it will do to those farm families - or at least assist some of them, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I've had members from southern Manitoba, farmers, come to see me - in fact members from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina - who he arranged - farmers, in fact, he set up the meeting to come and see me and I met with them and I said, what can we do? And they said, well if you can provide some assistance to give us some carry-forward, in terms of operating expenses that we will be facing, we will be having a difficult time in obtaining operating capital this coming year - that will be a help. We said, you know we really can't do everything but I said that we would attempt, Mr. Speaker, to do that and that would take care, to some measure, not to satisfy everyone to be able to deal with everyone's financial difficulties, but in large measure, to deal with those farmers who still had some equity remaining and were having difficult times to be able to carry on for the future years.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt, and it was pointed out by several members opposite and members on this side, that if the economy does not turn around, there is no doubt that there will be great difficulty throughout, not only Manitoba, but throughout this country if the economy doesn't turn around. There is just no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker.

But to say that this government, to some measure, has abandoned the farm community, has not tried to assist them, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of reality, because you know, their agricultural critic said that we haven't done anything. We haven't done anything to assist the farm community and he made mention and here is a statement that he made and he said, "I pay attention to what the cattle producers say", Mr. Speaker, and he was critical of our Beef Program. He says, "I pay attention to what the cattle producers say". It was those members, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Arthur, said that no one would sign up for the Beef Program. If we had 5 or 10 percent of the producers in this province, he would stand up here and apologize to us. I am waiting to hear that apology, Mr. Speaker. I am waiting to hear those apologies from those members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Member for Emerson too - he's another one.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, those members - but you know, he said he pays attention to what cattle producers say. Did he listen to the cattle producers when they came to him when he was the Minister of Agriculture and they asked him for assistance? Did he? No, he told them, he said look forget it. Forget it boys,

there's nothing available for you. We're not going to help you. Talk about a government that was caring for agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

We have put into place, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — Oh, Mr. Speaker, now we have statements "start counting the cows". They will try and carp and be able to finger and try to build up a kind of a nonsensical approach, rather than being positive and saying, look, there is long-term stability for the livestock sector in this province. We should be very pleased for the farm economy that for once farmers can plan, can be able to produce livestock beef in this province and be assured of income returns.

They don't want that, Mr. Speaker, because now they've moved away and said, you know, there's going to be lots of problems with this kind of a program. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you do nothing there will be no problems. But when you attempt to do something there will be all kinds of problems and I acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker. There will be all kinds of problems but, Mr. Speaker, I look at the farmers of this province and I recognize that in the main, there will be a few with great difficulty that may show that they want to get something for nothing and sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, they will be found out. Sooner or later they will be found out, but the vast majority of farmers are honest, hard-working Manitobans, and we are looking at the future for those people in this province, Mr. Speaker.

What did we have for the hog industry, Mr. Speaker? For a year-and-a-half the hog industry in this province was in depression, until they were forced into the corner that they had to do something because an election was coming, the industry was going downhill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in terms of future programming, we are bringing in long-term stability to the hog sector. As well, we will be putting forward a long-term Hog Income Assurance Program for the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker. Stability for agriculture, Mr. Speaker, that's what this party is all about, that's where we're moving in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur in his remarks said, "The great objective of this program" and he's speaking about the Beef Program, "was to increase feedlot feeding of beef cattle in this province", Mr. Speaker. It was not that great objective, although we said that part and parcel of the program, we would hope that the feedlot industry would capitalize and take part in the program by custom feeding and the like, but that was not the sole objective, Mr. Speaker. We did and want to be able to finish more beef on the farms in this Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we will no doubt have some difficulties over the years, but it will provide the stability to agriculture, that is required in terms of making sure that agriculture is the mainstay of this province, and we have given it the priority that we think it deserves and it is given high priority within our Budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur, the agriculture critic said that the loan guarantee program will not help one farmer. What he is we have to take into account the existing debt and do something about the existing debt. Mr. Speaker, does he realize, does he know what he was saying? Is he really saying that we should take care of that - it's over \$3 billion of farm debt that

farmers have - and we should be able to write it off and be able to write that off? Is that what he was suggesting, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I really don't understand the mentality of members on that side. On one hand they say don't, you're spending too much money; on the other hand, go ahead and bail out the entire financial institutions in the Province of Manitoba. They really can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. Either they should look at what their agricultural critic is saying, or maybe they should elevate him to the leadership post because they are lacking in leadership material. Maybe he can then stand and sway the farmers and the people of Manitoba on the direction that he proposes to take, or he would have us to take in these difficult times. But to make a suggestion that we should write off all the farm debts in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is ludicrous. It is not only ludicrous, it is maddening, Mr. Speaker.

