



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XL No. 27A - 1:30 p.m., MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIB
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	ND
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	ND
CARR, James	Crescentwood	LIB
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIB
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	ND
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	LIB
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	ND
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	ND
DOER, Gary	Concordia	ND
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIB
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	ND
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	ND
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	ND
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIB
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	ND
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	ND
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	LIB
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	ND
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	ND
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	ND
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	ND
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	ND
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	ND
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	ND
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	ND
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	ND

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 22, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Garden City Collegiate thirty Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Roberta Topping. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak).

Also this afternoon, from the Job Entry Program at Evergreen School Division, we have 19 adult students. They are under the direction of Laurel Johnson. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ESL Programs Government Commitment

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, during the election, on September 7, 1990, on a radio show debate, the question was posed to the Premier (Mr. Filmon): What promise will you make to preserve both the size and quality of the existing second language programs for immigrants in our province? The Premier answered: Education, particularly for immigrant population, and we believe that they are very key to our economic future, so we will continue to support the ESL program.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend we met, and again today our critics met with a number of students from Red River Community College whose programs are being cut by the provincial government.

I would ask the Premier: In light of the fact that six teachers have been laid off, 160 students and 10

courses are being reduced with his government's budget announced last week, will the Premier reverse the decision in that budget and keep his commitment to the size and quality of ESL programs that he made in the election to the people prior to the vote on September 11?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, before the Leader of the Opposition puts misinformation on the record, I would like to indicate to him and to the House and to those who are taking ESL programming throughout the province of Manitoba that in fiscal year 1989-90, \$1.1 million was in the budget for ESL programming; in the budget of 1991-92, \$1.3 million is in the budget for ESL programming. That is a 20 percent increase over two years, based on the Premier's commitment and this government's commitment to ESL programming throughout the Province of Manitoba.

* (1335)

ESL Programs Government Commitment

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have over 1,000 people over the weekend who disagree with the minister who rose in her place today, because they know in fact that there are 200 -(interjection)- well, that is a different issue now, they were making decisions. Well, that is what we want to get to. What decisions did you make and why?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated during the election that immigration was a key to our economic future. Hundreds of students today stated that ESL was a key to their future in our province. There is a 200-person waiting list at Red River Community College. The government, directly through its own budget, cut that program and 10 courses and six teachers in that program, affecting hundreds of students.

I would ask the Premier whether he will keep his word from the election in terms of ESL at Red River Community College, or is he going to go back on his word and in fact cut those programs at our community colleges?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I think it should be known that there were two deliveries of ESL in the city: one was done by Winnipeg School Division No. 1, the other by Red River Community College.

In an attempt to more cost-effectively deliver ESL training to students and clients throughout the city and throughout the province, it was decided that we would indeed allow Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to deliver the generic ESL training. Red River Community College will be delivering ESL training of a more specific nature, which is going to be for specific programs and for individuals who need specific ESL training. The generic training that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) referred to is increased by 20 percent, and it is indeed the generic type of ESL training that we are speaking about today.

ESL Programs Government Commitment

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, while there is a waiting list at the Winnipeg School Division and there is now a greater waiting list in the whole "system" because of the cutbacks in the government budget that were announced last week, the waiting list now will be 200 greater at the community colleges because of the cutbacks of this government.

So I would ask the Premier, who has made statements about the province taking over more control, western premiers taking over more control of immigration, why on the one hand is he saying immigration is the key to our economic future and also making commitments in the election to the size and quality of the existing ESL, which includes Red River Community College, and why is he going back on his word and going back on the policies that made Manitoba have the best ESL program all across Canada?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, there are none so blind as those who will not see. Two straight ministers have indicated that there is 20 percent more funding than was there two years ago for ESL training. The Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) has described the difference between generic ESL training and specific trades-related and oriented ESL training, and he has told the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) how the matter has been distributed.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot add any further to it other than to say, the 20 percent increase in funding over two years is not a cutback.

Health Care System Multicultural Services

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House and in fact the multicultural community as a whole cannot help but conclude that this government does not care about multiculturalism. We want to know why they are following more the advice of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) than listening to the voices of our newcomers, our immigrants and our refugees.

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, on this matter for the Minister of Health, because this government did not stop at ESL cutbacks. It has also targeted multicultural health services.

Mr. Speaker, we want to know why, if multiculturalism is such a priority for this government, this past week the Deputy Minister of Health sent a letter to Planned Parenthood informing them that their valuable program called the Immigrant-Refugee Health outreach program, one of the most significant and successful multicultural health services in the province of Manitoba, was denied funding. We want to know how this minister and this government can justify that kind of cutback—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* (1340)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to my honourable friend that the commitment this government has to the health of newcomers to the province of Manitoba is not narrowed to one single effort that my honourable friend refers to through Planned Parenthood, an operation that we provided support funding to last year as a start-up grant, I have to tell my honourable friend, with no commitment that we would be able to continue any future funding.

Mr. Speaker, lest my honourable friend wants to leave the impression that we do not consult and/or act upon advice of the multicultural community in terms of their health matters, let me indicate to my honourable friend that for the first time in the province of Manitoba this government has a Multicultural Health Advisory Committee made up of representatives, professionally and from the newcomer community to Manitoba, to provide

government on needed areas of advice, policy change and direction so that we can better serve the health care needs of newcomers to Manitoba who, through language difficulties, through cultural adjustment difficulties do not understand the range of services available to provide them with the care that they may well need. The advisory committee is providing with policy direction around those very issues.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, his advisory committee will tell him that the Immigrant-Refugee Health outreach program is a success and must be continued.

I want to ask the minister how he could stand up in the House on November 30 and say, I have been more highly involved in the multicultural issue than probably any other issue, and then on April 17, 1991, turn around and withdraw all funding for one of the most successful services in the health care field for the multicultural community of Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to my honourable friend the nature behind the funding last year.

The reason I made that statement November 30 is that we have established a number of initiatives in which we are trying to focus on the very unique and special needs of health to newcomers in Manitoba.

One of the first initiatives was an attempt to come to grips with problems in the mental health field, because some of the newcomers to Manitoba come from countries where they were oppressed by the government of the day, and that has caused some difficulties in adjusting to our democratic and free society in Manitoba. We put special efforts in place, through our Mental Health Division, to try and address those unique problems before they become major health risks to those newcomers to Manitoba.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Well, it is clear he is not listening to his own advisory committee, and we want to know if perhaps that is why he has cancelled his meeting with his own advisory committee for this Thursday at six o'clock.

My question to the minister is: How can he on one minute of the day talk about health care reform so that we can have savings down the road and in the next breath cut back a program that will not only incur savings for all taxpayers but will aid the most vulnerable members, the most voiceless members in our society today?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal as calmly as I can with my honourable friend's preamble to her third question, wherein she is indicating that I cancelled a meeting for Thursday of this week of my Multicultural Health Advisory Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of that committee has a pressing family matter which took him out of the province this year. That is why the meeting did not proceed. She might consider the interests of people other than her narrow partisan political approach to issues in this House.

Medicare System Abuse Study

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to read some quotations by the federal Minister of Energy with respect to the state of medicare in Canada, one of those statements in which he said that people believe that there is abuse of the medicare system.

Since that abuse would only have to be identified at the provincial level, can the provincial Minister of Health tell this House today if there are any studies in the province of Manitoba that would indicate that there is anybody who is abusing the medicare system here in the province of Manitoba?

* (1345)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I presume my honourable friend is referring to the newspaper coverage of apparently a resolution brought forward for debate at an upcoming federal party convention.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any background knowledge such as may have stimulated the resolution, but let me deal with the issue of health care services in Manitoba and the approach we have used. I want to indicate to my honourable friend that in January of last year, after receiving advice from the professional pharmacists of Manitoba, who indicated that there were overprescribing tendencies for certain restricted narcotic pharmaceuticals, we took their advice.

We brought in the triplicate prescription program. In its first year of operation, the number of narcotic pharmaceutical prescriptions went down significantly with a cost saving of approximately \$750,000 to the Pharmacare program and increased health status of those Manitobans who

were no longer being prescribed and using narcotic and addictive drugs.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, what the minister is suggesting is that doctors are overprescribing, because patients cannot overprescribe medications for themselves.

I want to know very simply: Is there any clear data that would lead Mr. Epp to say, "Many people believe user fees reduce abuse, and so there would be less of a drain on the system"?

Do we have any of that kind of statistical evidence available in Manitoba that would indicate Manitobans are abusing or misusing our health care system?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question on behalf of Mr. Epp, and I would suggest that my honourable friend contact Mr. Epp if so interested in finding out what might drive his decision making.

Let me tell my honourable friend, because she has accused the doctors of overprescribing narcotic pharmaceuticals in the introduction of triplicate prescriptions, that is as usual not the whole truth from my honourable friend the Liberal Leader.

One of the problems that we addressed in the triplicate prescription were those Manitobans who were double, triple, quadruple doctoring with no ability to recognize that they were doing that and hence abusing the Pharmacare program.

That triplicate prescription program allowed us in a very, very good way to come to grips with overprescribing of narcotic pharmaceuticals, saving the taxpayers of Manitoba and improving the health status of other Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

Health Care System User Fees

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that there is no statistical evidence available that people are abusing the health care system, and yet this government introduced just last week a user fee on the transportation of northern patients.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Health tell us today if this is his way of co-operating with the senior federal minister from this province so that user fees will become a way of life in the province of Manitoba and in Canada?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): In simple terms, as clearly and as precisely as I can make to my honourable friend, the answer is no. Furthermore, we do not accept advice from Mr. Epp unless we think it is good for Manitoba. Neither did we accept the advice from the Liberal Leader when she said we should charge for meals in hospitals, toothpaste in hospitals; that we should throw 40 percent of Manitobans currently in personal care homes out on the street. We will not take that advice either, Mr. Speaker.

* (1350)

CareerStart Nonprofit Organizations

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Family Services.

Mr. Speaker, the primary failure of this budget is that it does not offer solutions for the No. 1 problem facing Manitoba, namely, economic recession and growing unemployment. Instead, it is making the recession worse through cutbacks, including the scaling down of the CareerStart Program.

Mr. Speaker, the question to the Minister of Family Services is: Can the minister confirm or acknowledge that the nonprofit sector will for the very first time have to pay one-half of the wages of the students hired under CareerStart?

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the member of course is correct that we have made a lot of essential decisions in this budget, and while we do not like to see the program reduced, the CareerStart Program has been somewhat reduced in budget from previous years. People are currently applying for the program, and I believe the deadline is May 3. All of the components of the program will be treated in the same way this year.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, he has confirmed that the nonprofits have to pay half. How can the minister expect groups such as the Canadian Council of the Blind, the Kidney Foundation or all those dozens and dozens of community groups that run direct services for people with handicaps, how are they supposed to be able to participate in this program? You are forcing them to pay half of the wage. They do not have enough money to operate as it is, so you are virtually going to eliminate them from the program. How can they participate?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, many of the businesses, nonprofits and community groups who have taken advantage and participated in this program in the past will again be participating in the program this year. We are pleased that we are able to offer a number of millions of dollars in financial support so that these summer positions for students can be put in place.

Job Creation Statistics

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Will the minister tell this House how many fewer jobs will be created this summer because of the reduced budget and because of the reduced wage subsidy for the nonprofit groups? Are we looking at 2,000, 3,000 fewer students given job opportunities because of the cutbacks of this government?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, in the past year somewhat over 4,000 positions were created through accessing the CareerStart. Many of the businesses of course access two and three CareerStart grants. We are going to make every effort to have those grants passed around to as many nonprofits and businesses as possible. We anticipate somewhere around 3,000 positions will be created by the use of the CareerStart Program.

Fishing Industry Financial Assistance

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, in addition to having their loan assistance for the upcoming season put in question by this government, fishermen are also facing a cutback in the northern fishermen's freight allowance of over \$82,000. This will create additional hardships and cut into their profits when they do get their fish to the market.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Why is this government and this minister threatening the livelihood of Manitoba's fishermen?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, the same question was raised last week by several members opposite. It has been indicated to both the members in this House and to the fishermen of Manitoba that steps are being taken to review the manner and way in which the loans program has functioned for the fishermen of Manitoba. My understanding is that

those are proceeding and announcements will be made in due course.