Nobody on that side, not even the Finance critic — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, nobody is suggesting, the Member for Arthur was suggesting that. He said that the problem, and I'll quote to you, Mr. Speaker, what he was suggesting, "It's past debts that are the problem, it's not the future debt that they're going to incur, Mr. Speaker, that's the problem." And I will read his entire statement rather than even quote that one sentence, "Here's the thing that will strike out the majority of any farmer that may qualify. Guarantees will be strictly limited to operating credit and will not be used to cover existing loans in arrears."

Mr. Speaker, what farmers do we have that don't owe money already? That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's the high interest rates they've had to deal with last year. The high inflation cost that this government helped put on them because of high costs of government at the national level through the Pierre Elliott Trudeau, socialist. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's past debts that are the problem; it's not the future debt that they're going to incur, Mr. Speaker. Is he suggesting that we write off all the past debts and that is the only problem he has, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture has made a statement saying that my colleague, the Member for Arthur, had recommended that all of the farm debt should be written off. He then went on to characterize that as a ludicrous suggestion. It was not what the Member for Arthur said.

Last year, my colleague, the Member for Arthur, was thrown out of this House because your ruling, Sir, said that he misrepresented what the Minister of Agriculture said. Now, I want the Minister of Agriculture to withdraw that comment about the Member for Arthur.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture to the same point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of what the honourable member said, and I raised it in a question that the honourable member - and I quoted what he had said

- my interpretation was that the Honourable Member for Arthur suggested that the farms debts be written off. That was my interpretation of his remarks. — (Interjection) —

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain may disagree with my analysis of what the honourable member says and he can certainly get up and speak in terms of my interpretation of that, but I stand by my interpretation. I did not accuse him, that in fact, well, Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of his remarks stand in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to advise the Chair?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, very briefly. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to what was said by a member who is not present. I suggest that the matter be reserved, and if the Member for Arthur is able to cite what he said and it's contrary to what is suggested he said, I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture will act accordingly, but until that time, we require the clarification. I suggest it be reserved until such time as the Member for Arthur can make a statement on his own behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture to the same point.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to apologize to the House if, in fact, that somehow I — (Interjection) — now the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain says that I have just read the statement. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to apologize to this House and to the Honourable Member for Arthur if, in the course of his remarks, he says that he did not suggest that this was the course of action we should be taking. I will be pleased to apologize that if he gets up in this House and says I did not even attempt to suggest that this is what should be done, I will be pleased to apologize, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable for Sturgeon Creek to the same point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture was getting up and saying he will be pleased to apologize if the Member for Arthur is willing to say that he didn't say this or he didn't say something, the Minister in his speech and we will see in Hansard said "That's what the Member for Arthur said." When he finished speaking he said, but then he said "Is he suggesting?" is what he finished up saying, and he accuses the Member for Arthur of making a statement which he didn't make in the statement that the Minister of Agriculture read. The Member for Arthur did not say that in the statement the Minister of Agriculture read. If we are going to have the Minister of Agriculture be allowed to put an interpretation on a statement, making an accusation against a member of this House which the member got thrown out for, Mr. Speaker, let's start to have rules for all the people in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Before we get further embroiled in this matter, I did not hear the actual words spoken. I will review Hansard and see what the words are in print.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Knowing that you will review Hansard, Mr. Speaker, that's what debate is all about. This government's policies dealing with agriculture are for long-term stability to assist the family farms and we have and are going to continue to put programs that will place agriculture in its rightful position in this province, Mr. Speaker, No. 1, and our record will show that very clearly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to join in the debate and to offer my congratulations to the new Clerk of the Legislature and the Assistant Clerk of the legislature.

I have been a good listener over the last few days and I've heard many words said about the Budget, and against the Budget, and in favour of the Budget. I have not heard too much really in favour of the Budget, but if you have something to say about the Budget, go ahead and say it; if you don't have anything to say about the Budget, don't say anything, because that seems to be the plan of attack.

I have one point, I'm just going to read, rather than make a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to read something that was said in the Legislature on Monday, the 28th of February, on Page 400 of Hansard. It was spoken by the Honourable Member for Thompson, with that little bit of a smile on his face. But this is what was said, "Now, just to take a couple of examples, Mr. Deputy Speaker, . . ." - it appears that Mr. Speaker was not in the Chair and it was Mr. Deputy Speaker that was in the Chair. I remember a few phrases that he used, and who he's referring to is of no matter, because these are the words that were said by the Honourable Member for Thompson. He kept talking about "kooks"; he kept talking about "that bastard child." I suppose we could reply in kind on this side. We could come up with some smart remarks - "Well, it takes one to know one." I think the honourable member feels that he slipped something through the Legislature by making some remarks about the opposition, calling them "kooks" and "that bastard child." I don't appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to bring it to the attention of this Chamber.

I was going to say in my little bit of a speech - it's getting close to the 5:30 closing time and that doesn't bother me, Mr. Speaker, because what I don't say now, I'll say after - but I was going to make some remarks in French and I might even make some remarks in French a little while later. At this point, there are not too many people in the Legislature who would understand me without the translators being here, but I didn't make the arrangements to have the translators here which are the rules of the House and I am not condemning anybody for that.