Fishing Industry Financial Assistance

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Can this minister tell the House why the government moved the administration of operating loans from MACC to CEDF at such a crucial time in the fishermen's season without any regard to informing the fishermen?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for and charged with the administration of The Communities Economic Development Fund Act): Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that it is unfortunate that the member for Interlake had not been aware of this. It was the member for Gimli who in fact brought it to the attention of the government, the timing and the concern for the fishermen. -(interjection)- I am surprised the member is getting excited. He should have been excited a little sooner on this.

Let me make it very clear that CEDF is working with MACC to make sure that the program will be delivered probably more efficiently and probably, with the fishermen in the North, a little better program than it has been in the past. I can assure him, even though he was not aware enough to speak on what was going on, that with the work of my colleague from Gimli, who is concerned about the fishermen, we will work positively on behalf of those individuals.

* (1355)

Mr. Cliff Evans: Mr. Speaker, by what date, I have asked this minister, I have asked the Minister of Agriculture. The fishermen are calling me daily—daily—long before they were calling the honourable member for Gimli.

By what date can this minister assure that CEDF can approve the loans? What date?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it is being worked out between the MACC and CEDF. Meetings have taken place over the last few days and are going on today. I can assure him that the program which the member refers to I am sure will be available as it was in the past within a very few days.

ESL Programs Government Commitment

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

This government and the Premier never cease to amaze me. Earlier this morning -(interjection)- his colleagues might not be so happy to applaud the Premier (Mr. Filmon) once they hear this comment.

Earlier this morning, the Member of Parliament from Winnipeg North, Dr. Rey Pagtakham, called the Red River College to find out what effects and impacts the cutbacks this government has superimposed on immigrants who are going to be using ESL programs were going to have upon his constituents. He received a return phone call, at which time he was told that if he has any questions regarding the ESL cutbacks that he is going to have to call the Premier's office.

Mr. Speaker, is it government policy that everything that has to go through Red River College or any other organization in the province of Manitoba has to be funnelled through the Premier and the Premier's office?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this member for Inkster never ceases to amuse me.

The answer to his question is no, Mr. Speaker.

ESL Programs Funding

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship.

Earlier in Question Period she made reference to the '89-90 Supplementary Information and the '90-91 and said in fact that it is an increase, that the government is committed to the ESL program.

My question then is to the Minister. If we take a look at today's Estimates, the debates that are ongoing right now, there is in fact a decrease when we look at ESL, at the Grant Assistance, from \$1.5 million to \$.98 million.

My question is to the government. Will this government commit last year's budgeted amount to the ESL program in this year's budget?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, in fact we have committed more money to ESL in this budget, and maybe if the member chose to wait for the

Estimates process and learn the details of that line in the budget.

Previously in last year's budget, Mr. Speaker, the federal government flowed their money for ESL programming through the Manitoba government and to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and Red River Community College. This year the federal government is paying directly to Winnipeg School Division No. 1, so in fact we are not showing that cost recovery in the Estimates this year as we were last year. In fact, there is more money going, not less.

Government Commitment

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that Red River, when it comes to ESL, there are going to be fewer students going next year, starting in September, than there are this year. This government says that they are committed to ESL, but their actions do not speak—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster, kindly put your question, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Does this government support ESL or does it not? If it does support ESL, then why do they not start showing and proving it?

* (1400)

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, there has been a 20 percent increase in funding for ESL programming from this government over the last two years. I would indicate to the member opposite that that certainly is a commitment by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate something that happened over the weekend. Someone whom I know well was asked to sign a petition by someone in the community at a local convenience store in support of ESL programming. When the person who had the petition was asked about the difference between Red River Community College and Winnipeg School Division No. 1, the answer that was given to this person was, well, in fact, people at Red River Community College do not have to pay for ESL programming, but people who go to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 do have to pay. I would hope that is not the kind of information that the opposition is giving to -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Minister of Culture and Heritage withdraw her last comment. She is imputing motives, which is not parliamentary. We have been fighting in a fair fashion for the protection of the ESL program. This government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member did not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

Wards Boundary Review Government Research

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

The wards boundary review commission has now completed its hearings. My understanding and that of every political commentator is that there has been a consistent support for maintenance of the present system, a strong inner-city representation, a recognition of Winnipeg's historic communities and strengthened community committees.

My question for the minister is: Will he now recognize this extensive expression of public support, or will he continue to follow his own ideological agenda and insist only on a report which recommends between 12 and 15 councillors?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first of all, it would be foolhardy in my view to have set up a committee to go out and hold public hearings and not at least wait until they report. That, Mr. Speaker, is anticipated sometime in the next week or two.

Ms. Friesen: I assume that the minister has examined the research produced by the urban institute of the University of Winnipeg and presented to the Eldon Ross wards review committee.

Mr. Speaker, against all odds, I continue to anticipate that the Minister of Urban Affairs has commissioned research within his own department as a basis for bringing forward legislation for the ward changes in Winnipeg.

My question for the minister is: What is the basis on which he is proposing these radical changes? Where is the evidence to show that it will benefit Winnipeggers? What research has this minister commissioned?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect, and if I could offer some advice, that hypothetical questions really have no place during Question Period in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to my honourable friend earlier that I do not know where she is getting all of the statements contained in her preamble, because no decisions have been made, nothing has been tabled in this House, and I just finished saying that we will deal with the report when it is received.

Report Availability

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question dealt with research, not with hypotheticals. This minister is certainly very familiar with hypotheticals.

Given Canadians' current concern for open public institutions, is the minister prepared to table in this House the full record of both the public hearings and the private meetings which the Eldon Ross review committee has conducted over the past two months?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about hypothetical situations, when we talk about theoretical applications, the entire City of Winnipeg Unicity act was a hypothetical imposition upon the people of the city of Winnipeg by a former NDP government. They were the ones who caused the whole problem in the first place by creating that great urban experiment. That great theoretical application of municipal government created many of the problems that we have today as a result of that activity.

Harvey Pollock Case Public Inquiry

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice.

The Pollock matter has lingered in the public's mind for several months, and it has not been resolved by this minister's inactivity in this regard. Given the request from the city and given his own involvement and the involvement of his department and his own involvement by virtue of having reviewed the files and the charges, will this minister commit today because he owes it to this House to holding a public inquiry into the Pollock matter?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I have already responded in a positive way to the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, who visited my office the morning following a council meeting in the City Council Chambers ratifying a recommendation by the Executive Policy Committee. I have responded positively to the request that there be an inquiry into the matter referred to by the honourable member.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the same minister is: Will the minister table in this House today the terms of reference for that particular inquiry?

Mr. McCrae: When the terms of reference are fully developed, they will be made public, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chomlak: My final supplementary to the same minister is: Will the matters be public, and will they include a review of the Crown's actions in this regard?

Mr. McCrae: I am not sure why the honourable member has a fixation on the part played by the Crown in this matter, but ultimately the review of the whole matter will deal with the part played by the Crown, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member asks whether the inquiry will be public. I have made it clear that all outstanding questions will be answered. The question of how the inquiry will be operated is a matter I hope to take up with the person or persons vested with the responsibility of conducting the inquiry.

The Brick Warehouse Prosecution

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh).

I would like to know why any firm in Manitoba should go to the expense of registering their name when in fact Brick Warehouse of Calgary can flaunt the law and get away with it. For over 1,000 days the government has refused to press charges against Brick Warehouse Limited for failing to register their firm under The Corporations Act and The Business Names Registration Act.

Would the minister tell this House why the government refuses to press charges against this renegade firm?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the decision in the Brick reference was rendered very recently, and I have not yet been given a briefing from those reviewing that decision as to all of the implications of that decision to this point.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping by asking the question to a different minister that I would get a better answer than I have been getting for the last couple of years from this minister.

My question is again to the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh). The minister should know that failing to register under the act is subject to a fine under Section 187(5) for each day that the firm is not registered and that the fine for the Brick Warehouse would now amount to over \$50,000 for every—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the honourable member kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Maloway: My question to the minister is: When will the minister act to press charges against the company and collect this revenue?

Mr. McCrae: I would ask the honourable member to review Hansard and read the answer I just gave. A review of the decision is underway and answers to the questions like the honourable member is putting are forthcoming after that review is complete.

Business Names Registration Act Intention

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the government perspective on this issue has not changed one bit, and they have had a whole year now to do something about it.

I would like to know what the real purpose of The Business Names Registration Act is in the first place. Is it just simply a way for the government to raise money from companies, because it appears to give them no protection?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The honourable member knows full well from discussion of this matter over three sessions lasting for the last couple of years that there are some pretty significant issues involved in the Brick matter. It was this government and my department that assisted in the reference to the court so that the Brick matter might hopefully somehow be satisfactorily resolved. Obviously the

questions are not quite so simple as the honourable member would suspect.

I suggest the honourable member take the time to look further into this case himself, as we are doing with our review of the judgment that has been rendered. A simple look at Sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution of Canada might prove pretty instructive to the honourable member.

* (1410)

Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba Budget Reductions

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

In the summer of 1990, when the Minister of Health announced the drug abuse program chaired by the member for Fort Garry, he made a statement: "A new approach is needed which recognizes the role of prevention and the importance of empowering and supporting individuals and communities at the time they are battling addiction."

Can the minister tell this House why this government has slashed \$174,000 from the AFM's drug awareness program?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the reductions in budget at the AFM are those reductions in middle-management staffing positions. The programs and their availability to the community and their utility and value to the community will remain untouched.

Substance Abuse Prevention Programs

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, the news release also said there is growing concern that addictions go beyond personal behaviour and are linked to the social and economic factors such as unemployment, lack of social supports, geographic isolation and a sense of hopelessness. All these things exist today in this society.

Can the minister tell this House: Have they given up their so-called War on Drugs, and why are they ignoring the children of this province?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): The simple answer to at least part of my honourable friend's question is no.

The second more full answer that I would like to give my honourable friend is that the children of this province, particularly adolescent women, are

exceedingly better served today than they were last year, the year before or any time in the history of the province if they suffer from addiction to drugs and alcohol.

On Friday of this week a number of us from this House, including the chairman of the War on Drugs Committee, the MLA for Fort Garry, the MLA for St. Norbert and myself were at the St. Norbert Foundation doing a ribbon cutting with a young woman at Kirkos House, the first adolescent women's treatment program in the province of Manitoba and the first one in western Canada to deal exclusively with the addiction problems of young adolescent women.

Substance Abuse Prevention Programs

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the Minister of Education.

Given that there is a 10 percent reduction in the curriculum services which formulate the new programs, can the minister tell this House when the students in Manitoba will be receiving the compulsory drug awareness program?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to my honourable friend that indeed there are several programs that are being delivered through the Department of Education and Training in the public schools of this province which have to do with drug awareness and the prevention of abuse of drugs. Communities throughout Manitoba have become involved in the delivery of those programs, and I might add that almost every school in this province today is delivering some form of drug awareness program in their particular high schools and elementary schools.

Tourism Northern Manitoba

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism.

Last year the Manitoba lodges and outfitters, many in northern Manitoba, experienced a 40 percent reduction in tourist traffic. In this budget, this government has chosen to cut off the support to the North of 53 Tourism association.

My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism. How can this government talk about its support for the tourism industry and cut off support to the only regional organization which supports tourism in northern Manitoba?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, not unlike a question in this House on Friday.

The kinds of promotions that the department of Tourism is undertaking, working co-operatively with the outfitters and tourism organizations throughout the province, are in terms of a focused approach in the target markets that we are going after, promoting the positive aspects of our outdoors in terms of our fishing and lodges and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think the results will speak for themselves after this promotion is complete.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Nonpolitical Statements

Mr. Edward Connery (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for permission to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Portage la Prairie have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave? Agreed.

Mr. Connery: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to recognize Dr. Don Rae.

Dr. Don Rae was named 1991 Family Physician of the Year by the College of Family Physicians of Canada. This prestigious award is sponsored by the McNeil Pharmaceutical (Canada) Ltd. and will be presented to Dr. Rae at the Royal York Hotel in Toronto. Dr. Rae was selected by the National Endowments and Awards Committee after he was recommended by the provincial chapter.

Mr. Speaker, the criteria for this award include excellence in practice over time, community medical service, general service to the community and service to the college and family physicians and personal interests.

The candidate has to be in practice for over 15 years and a member of the college for at least 10. Dr. Rae has been a member of the college since 1958 and received certification in family medicine in 1970 and fellowship in 1972.

He was elected president of the World Organization of Family Doctors in 1989, an

international association representing 150,000 physicians in 41 countries. Dr. Rae has also been the national president of the college in 1976-77 and the Manitoba chapter president in 1968-69.

In Portage, he is also involved with the St. John's Ambulance association and is the honorary lieutenant-colonel of the 26th Field Regiment of the Royal Canadian Artillery. He is also an associated professor at the University of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have some very personal connections with him, because it was this particular doctor who had me go back into the hospital after a heart specialist had indicated my EKG was okay. He said he was not happy. Fortunately for me, some five days later I had my heart attack in the hospital after undergoing some medication. So to Dr. Rae I maybe owe my life, but if nothing less I could have been very severely impaired with heart damage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Legislature to join with me in recognizing this very prestigious award for Dr. Don Rae, who is in rural practice giving excellence to rural people of Manitoba, and I congratulate him. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I would like leave from the House to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Leader have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave? Agreed.

Mr. Doer: I would just like to briefly join the member for Portage la Prairie. I thought he would be making a nonpolitical statement today about the award for Dr. Rae, recognizing Dr. Rae as the Physician of the Year. I think we are all very proud of not only the award today, but the contributions Dr. Rae has made to the quality of medicine and the quality of life in Manitoba.

For what I know about Dr. Rae, and it certainly is not as much as the member for Portage (Mr. Connery), but if you were to use the term "making house calls" and all the kind of medical qualities and values that we all remember and value in physicians and doctors, not just to be technicians in medicine but also to be members of the community and quality people that we all respect, Dr. Rae meets all those tests, Mr. Speaker.

I think this Legislature should recognize the contributions of Dr. Rae in Portage and across

Manitoba and congratulate him, his family and his community on the recognition of the doctor as the Family Physician of the Year. Congratulations, Dr. Rae.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for The Maples have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add best wishes from our caucus to Dr. Rae who has been nominated the Family Physician of the Year.

Myself as a family physician involved in the college activities, not on a political basis but a nonpolitical basis, I have heard a lot of things about Dr. Rae. This award certainly speaks for that. He has served the community of Manitoba and Portage and has contributed in a very special way to promote the culture activity, the community activities, and also in the other parts which most people do not realize, that the physicians also play a very important role in economic development. I think it is one of the testimonies to the hard work Dr. Rae has done.

Also part of their campaign now, they are also starting to help the poor who are hungry. I think that is a part of the College of Family Physicians of Canada. They are starting a campaign in the first week of June to make sure that people who are hungry in Manitoba have got food and shelter. We should not be only doing that during the Christmastime, but all of the other times. Thank you very much.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: Adjourned debate, fifth day of debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the proposed amendment of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), and the proposed subamendment of the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), standing in the name of the honourable member for Crescentwood who has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to pick up where the clock stopped me on Friday to have a look at the implications of the Minister of Finance's fourth budget. I was intrigued

in just scanning over some of the speeches made by members opposite that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) said as recently as Friday, looking south of the border for his political inspiration and quoting Thomas Jefferson erroneously, that the best government is the least government. That is clearly the political and fiscal agenda of the Progressive Conservative government across the way.

If there was not enough evidence in the minority Legislatures which have since been replaced by a tenuous majority government, the evidence is certainly in the budget tabled by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). We can see it line by line that phase two agenda of the Conservative government is now being played out and implemented.

Interestingly enough, the comments from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld), in particular, are that constituents are telling them that this budget did not go far enough, that the expression that they are getting is that there ought to have been more cuts, more layoffs in the public service, a more deeply felt intrusion into the public sector of the province.

I ask the question to the Minister of Finance, if that is the case, why did he not do it? Why did he not go farther?

The reason that he did not go farther is because there were political constraints that held him back. Presumably, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did what he thought was right, what he thought was in the best interests of the province, and that it was not going farther for a whole host of very good reasons.

* (1420)

I am particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, at the revenue side of the tabled statements in the Detailed Estimates of Revenue of the Province of Manitoba, and I think they tell a very important story. While we have heard through Question Period and in speeches all kinds of rhetoric directed at the federal government for offloading and for cutting back on transfer payments to the provinces, cutbacks which we can see here in EPF, in the Established Programs Financing arrangements that fund post-secondary education and health care, but we look at the line of equalization, and we see that there is literally \$100 million more coming to Manitoba, through equalization, than came to

Manitoba the previous year. -(interjection)- Well, this is the anticipated revenue expected by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), and presumably he uses the best figures available to him at the time the budget is printed.

If you look at the total contributions of the Government of Canada year over year as best as the Minister of Finance knows them, we see that the increase is, in fact, 5 percent. Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says it is 1.5. I am looking at his own statements, and we see that the contributions from the Government of Canada are up from \$1.622 billion to \$1.707 billion. Yet if you look at the revenue projections from the Minister of Finance's own sources, we see here truly the real weakness of the Manitoba economy, the weakness of the Manitoba economy not just for the coming year, but representative of the fiscal record of this government since it became government three years ago, and there are some very telling figures here.

Corporate revenues are way down. Corporate revenues are down because the economy is sluggish. The fiscal policies adopted by the government have not in any way contributed to economic development, in growth in the corporate sector, and if you look at the retail sales tax figure we are looking at \$20 million less next year than last year, which is another very strong indication of the general economic condition of the province.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Perhaps as illustrative as anything else, we look at what is happening in the housing sector, and we see that the land titles fees are way down, I think something like \$1.2 million this year from last year. All of the economic indicators show that the Minister of Finance is not taking us out of recession over the next several months, but he predicts that the recession is actually going to deepen.

Then the question arises, what is the government's fiscal policy in order to take Manitoba out of the recession, rather than last out of the recession as some economic indications would have us believe?

The answers, I am afraid, are not very encouraging, Madam Deputy Speaker, because the government has taken the view that it has no role to play, other than setting some kind of climate, establishing an environment within which the private

sector will grow and create jobs. Have more jobs been created in Manitoba since 1988? No, fewer jobs, fewer meaningful jobs under the fiscal policies of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the government of Manitoba over the last three years, there are fewer Manitobans working. The number of layoffs as a result of plant closures and a general deterioration of the economic conditions of the province, including the lethargic housing sector and the slow retail sector, are hurting us. This is not even to mention the malaise in the tourist industry—as we revealed last week some 20 percent fewer automobile visits to Manitoba from south of the border than at the same time last year. So the government's approach is to pull back.

I am reminded of the image of two boxers in the rink, Madam Deputy Speaker, and one is hitting hard, and that boxer is the recession. The response of this government is not to hit back with innovative fiscal policy but to retrench, to protect itself, to go into some kind of defensive shell hoping that the boxer will get arm weary, punch drunk and go away. Well, there is no evidence that is what is happening. The evidence is quite to the contrary. The defensive shell that this government has put itself in is really resulting in a deepening of the economic situation in our province, not taking us out.

I challenge the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) when he makes what likely will be the closing speech on the Budget Debate to show to us, using any statistical information that the Minister of Finance believes to be relevant, that any sector of the Manitoba economy is better off now than it was three years ago when this Minister of Finance took office, whether that is the agricultural economy, rural communities, the inner city of Winnipeg, university students, those who access the health care system. In what ways has the fiscal policy of this government created opportunity, so that those sectors have been able to grow rather than retrench as they have over the last little while?

The trend is very disturbing because what we have, in spite of the fact that equalization payments from the Government of Canada are, in fact, probably the single biggest growth industry that the government of Manitoba has—which by the way, Madam Deputy Speaker, is yet another reason if we needed one to prove that Manitoba is a real beneficiary of federalism—that if it were not for the bulwark of federalism, Manitoba would be in a lot worse shape than it is now. If we look at what the

Minister of Finance has chosen to do with his fiscal options, we see that he is doing the very same thing that he accuses the Government of Canada doing in his own budget figures.

Let us look at some of the examples of the offloading, Madam Deputy Speaker. First of all, he has transferred to municipal governments 2,000 kilometres of provincial roads at a cost of some \$6 million; engineering and water management service resulting in a loss of 24 positions; local government districts have activities reduced for provincial government savings; a reduction of \$500,000 in street improvement grants to cities, towns and villages; a reduction of \$200,000 to the Rural Municipal Bridge Assistance Program.

How about grants to the City of Winnipeg? Does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) believe that when he freezes grants to the City of Winnipeg, either the general purpose grant or the transportation grants, that the City of Winnipeg is going to say, okay, and not pass on some of those responsibilities to the property taxpayer? So what is the net effect? There really has been through this budget a substantial transfer of taxing authority and responsibility from the general revenues of the province to the property taxpayers, not only of the City of Winnipeg but of rural municipalities right across the province.

One is left to pose the question: Is that a fairer form of taxation than taxation that we collect through income tax arrangements with Ottawa? Is that a fairer way of taxing the people of Manitoba now that we have offloaded the same thing that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) accuses the federal government of doing to property taxpayers throughout the city of Winnipeg? I do not think so, because in fact those taxes tend to be regressive.

My friend the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) knows the tax system better than I do and probably better than most members of this House. Does he believe that transferring tax burden to property owners is a fairer form of taxation, it is a better way of raising revenue, that somehow it is going to strengthen the infrastructure and the economy of our province? I do not think so. I certainly did not hear the Minister of Energy say that it was during his remarks.

How about the quality of life for our citizens in the province of Manitoba?—because after all, that is the argument we use in trying to entice people to come

to our province. We do not generally talk about the weather when we are enticing people here, although I must say every once in awhile I run into people who argue that we have the finest climate in the country. I will leave that to the debate of others.

* (1430)

We tend to talk about quality of life, that it does not take very long for us to drive to work, that we have cleaner water, we have cleaner air, we have a less hurried kind of pace that we take through our everyday lives, that we have one of the finest cultural lives available to citizens in any city in North America—and I agree that that is true—and we have a first-rate quality of education in our universities and community colleges. These are all of the arguments we use when we are trying to either entice people to come to Manitoba or try to convince them to stay.

Yet this budget represents a substantial attack on many of those quality of life indicators that are so important to us, and as a community, Manitoba has always relied heavily on the volunteer sector. By the massive cuts in grants to organizations, we will see that it is going to be more and more difficult to ask people to give of their own time, of their own resources, if we as a community are not prepared to fund those things in which they believe. There has been a substantial reduction in what I would call the quality of life indicators in Manitoba as a result of this budget.

How about the issue of layoffs in the public service? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) tells us that many of the jobs will be lost through attrition, through early retirements, those which are already vacant or in some kind of severance arrangement that will be made with public servants who want to leave.

Even after all of that is accounted for, we will see that between 375 and 450 people will lose their jobs. That in itself is something that we can debate, the appropriateness of putting civil servants out of work at a time of recession.

Equally important is to look at the way in which the civil servants who no longer work for Manitoba were handled because often governments are judged not only on what they do, but on how they do it. Was it handled with compassion? Was it handled with caring? Perhaps in some cases it was, but the horror stories that we now hear told,

coming from people who no longer have a job with the public service, are not very encouraging.

This in spite of the fact that the Premier tells us that he, himself, gave instructions to all managers that the layoffs in the public service were to be handled with tenderness and with care. It was ham-handed, the bloodletting was done with insensitivity, as we see everyday, stories of people who were handled with a bludgeon and who no longer now have any economic prospects. The handling of it was poor, an indication of the way in which this government is handling the human issues that are associated with these budget cuts.

An Honourable Member: A little Sterling Lyon here, go the same way he would go.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Get some facts.

Mr. Carr: The Minister of Labour says, get some facts. I read quotes from him in the newspaper, and he can tell me if he thinks he was misquoted, that, yes, there were instances where it was not handled very well. Well, that is all I am saying, that the government did not do a very good job, it could have done much better.

Then there is the whole question of decentralization, and this one is really for the books. We can remember when the decentralization issue was announced by the government and how they were going to create economic opportunity for rural communities outside of Winnipeg—

An Honourable Member: Hundreds of jobs.