Once more into the breach, dear friends; once more close the walls with our Manitoba dead. After only a little longer than a year . . .

HON. R. PENNER: I understand that reference.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much. After only a little longer than a year, this NDP Government has given up. They are walking around with their hands in the air and they say, comrade, I have given up. They no longer care to be responsible. There was a deficit last year of .5 billion. There is a deficit this year, probably .75 billion. It is time for some restraint. Stop spending what we haven't got and stop putting the future of our young people in jeopardy. Their attitude is, we're going down; we might as well take everybody with us.

As a matter of fact, I heard and I'm not sure whether this is true, but I think that they are probably going to reestablish the former Minister of Government Services so that he can build more toilets, so that when they flush down Manitoba, he'll be right there.

How did the Minister of Finance go about arranging all of these new taxes and the great deficit that we are going to have? The remarks that the Honourable Member for Inkster made before caused a lot of problems inasmuch as some of the remarks he had made caused the Leader of the Opposition to be removed from the House because it encouraged him to say things that possibly he shouldn't have said. I am very disappointed that I don't have my leader here to listen to some of the words that I'm making, but I will get to that. The Honourable Member for Inkster just sitting there with his gums chopping away there, but that's all right.

How did the Honourable Minister of Finance go about arranging his Budget? I heard the Minister of Natural Resources saying that he was proud of the fact that the Honourable Minister of Finance went out and consulted with the people that were concerned. He had open dialogue and that indicates compassion. How did the Minister come about all of these tax changes that have come about? He's got a payroll tax of 1.5 percent which he left in place and that's caused a lot of businesses to close up. We won't dwell on that too much, but how did he come about the increase of 1 percent in the sales tax? I can just visualize the Honourable Minister of Finance sitting in his chair and saying to himself, where will we get the additional monies to spend? The Honourable Minister of Finance heard something and it was really the hissing of - you know - should we raise the sales tax? And he heard the hissing of the radiators, that sssss, and he mistook it for somebody to say, yes. So that's why he raised the sales tax. He heard something that caused him to believe that "yes" was why he should raise the sales tax. How much should he raise it? He looked around and he saw the statue of Moses over there - 1 percent. Now this isn't what I call dialogue. This is reaching up in the air to come up with these figures.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, it's the finger in the air, not the ten.

I remember a little story about the waitress that was standing in a restaurant — (Interjection) — oh, this is a good one because I have something more to say

about this waitress that was standing in the restaurant. She was standing there unconcerned, and the restaurant was quite busy, except that the tables that she had to wait on weren't too busy and she was just standing there. One of the tables close by, the fellow had taken a cigarette - by the way, I just finished smoking; I haven't smoked for two years now, as of last Saturday - and the waitress looked over at one table and there was this man smoking and he puts his cigarette into the ashtray and there happened to be some paper there and the paper caught on fire and started to burn. He yelled, waitress, waitress, please, some water, we can put out the fire. She just stood there and he says, waitress, waitress, please, some water to put out the fire. And she stood there and then he says, are you not going to help? She says, I'm sorry, sir, that's not my table. Fine, it's not my responsibility is what the waitress is saying.

Now let's put it into context where the government are sitting there and the table is on fire. The table's on fire, they're sitting there and they are saying, it's not my responsibility. That's not my table. Unemployed in the Province of Manitoba - sure they have come up with some little effort to try and correct the unemployment, but not enough. It's not my table; it's not my responsibility.

Hydro rate increases - why are you increasing Hydro rates? We have promised business the opportunity to come into this province at a secured Hydro rate, but you are disregarding it under any circumstances. It is being disregarded. Hydro rates are going up. It's not their responsibility; it's not their table.

The loss of the mega projects - Alcan, the potash and the Hydro - not my table, not my responsibility. That's fine. It will come back to haunt you. Highways, hospitals, social services - not my table, not my responsibility. It will come back to haunt you.

We need a better balance of the cutbacks and the expenditures. We are not saying that you've got to cut back to the bone. We're not saying that you've got to stop spending. You need a better balance. There are things that you are wasting money on; a better balance is all that I'm saying. Let's not make decisions just for political purposes. There are a lot of people who suffer because of those purposes.

I am going to talk on health, and I don't feel that I'm taking advantage of anybody by talking on health, but at this point we have something happening in the Province of Manitoba that I've got to give the Minister of Health the greatest accolades for his stand that he took at the NDP convention the other day. I think that he's got to be congratulated. Sir, for the stand that he took, except where he said that he would leave the party if they brought around a resolution that favoured abortion. — (Interjection) — I believe that was what the resolution was. It might not have been, Sir, and if it wasn't I will apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening. When we next meet on this motion, the honourable member will have 30 minutes remaining.