Mr. Carr: Hundreds of jobs. Meanwhile, what has his budget done to jobs in rural Manitoba?—cut, cut, cut. So the logic of the government is to take people who would rather live and work in Winnipeg, move them to rural Manitoba where they do not want to go, and then in the next breath take people who love rural Manitoba, who are working in rural Manitoba happily and active in the communities and fire them. -(interjection)-

Well, I do not understand the logic. Is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) not saying that there are jobs lost? Look at the Natural Resources, many of these jobs in rural Manitoba, 231 jobs were cut which really destroys the credibility of the decentralization program; it makes no sense. Forest received a cut of 12.63 percent; silviculture, which is reforestation, cut by 14.23 percent. So

what is the commitment to the health of this sector in Manitoba? None.

Water management and hydro-technical services cut at a time when the government is planning on diverting much of the water in southern Manitoba.

Fisheries cut by 16.56 percent; Wildlife by 7.94 percent, and I am very anxious to hear the response of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) when he closes debate because the question that he will be answering, for the benefit of Manitobans and the taxpayers of Manitoba, is how this set of fiscal policies is going to take us out of the recession. He refers in his budget speech to the future of Manitoba and that the decisions he took were not so much for us but for our children.

That is a goal with which none of us would disagree, but the Minister of Finance is going to have to explain to us how that goal is going to be accomplished with the measures that are in this budget. For example, how is he going to improve the prospects of the Manitoba economy when there is literally no economic development strategy? You know sometimes—and I would think the Conservatives would know this because they pride themselves on management, that sometimes you have to spend a buck to make a buck. -(interjection)- Well, the Minister of Finance obviously disagrees with that remark.

Tourism is an example—and I hope he will listen to this—is the single largest industry in the world. People invest in the tourist industry because it pays off dividends in the long run. When you have people coming to your province spending money on hotels, on restaurants, in the shops, that generates jobs, that is economic activity.

An Honourable Member: What about the lodges? That is where the tourism is growing.

Mr. Carr: The lodges are very important. Does the Minister of Finance expect that more people are going to come to the lodges of Manitoba when he has cut the park service, when he has cut tourist promotion, when he has cut the grant to the Tourism Industry Association of Manitoba?

If Manitoba develops the reputation as a place that does not place a high priority on its tourism industry, then they are not going to come to Manitoba, all of the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) objections notwithstanding. If he cannot see a link between the commitment this government gives to the tourism industry and the health of our

lodges in northern Manitoba, then he better smell the coffee, because believe me—

An Honourable Member: Northerners want less taxes . . .

Mr. Carr: Everybody wants to pay less taxes, Madam Deputy Speaker. There is not anybody going to stand up in this House and say people like paying taxes. Is that why the property taxpayers in Manitoba are going to pay more this year as a result of this budget? Is the Minister of Finance saying that a property tax does not count when people try to determine every year what their tax liabilities are? I do not know about the Minister of Finance, but if you would canvass people around this Chamber, they would tell you that the property tax hit is about the single biggest they get aside from the income tax hit they get.

How about all the offloading to the rural municipalities? Is this not going to filter down to people who earn a living, who will have less disposable dollars as a result of this budget? I do not really understand the Minister of Finance's logic because we are going to determine the best we can just what the impact of all of this offloading is going to be on taxpayers.

Then we see some very silly things in the budget. I will just use one example, as I see my time is running out. In the line for the Wards boundary commission in the Urban Affairs Estimates, there is \$90,000 for the Wards Review commission which has already cost the government \$20,000 that it did not have to spend because they have a commission established by the act which is free, and now there is an additional \$90,000 that they are paying out—who knows why—I guess we will find out in the Urban Affairs Estimates.

* (1440)

Madam Deputy Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that nobody has all the right answers, and we can only be judged on the choices we make. This government has taken a radical course; some members of the Treasury bench think not radical enough. It is radical because it is careless in its approach. It has not taken into account the needs of people as they react to the new Tory reality, and most important, the failure of this budget is that it really does not give any hope to your children or to mine that as a result of the fiscal policies of this government, they have a better and a brighter future in the province of Manitoba. That is the great

failure—a decision made not to invest in the people, the training of our human resources and the promotion of those strengths that we have as a province that make us unique in Canada.

After four budgets of the Progressive Conservative Party, we see that our province is not better off. In fact, our province is poorer off, so we will continue to be aggressive in giving options and alternatives to the government while criticizing the choices that they make at a time when the people of Manitoba are looking for sensitivity and leadership. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Praznik: Madam Deputy Speaker, it is certainly an honour and indeed a privilege for me, as a member of the Executive Council and as Minister of Labour, to rise today to speak in support of the budget that was presented in this House by my colleague the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

I quite enjoyed the remarks of my colleague, a fellow member of this Chamber, the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), but what I found in his remarks that I think are very characteristic of so much of the criticism levelled against this budget, indeed budgets that all provincial governments, even in Liberal provinces, are having to bring in at this point in the history of our country is the sense that somehow there is a magic solution to the financial problems, somehow that difficult choices can be avoided or covered up.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, there is, in the remarks of the member for Crescentwood, indeed in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), certainly in many members of the New Democratic Party, particularly the New Democratic Party, a sense of unreality that I find almost unbelievable in this day and age.

There is no doubt that every member of this House would love to have access to vast more wealth for this government, indeed any government, to spend. There will always be many more programs and projects that we would like to take on, many more services that we would like to deliver to the people of Manitoba, many more programs.

I am sure, with 57 of us in this House, there must be over a hundred new programs among us that we can invent, think about or propose, all of which may improve the quality of life for Manitobans, but there is a reality there, a reality that they all have to be

paid for. That reality has gone over the head of so many for so long, Mr. Speaker. The failure to come to grips with that reality has indeed put not only our province, but other provincial governments, indeed our national government, at a very critical point in the history of our country, indeed our province.

Mr. Speaker, when I became a member of this Legislature and became more and more familiar with the finances of the province, there were some basic numbers that came to impress me. What I found, as I am sure other members of this House have found, is that the vast majority of people in our province, indeed our country, never fully are aware—and I certainly was in that category prior to my election—of exactly where our money is being spent. It amazes me, when one knows those numbers, just how wrong often that public perception of where dollars are being spent actually is.

Mr. Speaker, at a public meeting in my constituency with the school division that we sponsored jointly some weeks ago, a strong supporter of the New Democratic Party, someone who lives in my home village, came in halfway through the meeting, had missed the presentation, got up to make a comment and said what has become very typical of what New Democrats say. This woman got up and she said that government is not spending money in the right place. We should be spending it on health and education. We should not be spending \$3 billion on the highway project now underway on Highway 44.

Mr. Speaker, she said with all sincerity and candour, she used the term \$3 billion on a small stretch of highway. I could not resist. I got up and I said to her, Shelly, I said, do you mean \$3 billion? I said, the whole provincial budget is just \$5 billion. Oh, well, I am not sure, she said. How much is that project? I said, in total with paving and everything else, I understand somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1.3 million. I said, our total Highway budget is \$100 million.

The vast majority of people who were there had heard the number, and they all looked at her with great disdain actually as to, you know, where were these numbers coming from. The point of the matter is, there was an utterly wrong statement, an utterly wrong perception about where money was being spent. She had it, I think, because it is shared by many, many Manitobans who never have the opportunity to see those numbers. Mr. Speaker,

what was the saddest part, of course, is I think she was trying to make some points for the New Democratic Party, and I believe fell far short of that simply because she did not deal with the facts.

I do not think any member on this side of the House has difficulty with debating choices, debating issues all within the context, of course, of reality. It becomes very difficult in this Legislature, indeed in the course of public debate, to have a really thorough discussion or debate on public expenditure when the unreality, the public myth, of where government spends money remains and is propagated by members of the opposition. Mr. Speaker, I think it is deserving on all of us, or it is incumbent on all of us to deal with the realities and the facts as to where government spends money, because the trends as to where this government spends money are not unlike those trends in every other provincial jurisdiction in this country no matter what political party occupies the benches of government.

Mr. Speaker, just to put some of those numbers into perspective—I had the opportunity as do all members, with our householder that I sent out throughout my constituency, some about 9,000 copies of this. The numbers because they were based on the budget Estimates of last year, and numbers come in a little bit differently from actual expenditure, but the purpose was to give people a sense of the relative amount of money where it is spent.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) has asked to use my householder. It is outdated with the coming in of the budget because these numbers have now changed, but I would be glad to provide him with a copy. In fact, he would like to provide it in his constituency.

Just to put things in relative terms of spending, we spend in Manitoba about \$5 billion a year—I am rounding off my numbers. About a million people, that is \$5,000, approximately, a person in this province. Where do we spend it? We are now spending close to \$1,800 a person on health care, by far the largest expenditure. Almost \$2 out of every \$5 on health care. We are now spending close to \$1,000 a person, just under \$1,000 a person on education. That is, almost \$1 out of every \$5 that we spend as a Legislature for the people of Manitoba is spent on education; the area of family services, over \$550 a person in that particular area. Of course, the one expenditure this Legislature in

reality has absolutely no ability to deny and that, of course, is our interest payments which are now over \$550 a person a year.

Those four large areas gobble up the vast majority of our budget, and that is the case in almost every other province: health, education, family services and debt servicing. Everything else we spend on that kind of comparison is pennies.

Mr. Speaker, the next highest area of expenditure—and my friend the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) may appreciate this—the next highest, remember, nothing below \$550 per person in those four large areas of expenditure. The next largest area of expenditure is tax credits, including the Homeowner Tax Credit and all of the tax credits for lower-income Manitobans. That accounts for somewhere between \$200 and \$250 a person.

The next highest is the Department of Justice, somewhere between \$100 million and \$150 million approximately—\$150 a person. Mr. Speaker, that is the scale, the great distance, between these departments and the big four.

* (1450)

We go from there into our Highways budget. Last year in Manitoba, we spent some \$118 or \$117 per person on new highway construction. When my constituent from the New Democratic Party said we are spending so much on highways, I do not think she realized at all that that new Highway construction budget for the last year in Manitoba, and it is somewhere around that number again this year, is only equivalent to the wage and benefit package for St. Boniface General Hospital. In other words, we spend on wages and benefits at St. Boniface General Hospital virtually the same amount of money, now probably a little bit more than we spend on all new highway construction throughout our province. . . Look at how you compare those numbers. So when members say, oh, there is room to take it out of highway construction—there is not. We do not spend a lot on highway construction now.

Then when you go into other programs, the Department of Agriculture, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) sits behind me in the House, he probably wishes every day he could have twice the money that he does; last year spending somewhere between \$90 and \$100 a person. The Interest Rate Relief program, about \$23 a person;

the Department of Rural Development, somewhere \$50-\$60 a person; Culture, Heritage and Recreation in the order of around \$50 a person.

Again, my numbers—I am using my constituency pamphlet based on last year's budget. Some of these have changed a little bit and I have not been able to sort through the numbers. Just again to give the range, the relative sense of those numbers, because when you come down to a department like mine, the Department of Labour, with the \$1 million allotment we have for the program for Older Worker Adjustment, our budget is \$17 a person. For every \$1 we spend in the Department of Labour, the Department of Health spends over \$100. I cannot see, when I hear New Democrats or Liberals or anyone saying, the thrust of where you are spending is wrong, there are other sources of money you should be tapping for health care or education. Those are already such overwhelming parts of provincial budgets not just in Manitoba, but indeed in all other provinces. They consume a huge amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, again, the Department of Environment, somewhere \$12, \$13, \$14 a person; Fitness and Sports somewhere \$10, \$12 a person reduced this year, of course, because the Manitoba Sports Federation will be using its accumulated surplus out of Lottery monies to function. Just again, those kind of numbers, the big four way out there, everybody else substantially lower in relative terms.

Over a number of years we have seen governments of different stripes, right across the country, put dollars into those high priority areas. I think when the public—and I know in my constituency the response I have had to this pamphlet that I sent out before the budget to give people an idea of where their dollars were being spent, was just incredible. I have never, in the years I have been involved in politics both as an elected member and working for an elected member, seen the kind of response to a pamphlet as I have seen to this one. People were saying it is about time someone gave us the facts, I did not realize we spent that much on health care, I did not realize we spent that much on education, I just did not know.

Mr. Speaker, I think the debate over budgets and finances really has to be put into that context, and it is regrettable I think, on all our parts, that this type of information is not out there more often amongst members of the public, indeed, all members of this

House. We deal in these great budget books that are complicated and difficult to get through, and we talk about percentages of increase and decrease in departments but when you look at where the dollars are actually being spent, I do not think there is a member of this House who could probably get up and say that governments are not spending those dollars in the high priority areas, the high priority that the public has, which of course is health, education, family services and the area over which we have absolutely no choice, our debt servicing.

I know members of the New Democratic Party from time to time in my constituency—I know I had the opportunity to speak in my department, to brief employees in the Department of Labour on the budget, and I know one of the shop stewards from the MGEA asked the question, well, do we really have to be paying that interest? I know members of the New Democratic Party often propagate the belief that these dollars are flowing into vast corporate vaults somewhere in New York and they are fueling champagne and caviar for the elite.

Mr. Speaker, a very large portion of our provincial debt of what we owe, is owed to pension funds, and I know the Minister of Finance in this House has spoken on a number of occasions about those pension funds. I just give you five examples of the pension funds that we owe our interest to, who depend on us every year to make our payments so that their members may have a pension, and who do they include? They include groups like the Texas Teachers' Retirement Fund, the Lutheran Brotherhood Pension Fund, the California Public Employees' Pension Fund, the Alberta Teachers' Pension Fund, the Canadian National Railroad Pension Fund.

Again, those people depend on us paying our interest so that their pensioners can receive their pensions. Anyone who says to me we should not have to worry about where that money goes, should know that is the first dollar that this Legislature approves, and that the people who have loaned us their savings for us to expend annually to cover our own costs, those people depend and have a right to expect that they will have their interest paid to them. Let no one here suggest otherwise, because I think it would just be silly and downright dishonest.

One part of our budget that I would like to discuss a little bit, and I know members opposite have a hard time dealing often with, particularly the New

Democratic Party, is the concept of provincial debt and servicing debt and what that debt is costing us.

In the 1980-81 provincial budget, the cost of servicing our accumulated general purpose debt in this province amounted to about \$79 a person. That was not an excessive amount of money. Today it is somewhere around \$550 a person and well on its way to \$600 a person, now the third or fourth largest expenditure of government and probably the fastest growing area of expenditure over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the numbers, when you look at the years, in the '80s when provincial revenues were growing by substantial amounts, 10, 12, 16 percent, government expenditure growing at an even faster rate, money being borrowed many years under Mr. Pawley's administration, over half a billion dollars a year being borrowed, while revenues were increasing and those dollars always having to have the interest paid on them annually, growing and growing until in 1985-86—and I look at the members of the New Democratic Party who are here.

* (1500)

I know the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), who was the former member for Burrows, was a member of the Legislature at that time, but many others were not. What they may not want to recognize was in that particular year the government of the day, of which their party was part, I think came to realize that they were in real trouble and started internally within government reductions of services, reductions of funding, reductions of financing to others.

They brought in what turned out for them to be the most politically disastrous budget of their party's history, designed to take more and more tax dollars out of middle class—the ones they try to defend in this House, particularly lower middle-class families. They did it because the debt, the borrowings that had gone on, the servicing of those borrowings had gotten to the point where their own bankers were telling them they had to do it. Even though they wanted to pretend to be the party of Manitobans and they were going to show those bankers, they had to go and increase taxes and reduce services because they knew they had to pay their interest if they wanted to be able to borrow any more.

What is particularly interesting about the 1985-86 year, Mr. Speaker, was in that particular year it was the first year in this province's history where our total

deficit for that year was solely for the repayment of interest. Not one penny of any dollar we have borrowed as a province since that year has gone to fund programming. Every dollar—every penny of every dollar, Mr. Speaker, has been used by this Legislature to pay interest.

Since that time we, as a province, would have had surplus in every year since '85-86 if we had not had to pay interest on our debt—since '85-86, two different administrations.

What that says is I think the good news about that—and it is sort of good news in a sad way—is we are able to deliver a large amount of services, quality services to the people of Manitoba for less money than they give us each year to spend, or we take from them to spend. Yet the pressure grows, because we continue to borrow, this year some \$325 million cushioned by a \$125-million transfer from the rainy day fund.

I remember being part of debates in this House when members opposite criticized that fund, said we should not be doing it, we should spend the money in this year, who daily came into this House, Question Period after Question Period, demanding money be spent on anybody who came to this building and said, give us more money. If we had done that, we would have been even farther on that slippery slope to the Newfoundland example.

Mr. Speaker, if you wonder why any member on this side of the House can make the difficult but essential and necessary decisions that have to be made, and why, if members of the New Democratic Party were now in government they would have to do just the same thing, just like their compatriot Mr. Kostyra had to do in this House when he brought in the budget that was their downfall, it is because of the Newfoundland example.

All of us as politicians either realize today, or should realize, that if we do not get control of our financial house we will have choices taken away from us in the not too distant future. That is what has happened in our sister province of Newfoundland, indeed a province of a half a million people today—and again, the worst case example, but we are all on the same road—a province that today cannot borrow money except with a federal government guarantee, and I think in the area of 18 percent interest. It is called junk bonds.

Mr. Speaker, do you think Premier Wells of Newfoundland wanted to lay off 2,100 public servants in his province of half a million people?

An Honourable Member: Liberal Premier.

Mr. Praznik: Liberal Premier Wells of Newfoundland. Do you think that he wanted to make those layoffs? He had to do it because his bankers told him he had to do it. Even \$30 million, or \$40 million, or \$50 million, or \$100 million more in federal transfer payments would not have postponed the inevitable in that province, not only 2,100 public servants and the elimination of 600 vacancies in their public service, but also 1,200 people in the health care area. -(interjection)-

You know, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says a hundred million would have helped. I do not think the member has read the financial statements of the federal government yet. We feel the pressure in this Legislature where 10 cents or 11 cents out of every dollar is going for interest payments. They are now at 30 cents.

Yes, we would all like more money. There are areas where we think they should be spending more wisely and we are having those debates with them. The inevitability of that growing consumption of dollars for interest payments will come and it will come for a federal government sooner than later. It will come for Manitoba just as it has come for Newfoundland unless there is a concerted effort to get control of our finances.

Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party may try to hide from it and one day they may find themselves on this side of the House again, but they will have to do exactly what Eugene Kostyra did in his '88-89 budget. They will have to do exactly the same thing as he did in '87-88, and they will be faced with exactly what the Liberal Premier of Newfoundland is facing now. They may hide from that. They may try to believe that it is not possible, but you know, the public of Manitoba, and I sincerely believe this having followed politics a long time, throughout all of my almost 30 years, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Thirty years as an adult?

Mr. Praznik: Not as an adult, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) makes a comment. Politics was always a very big part of our family and dinner table discussions.

Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa): Conservative.

Mr. Praznik: I can remember politics in our house from my earliest times, from being three, four years old.

In fact, the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) made a comment about politics. My family actually comes from a long Liberal tradition. My grandfather was the president of the Liberal Association in Springfield, but my grandfather died a Conservative. Mr. Speaker, I had many members of my family who were supporters of the New Democratic Party as well, but I will tell you, they do not support the New Democratic Party today.

The reason I am on this side of the House today as a Conservative, the reason why I think the Lac du Bonnet constituency is on this side of the House and the Springfield constituency and the Gimli constituency and how many other ridings, La Verendrye, that had never been Conservative ridings, is that the people of Manitoba, particularly the younger people of Manitoba, realize the burden that is being placed on them, realize that the decisions of the 1970s and indeed the 1980s were ultimately wrong decisions and realize that it is going to take difficult but necessary decisions, essential decisions, to correct that path, because disaster, real disaster with lots of real pain, is just around the corner if this Legislature and the Legislatures of nine other provinces and of federal parliament do not take necessary steps to avert that kind of calamity.

Mr. Speaker, I remember growing up in the '70s and following politics and election campaigns. I remember Howard—

An Honourable Member: I remember it well.

Mr. Praznik: That is right. I remember the comments and the campaigns where who could outbid who for votes, who could bring in another government program to do something else. All parties competed against one another shamefully, and they brought in those programs. They borrowed the money, and they never paid the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I remember sitting in this House as Premier of the Manitoba Youth Parliament, being a young university student in December of 1981, and if there was a turning point for me when I became a Conservative member, it was that day. I remember sitting in that particular loge. I sat between the newly elected member for Morris, Mr. Clayton Manness, who had been returned in the general election of November 17, sitting between him and

the new Premier, who was my MLA of the day, the honourable Howard Pawley.

I remember listening to a debate between the two of them about how we finance government, and I remember Mr. Pawley saying that in classic Keynesian economics, when times were bad, like they were in that recessionary period of the early '80s, government should be spending money to stimulate growth. I remember Clayton Manness turning to him, and he said, yes, Howard, but where do you make up that money? Howard Pawley, avoiding the question of when do you make up that difference, because the other part of the Keynesian model is that when times are good, government should retract, pay down that deficit and rearm itself to deal with recessions.

You know something, Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats had that opportunity. They had that opportunity during the '80s, and when the economy turned around and when revenues were coming in at the rate of 10 percent, 12 percent, 16 percent, Mr. Pawley forgot that Keynesian economics, and he borrowed and borrowed and borrowed, so all of our children, all of the poor people of Burrows constituency will be struggling forever and a day under that kind of yoke.

Members of the Liberal Party and this party may have differences from from time to time, but the Liberal Party still appreciates, I think, some of those bottom-line economics which members of the New Democratic Party continue to fail to observe.

* (1510)

Mr. Speaker, this House may mark my words but if governments do not come to grips with those pressures and those realities, whoever sits on this side of the House will face the Newfoundland example; but if we continue to sit on this side of the House, we will avoid that because we are doing the right thing—not an easy thing, not an easy task, but ultimately the right task.

When you listen to the comments from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) about what this province is going through and the plan that he is implementing on our finances to get control, you will see, within the very near future, almost every other province, except probably Ontario, follow suit because this province really is on the leading edge of trying to get control of its finances and have a firm basis for providing services to the people of its province.

It is so ironical watching Ontario. I understand that the former chair of the Workers' Compensation Board in Manitoba has now gone over to Ontario to help make a mess of their Workers' Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, you know I just want to digress for a moment. When this government came to power in 1988, the Workers' Compensation Board was so badly run by a labour government in Manitoba, a government of workers, that there were 200 boxes of active files sitting in a corridor in the basement that no one even knew what was in them. They did not even have sufficient telephone lines into the office to accommodate all of the people taking telephone calls. They took phones literally off the desks of some people to move them onto others because they did not have enough phone lines.

Now we should all be having a moment of silence for the workers of Ontario, what they are going to get with those kind of changes, because the bad management from here has now gone over to Ontario.

I have not been around in elected politics for a long time. My colleague the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) is indeed the dean of this Chamber. I think if you ask that member about Ontario today, he could almost repeat to you step by step about what Bob Rae is doing in Ontario. It is exactly what happened here and got us into so many problems and difficulties in destroying so much of our province, and that is what will happen in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of my time just to discuss the very regrettable layoffs that we had to do in the Civil Service. As Civil Service Commission minister, it is never easy, not only to be a minister, but it is never easy in any form to have to end somebody's employment with you. Indeed, it is one of the most difficult tasks, I think, anyone can ever be called upon to perform. Now, the member goes out and hack and cut. Well, there are some of us in this House who know exactly how New Democrats handle layoffs, and the classic example is Mr. Joe Brako, who used to be the Deputy Minister of Highways and Transportation. Do you know how Mr. Brako, whom I have met personally and talked to, was told that his services were no longer needed? You know, I will tell you how he was told. He heard it on the news in his car coming back from Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the day, the grand Pooh-Bah of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Pawley, who was supposed to—Premiers hire deputies—did not even have the courtesy to wait till Mr. Brako arrived back and to call him in and tell him personally that his services were no longer needed. That is the kind of disgusting hypocrisy that we hear time and time again in this Chamber.

We will remind members opposite of Mr. Brako, because that is the way they treat their employees. On the news they learn that their services are no longer needed, from the radio on their way back from a meeting in Regina. So let them not say one word in this House about how this government handled this particular very difficult situation, because their example does not afford them that right, I believe, to comment on what took place over the last week or so.

It was our intention that every employee who was going to be affected by this process would be told personally by either the deputy or their senior manager. Indeed, in some departments I know that senior managers went out and travelled great lengths across this province to meet and tell those people so they would hear from their management directly and privately.

We also provided more than what the collective agreement called for in layoff situations. We provided and are providing an enhanced package for people choosing that package if they take it up front to go off the redeployment list. We have offered one week of severance for the first 10 years of service, a minimum of three weeks severance plus two weeks for every year after 10, with a maximum package of 52 weeks—one year—far greater than most ever get in the private sector.

We also provided everyone with the 18 weeks notice or money in lieu of notice, because we wanted to make sure that we were more than fair in providing those severance packages, because it is difficult times. We recognize that. Mr. Speaker, we also put into place, and I am very proud of this program, because I think it is going to prove to be an effective one, a voluntary incentive for any public servant wishing to leave public service who is in a position -(interjection)- well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) makes his comment, but at least members on this side of the House pay their bills, and I am really sorry to have to say that. If you ask why there is no money, that

is why, and I think that member should take some responsibility for his own life.

An Honourable Member: Pay your student loan, Greg.

An Honourable Member: Oh, but it will take a long time to get it done.

Mr. Praznik: Only when forced by public pressure, Mr. Speaker.

We provided a voluntary incentive package of 18 weeks of severance in addition to whatever that person would be entitled to if they left the public service. The member calls it a buyout. Yes, it is to encourage those people who were thinking of leaving, would like to leave, to make their decision now to make that position available for those who have been laid off who would like to stay in public service.

Over the next week or so we should know how many positions have become available in that pool. Of course, they have to be positions for which there is someone on the redeployment list, and that should minimize, that should reduce further the number of people actually affected in this process.

Mr. Speaker, there are cases where people may have not been dealt with in a manner that they have felt they should have been dealt with. I would remind members opposite that anybody who has been laid off is going to have a very difficult time. Anybody who is laid off is not going to be enamored with their employer and is not going to have anything probably good to say about the way in which they were handled. One has to put those comments that are coming out now by many in that context to be fair. It is understandable. I think if any of us were in that position, of course, we would probably say we were not handled well.

Given the fact that people were to be told personally, given the fact that we provided them with and are providing them now with a host of services and supports including assistance in preparing resumes, dealing with some of the stress and anxiety of a layoff, et cetera; we provided them with a handbook outlining this information; some departments, I understand, brought all of their affected staff together to help provide those services—Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do this in a humane way, and the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says, pushing them out the door. They did not even push Mr. Brako out the door. He rolled in to find his stuff out on the street. That is the way

New Democrats handle layoffs. We did not do it that way. The members opposite, when they get up and apologize to Mr. Brako publicly for the way that they handled that situation, then they may have earned the right to comment on the way this government handled the situation, and Mr. Brako is still waiting for that apology.

* (1520)

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that nobody likes to be in a situation where you cannot meet all of the demands on the Treasury that are there to be met. No one likes to be in a situation when you have to lay off staff. No one likes to be in a situation where you have to make difficult decisions, but they do have to be made. Any political party who thinks and honestly believes that there is some cash cow out there to milk, that there is some way that you can avoid the inevitable decisions that are now coming down for every government, including Mr. Rae in Ontario, then they are fooling themselves.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they are not fooling the people of Manitoba because the vast majority of Manitobans—and I say this, particularly of my generation—appreciate the decisions that have to be made and know that if they are not made now, there is not any kind of hope for any kind of strength or good future. The people of Burrows constituency, of Interlake, of Selkirk and of Broadway, the people who know, they deep down know that as well.

I would say to members opposite, it is time for all of us to put away that kind of malarkey that has dominated politics for 20 years and get down to the real tough issues that have to be dealt with. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, normally in this House people say that it is a pleasure to rise and speak in debate. Today, it is not a pleasure to rise and speak on debate since there is so much pain in this budget. There is pain for many Manitobans, but pain for particular groups in our society.

There is pain for aboriginal people; there is pain for rural Manitobans; there is pain for northern Manitobans; there is pain for poor families; there is pain for women and there is pain for seniors. I will come back to this, explain what I mean and why I think there is so much pain in this budget.

Before I do, I would like to start off and commend the government for three good things that I actually found in their budget.

An Honourable Member: Only three?

Mr. Martindale: Only three. For example, converting the annual tax credit for social assistance recipients into monthly payments is a good thing because what the government did by that was they cut out the tax discounters. It was not just that it was depriving money from people on social assistance, but it was also the taxpayer's money that was being skimmed off the top by the tax discounters.

When the minister announced this in his Budget Address, I was pleased to hear that. That was a progressive thing they did in this budget, something that they should have done years ago and something that the federal government should have done years ago and could still do. In fact, I would hope that the federal government would take this good example, imitate it and do the same thing.

Second, I support and we support the government-labour sponsored employee ownership fund. The fund will provide incentives to facilitate the transfer of broad ownership of Manitoba companies to employees. It will help Manitoba employees to take ownership position in companies. It will create jobs and save jobs. It is \$2 million well spent.

The third thing I would commend the government for is the elimination of the Seniors RentalStart program. This program I believe was brought in in 1986 by an NDP government, but brought in at a time and for a particular reason, namely to increase the number of rental units being constructed.

With a high vacancy rate, I do not think this can be justified anymore. It is also hard to justify a program that spends money subsidizing very rich seniors. These are people who are putting \$25,000 to \$100,000 equity into a project and then paying rent of \$250 to \$950 a month, depending on which Seniors RentalStart project they are buying into. What the government was doing was subsidizing people in the top 5 percent of the rental market, people that could afford to buy condominiums and do not need government assistance or those kind of life-lease programs. I think the program, while it had a purpose and a social goal when it was first introduced, had outlived that. I commend the government for chopping that particular program.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence by our Leader because in presenting its budget, the government has completely failed to develop an economic strategy that will counter the severe recession facing the Manitoba economy. There is no economic strategy of this government, otherwise they would not be laying off civil servants when the unemployment rate is 10 percent.

The manufacturing sector has declined from 62,000 jobs to 54,000 jobs. Public administration jobs are declining even before the recently announced layoffs. Transportation layoffs have resulted in a drop in the work force from 43,000 to 40,000. Corporate tax revenue is down 47 percent or \$86 million, but on the other hand, individual tax revenue is up 7 percent or \$84 million. The gas tax revenue is up 10 percent. Manitoba families though are paying the difference. There is no economic strategy to the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) budget.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence because this government has cut thousands of jobs from the Manitoba economy and has cut job creation programs when the actual unemployment rate has increased to over 10 percent under this government. Unemployment will be up as a direct result of the government's budget. For example, not only are there civil servants being laid off, but the result of cuts to grants to nongovernment organizations will result in at least 300 jobs being lost.

The government needs to look at but is probably aware of the multiplier effect, so probably for every job that is lost, two more jobs will be lost because of money that circulates in the economy—or money that will not be circulating in the economy because of those layoffs.

An Honourable Member: The trickle-down theory?

Mr. Martindale: Well, it is your—it is the government's trickle-down theory. You lay off one worker and two more get unemployed because the money is not in the economy circulating to keep those people working. It is a Tory trickle-down economic theory, but it creates unemployment—that is the problem. There are also cuts to staffing in regional offices which will result in unemployment, most of which will be in rural Manitoba.

I am supporting the resolution of nonconfidence because Manitoba has dropped to tenth out of 10 in

private investment and seen a 47 percent cut in corporate income taxes because of the failure of the government. There is irony in being tenth out of 10 in private investment since the Tory party campaigned in 1988 and '90 on getting the economy going again. Any of us who were candidates in both those elections will remember the Tory candidate saying, we are the party of good management, we are the ones who are going to get the economy going again. What happened? That is what they say, that is true, but what happened since then? The economy has got worse and worse since 1988, and they have been in government since then.

This is their fourth budget. Instead of fulfilling their election promises of getting the economy going again, things are getting worse every year. Of course, you know, they couch it in language which could be summed up best, I guess, as business friendly, because that is what they want to do, is help their business friends. Now they are going to do it with this budget because they are going to privatize things and give things to private companies that civil servants were doing in the past, although I think they should really take the advice of some of their business friends like Buddy Brownstone, who is quoted very interestingly on the front page of the Business section of the Free Press on Wednesday, March 6.

The headline is, deficit cutting, start with us; business says it is willing to get by without the grants. I think it is a very interesting quotation from Buddy Brownstone, their friend, the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. We would like them to take us seriously, he said. We have said to all governments for some years that we have to get our economic house in order. We are saying, start with us. While business says it can do without government handouts, it favours assistance through repayment loans and tax forgiveness under certain strict criteria.

Have they listened to Buddy Brownstone? No. He is saying start with us, cut off the grants to business. They listen to him for everything else. Why do they not listen when he says cut the grants to businesses? Sounds like good advice from a source that normally they would listen to. I am surprised that they have not taken his advice in this budget.

The government wants to make the economy more business friendly by doing things that the business community is asking that they agree with.

For example, they want to achieve their goals by cutting back on labour legislation that they consider is unhealthy. In response to these requests, in the last session they repealed final offer selection. It is clear that they have not totally achieved the goals of the business community yet, but who knows, with another few budgets they probably will. They will be able to do everything that they want, and things will just get worse and worse and worse.

I am supporting, and our party is going to support our Leader on a motion of nonconfidence because this government has ignored the future of this province by instituting major cutbacks to education, training and job creation programs for young people. They are cutting education by funding it at less than inflation. This is a shortsighted policy.

* (1530)

You know, I listen to business people. This might surprise the members opposite, but in the morning I go for coffee at the North Y, and there is a group of business people who have coffee there every morning. I said to one of these people, reputedly a millionaire who owns his own insurance company, I said, what do you think of the budget and what do you think of the cutbacks? We got talking specifically about education and he said, what I think they should be doing is pouring money into education, pour it into education, he said, so that we can be competitive with countries like Germany and Japan. His feeling is that we need to improve educational standards, improve educational funding and improve the quality of graduates.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Another business owner who was there at coffee at the same time, who also owns an insurance agency in East Kildonan, agreed with him. He said, we have a problem. We cannot hire graduates from high school because they are not well enough qualified. We need to improve standards. We need to improve the quality of education, and we should improve the funding as well. That is not me who is saying that; it is my business friends over coffee in the morning.

Why are these people saying this? They are saying it because it will pay dividends in the future. Funding for education is an investment in the future, not just the future of young people and their education, but the future of our economic well-being in this province as well.

Instead, what is the government doing? They are cutting support to community colleges, reducing it by \$3.9 million, cutting Native education funding by 10 percent, eliminating the high school bursary program by \$1.7 million—money that is given to the poorest students to encourage them to stay in school. This is the group of students who need the most help.

We know that there is a very definite correlation between education and income; that the more education you have, the more likely you are to have a higher income. Student Aid has been reduced though by \$1.2 million, and university tuition is going up by 15 to 20 percent. There has also been a \$600,000 reduction in funding to English as a Second Language programs and yet, while cutting back on education funding, the government has increased funding to elite private schools by 11 percent.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence, and my party is supporting the motion of nonconfidence because this government has severely cut programs for people throughout Manitoba. I believe that by cutting back on programs for vulnerable people and poor people that this budget contradicts a whole lot of things, but one is the Mission and Goals Statement of the Department of Family Services. One of the goals of the department is, quote, to ensure that Manitobans' basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, safety and care are met.

One of these groups is seniors, and what did the government do? They de-indexed the 55-Plus income support program. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) couches it in terms of so much per senior per week, but the total is quite impressive. It is something like \$480,000. Collectively, they are hurting all seniors who benefit from this program.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence of this party because this government has further jeopardized the extremely difficult situation in the rural economy by failing to develop a rural economic strategy and deal fairly with the crisis facing Manitoba farmers.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Do you know of what you talk?

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture asked me a question and, of course, I am going to be careful in what I say now because I do not pretend to be an expert in rural issues. I am only going to talk about their plan of

decentralization. That is basically their only strategy for rural Manitoba, to decentralize Civil Service jobs to rural Manitoba.

We, in our party, are in favour of that. Our only criticism has been how they have tried to carry it out. I think their policy seems to be one step forward and two steps back. They announce decentralization and then they cut out 150 jobs in Housing, most of them in rural Manitoba. They talk about decentralization in the throne speech, and then they bring in a budget which cuts civil servants in rural Manitoba.

They are redeploying Housing staff. Some of them have been phoning me, and it is quite interesting what they say. They say, we were working in rural Manitoba and we were moved to Winnipeg, or we were told, you can take advantage of this redeployment program if you move to Winnipeg, and then somebody is going to have to do the same job. They are going to be driving out to rural Manitoba, doing the same job that they were doing before, but based in Winnipeg, which is really going to cost the government more money. It does not make any sense at all.

An Honourable Member: Poor research done.

Mr. Martindale: The research, Mr. Acting Speaker, is my own. It is people who have been phoning me and telling me what is happening to them in the Department of Housing. I am happy to do that kind of research. It is very interesting to hear what people have to say when they are moved from places like Brandon to Winnipeg. That is an example of Tory decentralization.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence because this government has cut programs to northern and aboriginal Manitobans, including job and education programs. They are cutting out Northern Youth Corps job program. This is extremely shortsighted. It is taking away hope for northern Manitobans, especially for northern Manitobans who are young. There is \$1.6 million taken from ACCESS and New Careers, much of which would have helped northern aboriginal people. They are taking away the hope of the university education and jobs from aboriginal and northern Manitobans.

The budget for Northern Affairs has been cut by \$2.5 million. They have cut \$1.2 million from the northern infrastructure. They have cut aboriginal development programs. They have eliminated the

Northern Association of Community Councils grant. The Native Communications grant has been eliminated. I think this government has basically written off the North and written off our aboriginal people.

I support the resolution of nonconfidence because this government has failed to deal with the real needs of Manitobans' health care system and introduced user fees for Northerners. The real need is to provide community-based health care as a front line of delivery of health care, backed up by institutions. There are some examples on how this is happening, on how the change is happening in other places. I think we would do well to study these changes and see how they are being implemented, see if they work, look at the successes and imitate them in Manitoba. For example, perhaps some members have read about the changes that are happening in Victoria, B.C., rather significant changes, and probably happening there because they have a higher percentage of seniors than any other city in Canada, but we know that seniors, as a percentage of the population, are increasing all over Canada. We would do well to study the experience there.

One of the things that they have done is they have tried to keep seniors in their own home, whether they are sick or well, and they have done that by greatly increasing funding to home care and to home nursing. An amazing thing has happened. It has been so successful in keeping seniors out of hospital that five hospitals in Victoria, B.C., have voluntarily taken a million dollars out of their budgets and given it to this new program of home care and home nursing. Now, can you imagine any hospital in Winnipeg or any hospital in Manitoba voluntarily giving up a million dollars to put the money into home care or home nursing? Well, it is hard to imagine, but it is probably what they should be doing because it is cost-effective in the long run.

I have some personal experience with this, having looked after an elderly neighbour of mine who was ill. This individual spent months in the hospital until we arranged for home care. As a result, she spent much less time in the hospital. Now, those hospital stays may have been costing up to \$900 a day. I am not sure of the exact figures, but we know that hospital care is very, very expensive. One of her problems was malnutrition. The first time she was in the hospital for a number of months, she gained 17 pounds. Obviously, this individual was getting

sick and was going back for repeated hospital stays because she was not eating properly. Once we cleaned up her house a little bit and home care put in a worker and she was getting two hot meals a day, the senior citizen spent much, much less time in hospital. She was getting good nutritious meals, and she was getting companionship.

The cost of paying a home care worker \$6 or \$8 an hour is miniscule compared to this person being in hospital and being cared for by nursing staff, other support staff and doctors, three shifts a day at somewhere, I do not know, \$800-\$900 a day.

We need to do much more of this, and I would urge the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to study the Victoria experience and see if it cannot be replicated here in Manitoba and in Winnipeg. If they are saving a lot of money in Victoria, which seems to be the case, then there is no reason why we cannot save money in Winnipeg. The example I have given of my neighbour I think is probably typical of other seniors and could be replicated here.

* (1540)

We are disappointed that there is now a transportation fee for Northerners. This seems to be extremely discriminatory because it is only applied to Northerners. In fact, it is probably illegal under the Canada Health Act, and I hope that somebody from northern Manitoba takes the government to court to see whether it is illegal or not. Certainly it is the thin edge of the wedge; it is the beginning of user fees in Manitoba.

I support the resolution of nonconfidence, Mr. Acting Speaker, because this government has not provided adequate support for services to Manitoba families. In fact, there are some very specific cuts which has affected families. They have, for example, cut funding from Parent-Child Centres. The Parent-Child Centres are providing excellent programs in neighbourhood schools and formerly in storefront locations, which provided programming that was very appropriate, especially for single parent mothers.

This government has also cut back on CRISP, the Child Related Income Support Program, which supported working poor families. This program is one of the best programs in existence because it is targeted to low income families, not people who are unemployed who are eligible for social assistance, but people who are working poor, people who are not entitled to supplement programs because they

are on social assistance, and many of whose income may even be below what the income is of people on social assistance.

Unfortunately, the government chooses not to advertise these kinds of programs. People do not know that they are available. If you do not know that something is available, you do not apply for it; if you do not apply for it, you do not get it. The result is that every year the take-up rate goes down and down and down, so in fact by attrition, you might say, it is costing the government less and less money every year. What do they do? They cut it even further by deindexing it. They are freezing the amount of money that people are eligible for on CRISP.

So they are cutting back on an income support program to families, as well as the cutbacks in funding, the total elimination of funding to the Parent-Child Centres, or the lack of funding for Parent-Child Centres which specifically, and particularly, affects people in Burrows more than many other constituencies in Manitoba.

They have also cut back on the children's dental care program by reducing the age of eligibility. There has been a cut of \$697,000 in health promotion programs for children. Instead of cutting back, what we need are improvements in support to families, for example, youth drop-in centres like the Pritchard Place Drop-In Centre.

I think this government has choices; any government has choices. You can either fund these things, which may cost you money today and save money in the future—and I would suggest that they should fund some of these things today to keep these young people off the street and out of the judicial system in the future. It is much cheaper to fund youth drop-in centres like Pritchard Place now than to pay for the social costs and the economic costs of these people 10 years down the road, whether it is at Headingley jail or wherever it is, maybe social assistance, maybe the cost of these people being unemployed because their family life was disrupted and fell apart.

What we need are more safe houses for children dealing with chemical and alcohol abuse. I commend the government for partial funding. I think it was \$75,000 for the house that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has been telling us about in recent days.

I support the motion of nonconfidence because this government has reduced services to Manitoba women. There have been cuts to the women's health programs; there has been a cut to the Status of Women budget by 14 percent; they have increased fees for day care. I suggest this is also an attack on women, because if people decide that it is too expensive to have two people working and keep their child in day care, that one of them is going to drop out of the work force if they cannot afford to keep their child in day care. Who is going to drop out of the work force? Well, because women earn much less than men—I think on the average they earn 68 per cent of males' earnings—it is probably the woman that is going to drop out of the work force to stay home to provide the home care probably because her income is lower than her male counterpart. So the changes in the day-care funding formulas, I believe, are disadvantageous to women in Manitoba society.

I am supporting the resolution of nonconfidence because this government has targeted seniors for reduced programs and services specifically by deindexing the 55-Plus income support program. The 55-Plus income support program assisted 24,000 seniors in 1989-90 according to the government's own statistics, all of whom were well below the poverty line. I believe that singles were something like \$3,000 below the poverty line, and couples a thousand dollars below the poverty line.

I am supporting the motion of nonconfidence because this government has lost the confidence of this House and the people of Manitoba.

I would like to spend a few minutes replying to some of the things that members on the government side have been saying and also publishing. For example, I have a leaflet, I guess a householder. This one is that of the member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay), but she uses the same figure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) used the other day in debate. Also, I am sure that this pie graph is in the member for Lac du Bonnet's (Mr. Praznik) householder which he has offered to show me.

It is a very interesting pie graph, because it is quite different than the pie graph that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has in his budget documents. It says, interest costs as a proportion of provincial income tax, and it says, 1980-81, 19 cents out of the dollar; 1990-91, 48 cents out of the dollar. Well, first of all, the figure is misleading. I suppose this was published before the budget, but

the figure in the speech of the Minister of Finance was 45 cents on the dollar.

The reason it is misleading, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that it is only a percentage of income revenue. What you really need to look at is the provincial expenditures on page 4 of Financial Statistics in the minister's budget papers, and we see that the public debt cost is only 10.5 percent. So I think the government members are misleading the public by saying that it is 48 percent and, you know, obscuring the fact that that is a percentage of income tax revenue, when a much more accurate figure is the 10.5 percent which is published in the budget.

If you look at comparisons, year over year comparisons, you see that the 10.5 percent is actually lower than it has been in the past and is not out of line with the percentages in the last several years. Those percentages have varied from 5.7 percent in '82-83 to 11.3 percent in '87-88 and this year actually, according to this, 10.6 percent, identical to last year. So I think the government is trying to create a climate out there, they are trying to suggest that the deficit and deficit financing is much greater than it actually is in order to justify some of the cutbacks that they are making in the Civil Service and more particularly in government programming.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The government has also misled the public, I think, particularly during the election, because they said during the election that there would be no new taxes, and yet gasoline tax is up 10.5 percent; diesel fuel tax is up 1 cent a litre; tobacco tax is up 1 cent a cigarette; in total \$32.5 million in new taxes. Taxes on families are up 7.4 percent or \$84 million.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when I began I said that it was not a pleasure to take part in this debate, because there is so much pain in this budget for Manitobans. I would restate that and say that in particular there is pain for particular groups of people in our society, especially for northern people, for aboriginal people, for women, for children, for families, for seniors and poor people.

It is quite a list, a very distressing list, a disappointing list. It is particularly disappointing for members like myself who have a very large percentage of people in those categories. In the constituency of Burrows, an inner-city constituency, this is going to be a very hard, harsh budget for them. It means higher unemployment, it means less hope,

it means less likelihood of getting their education, especially those people who might have qualified for ACCESS programs.

* (1550)

They will not forget this budget. I think the era that we are in now is reminiscent of the first year of the Sterling Lyon government. What is happening is that perceptions are being formed and those perceptions will last, because people remember the kind of climate that this government is creating, and they will remember come the time of the next election. Thank you.

Mr. Reimer: I, unlike my colleague from Burrows, rise here today in support of the budget brought down by our Finance minister.

I must compliment the minister and all colleagues in the Executive Council for the hard and the often difficult decisions that they had to go through in coming up with this budget. They were decisions that were responsible and unavoidable.

Recent events in Canada and around the world make it very clear that we cannot keep spending and we cannot continue with programs unless we get our economic and our own house in order. This requires a stable and competitive tax environment in which disposable income derives through consumption, capital investment drives through production.

When we talk about debt and interest costs, deficit leads to increasing debt, increasing debt leads to rising interest costs and rising interest costs lead ultimately to reduced services. This government has made commitments that services in vital areas such as health, education and family services will remain and have remained the priority of this government.

Since 1980, Manitoba taxpayers have paid over \$3.5 billion of their hard-earned money as tax in interest payments. This amounts to around \$1,400 a day or almost \$60 per hour since 1980 that we have been paying tax and interest on debt.

What is happening in today's economy and in world society is we are in a recession, a recession that possibly our honourable members across do not recognize or cannot fathom. We have a recession that is not only here in Canada or in Manitoba, but we have a recession in the United States and we have a recession in the world.

As the honourable Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) was mentioning the other day, this is a world-wide recession where in the United States you have 260 million people in the throes of a recession, you have here in Canada 26 million people in the throes of a terrible recession.

Here in Manitoba with one million people, we are also faced with a recession. Yet our honourable friends in opposition, and particularly in the NDP, are saying that we here in Manitoba with our one million people, we should be the kick-start to get this economy going. Kick-start one million people to kick-start 26 million people to kick-start 260 million to kick-start the world recession.

That is fantastic thinking and logic on our opposition's part that we, as a million people in this province, have the resources and the ability to revitalize the whole world and North American economy; the philosophy of going out and borrowing money and getting our economy going, not realizing that here in Canada we are just part of the players of the world that are going through the same terrible, terrible situations.

A recession that has already been shown in other parts of Canada with some very dramatic and unfortunately very tragic figures. The recession in Quebec has shown that wages now are frozen for 450,000 public employees. Newfoundland has closed 360 hospital beds—that is in Liberal Newfoundland. In Prince Edward Island, personal income taxes rise to an all-time new high. New Brunswick imposed a one-year freeze on Civil Service and Crown corporation wages, hospital and nursing home fundings were frozen, education and municipal funding show a zero increase, and doctors and pharmacists were advised that their wages would not increase. These are facts, Mr. Acting Speaker, that are coming home to roost. These are governments that are realizing that they have to make very hard decisions.

Here in Manitoba we are not looking at closing hospital beds, but we are looking at more humane and conscientious ways at looking at our debt and structuring it. In fact, in health care we have increased our funding this year.

Federally, we have been faced with some terrible transfer payment reductions. Spending policies by the federal government and high interest rates have placed enormous burdens on the Finance minister in coming forth with a budget that is recognizable.

We are also looking at federal cuts in RCMP cost-sharing and also social assistance programs for aboriginal peoples and in other areas.

The federal government is currently paying about \$1.3 billion less to the provinces, \$121 million less to Manitoba. These are amounts that were required to achieve equalization under the federal government's own calculations. This government is trying to keep taxes down. The people have told us that, the electorate have told us that, they are full and sick and tired of taxes. We must be tax competitive, but at the same time we must look behind us.

We cannot drive forward without looking in the rearview mirror. When we look in the rearview mirror, Mr. Acting Speaker, we must look back at the NDP record. It is worth repeating, because as we look back on the NDP record, we seem to strike a sore part with our honourable colleagues in the NDP, but at the same time, they will throw up a former Premier in our province, Mr. Sterling Lyon, who was over 10 years gone, but we must look at the NDP record and we must reiterate their philosophy, because these are the things that the people must be aware of.

In 1982, personal income tax is increased by 24 percent. They increased the insurance premiums tax. They increased the bank corporate capital tax. They imposed the payroll tax. They imposed higher income tax surtax. In 1983, increased personal income taxes by 23 percent. They increased corporate income taxes by 104 percent, Mr. Acting Speaker—104 percent in one year—and they increased the provincial sales tax to 6 percent. In 1984, they increased the corporate income taxes by 18 percent. In 1985, the NDP government increased personal income taxes by 11 percent. This list goes on and on. They imposed eight new taxes in 1987 for a total of raising the taxes during the NDP record of 16 times. Let not the people of Manitoba forget the NDP record and their legacy of tax increases.

In looking at the Filmon government's record for taxes, we have cut taxes for families. We reduced the number of family firms payroll tax. We reduced the small business tax. We reduced the taxes on farm land by 25 percent. In 1989, we reduced the personal income taxes by 2 percent.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this government is committed to trying to keep the line and to lower taxes. We

must target economic incentives to make this province grow.

* (1600)

With this budget, introduced by the Finance minister, major initiatives have taken place. A new small business tax reduction, which was introduced in the 1988 budget, which provides income relief for the small business corporations, will be extended to ensure that new firms and new businesses could take advantage of this program.

The payroll tax credit for employees' training, for employees committed to improving their worker skills, will be able to reduce the payroll tax to 1.95 percent. The program will help businesses put training programs in place and will provide opportunities for employees to increase their skills and their values in the workplace.

A new incentive to redirect Manitoba's investment to the Manitoba economy to encourage exploration for mineral deposits, oil and gas in our province was introduced. Investors who purchase equity in Registered Manitoba Mineral Exploration Investment Corporation will qualify for a grant equal to 25 percent of the investment. This is intended to stimulate and encourage the mining and mineral exploration in Manitoba, which indeed is a very significant part of our economy and contributes a significant amount to our tax base for further and future programs here in Manitoba.

A new initiative taken by this government is that our government is also working actively with the Manitoba Federation of Labour on the start-up of government-labour sponsored employee ownership fund. In fact, in the weekend paper—I believe it was the weekend or the latter part of the week—it was endorsed by Susan Hart-Kulbaba of the Manitoba Labour Federation as being a very positive and worthwhile endeavour to get small businesses involved in with the possible purchase of their own businesses.

The spending priorities of this government have been and will continue to be Health, Family Services, and Education and Training. It must be pointed out, even in the economic times that have been mentioned, that an additional \$90 million is devoted to health programs in this budget. A further \$37 million is provided for health services. Education and training will get an additional \$23 million of this total increase in the budget, increases

that are needed and increases that are part of Manitoba's plan for the future.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I stood in wonder the other day when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) got up to reply to the budget speech, and I read with interest a lot of the things that he had to say, because I felt it was important that the Leader of the Opposition should have some sort of guidance as to what was good or needed in the budget. In his reply I noticed that he throws out a challenge, and I am quoting from Hansard where he says, I challenge every Conservative member of the Chamber to look through these revenue numbers, because it gives you an amazing story of what it is, a mirror on the economy.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I thought that was very appropriate that we should look at our economic indicators here in Manitoba because the economy of Manitoba is what is the fuel for growth, what provides the jobs, what provides the income and the taxes that this government needs, because throughout the reply by the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), he kept talking about being 10 out of 10, that Manitoba is 10 out of 10.

Every time that there was a quip, which he is very good at doing, a wit one-liner—he is very adept at his one-line replies—he has always got the quip of saying we are 10 out of 10. It is an interesting observation by the Leader of the Opposition that we are 10 out of 10 because he picks out the one figure which does indicate from the Conference Board that we are 10 out of 10, but that is one indicator of 13 major performance indicators.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I would like to point out the same figures and the same information that I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition used that I will use, too, because I think it is only fair that we compare what he is talking about with what I would like to talk about.

As mentioned, he is right. He has said the Conference Board has said we are 10 out of 10. I will agree with him there, but there are some other interesting figures that he sort of forgot to include in his preamble and his tirade of the budget.

I think it is worth getting them on the record because on the same sheet that I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition was referring to, the very first page, the very first line in fact, says that Manitoba is performing at or above the national

average for seven of the 13 major performance indicators. That is amazing. You know, we have seven out of 13 that we are doing above or better. These are things that are worth noting.

In employment we are above the national average. Manufacturing employment in Manitoba averaged 53,000 persons during the first quarter of 1991. It is down by 3 percent but in comparison to Ontario and Quebec, which was down 11.9 and 2.2, Canada's employment decline was less, so we are above the average there.

For capital investment—we keep hearing this thrown back at us from across the floor—there were 10 out of 10, but the same sheet that I am sure, as I mentioned, the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) was referring to, says we are above the national average here in Canada and these are the same ones for the same quarter that I am sure the Leader of the Opposition was referring to, and it says that here in Manitoba we are expected to reach 293 million in 1991, up 7.7 from last year.

It also says this is the fourth best growth rate among the provinces here in Canada, fourth out of 10. That is four out of 10. I believe that is four out of 10, that is not 10 out of 10, that is four out of 10. So I believe that maybe the Leader of the Opposition was just misinformed with that. -(interjection)- No, I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition was using the same sheet that I am using, so it is just that he may not have seen that. I would just like to, in case he was in such a hurry -(interjection)- well, in case he did not read it all, I think that it is worth getting to know.

In bankruptcies—we hear the opposition talking that bankruptcies are up in Manitoba. We have the first quarter statistics here. I think we should look at it, and right beside it, it says above the average in Canada, again. It says that there were 80 business bankruptcies. Any bankruptcy is not a good bankruptcy, and I must say that right off the bat. We do not like to see any type of business have a bankruptcy, and the increase was 27 percent. Compared to Canada, we are the fourth lowest amongst the provinces. So here we are four out of 10 again.

It does have a footnote on here, too. It is something that I think should be brought out and it refers back to bankruptcies per a thousand business starts. It sort of has a little asterisk beside it. I should read it out, though. It says, the highest level

of business bankruptcies per a thousand starts in Manitoba over the last 20 years occurred during the last recession in 1982 which was 58 out of a thousand, back in '82. I believe that is the year that the NDP were in power. You know, it just should be worth noting.

In looking further on these economic indicators that are being used by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, it says that employment—here again we are above the national average. Total Manitoba employment average 483,000 persons during the first quarter of 1991. In percentage terms, this is a decline of 2.2 compared with the Canadian average drop of 2.5.

* (1610)

Unemployment rate—Manitoba's unemployment rate in March remains the third lowest in Canada, so that means three out of 10. So again, the Leader of the Opposition keeps referring to 10 out of 10, and I keep looking for the 10 out of 10 that he keeps referring to.

Housing starts here in Manitoba during the first quarter, we are above the average. Retail sales, we are above the average. In fact, our retail sales for the first quarter increased by .7 percent in 1991, compared to the Canadian retail sales which fell by 4.1. These are figures that I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition was using. In his looking at the figures of being 10 out of 10, he is referring a lot to the Conference Board, because on the same forecast that the Conference Board is listed as being 10 out of 10 it also has the Bank of Nova Scotia saying that we are eight out of 10. The Informetrica poll says we are six out of 10.

The TD Bank says we are five out of 10. The Bank of Commerce says we are seven out of 10, and the Royal Bank says we are five out of 10. So I guess if you took an average of them all, we would be seven out of 10. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has said we are 10 out of 10 because, sure enough, one indicator does say that—one out of 13. So he is not stretching the truth when he says that, but he keeps repeating it so everybody knows. I believe that he is referring to the Conference Board; he is referring to the results of the Conference Board. I would think that the Conference Board is what he is basing a lot of his decisions on, and I commend him on the faith he has in the Conference Board.

I should point out too that the Conference Board has also come out with another figure. I would think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) should be wary of this because this is also from the Conference Board which he has relied so much faith on. It states that the Conference Board of Canada has recently issued a study which shows that Manitoba exports to America have increased 9 percent since the introduction of the Free Trade Agreement.

Now, I mean, the honourable Leader of the Opposition has got up and said that we are losing millions; we are losing all our investments, our jobs, all our goods and services, and everything is all leaving to the United States since the free trade. If he would base his assumption on the Conference Board in which he says were 10 out of 10, I would think that he should look at the Conference Board report that says we are up 9 percent since the introduction of the Free Trade Agreement.

The logic seems to be there. It is just up to the Leader of the Opposition to grasp that possibly there is a correlation between there, and maybe he should understand that. I am not here to try to give any type of direction to the Leader of the Opposition, because I am sure he knows exactly where he is going.

Further on in his reply to the throne speech, he makes great pains in saying that, when he is questioned about our friends to the East, the province of Ontario, he says, and I quote, and I will quote this—this is from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer): I think Bob Rae is doing a great job. He goes on further to say, if you want to debate the Province of Ontario, my friends, I will debate it. We will debate it with pride at any time.

Well, I think that is a noble and a very generous throwing of the gauntlet, if you want to call it. I think Bob Rae is doing a great job. Well, I have to maybe take a little question on that because we have a government in Ontario that was elected—how long ago?—in September, I believe it was. How many budgets have come down since then? -(interjection)- Well, I do not think it has even come down with the budget yet.

I would like to point out what our honourable Leader of the Opposition is referring to and where he says, if you want to debate the Province of Ontario, my friends, I will debate it. We will debate with pride at anytime. I want you to focus in on that name "pride." I think Bob Rae is doing a great job.

I would like you to remember those words of the honourable Leader of the Opposition because, just as he was referring to some of the economic indicators that were put forth before, I think that maybe we should just look at how Ontario is doing. If Ontario is doing such a great job, we should maybe take some lessons from them. We will look at some of these Ontario figures that the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) is so proud of. He is proud that Ontario unemployment is now 11.9 percent.

An Honourable Member: How much?

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, 11.9 percent in Ontario. In Ontario, the bankruptcies have almost doubled. They are up to 99.4 percent, and the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said he is proud of that, proud of what Mr. Bob Rae is doing.

Employment, the declines in Ontario were 4.6 percent. In housing starts—the pride that the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said that he is proud to debate with pride at any time—are down 61 percent in Ontario. As I mentioned previously, retail sales in Manitoba are up .7 percent. In Ontario they are down 5.9 percent. These are the things that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is so proud to debate and had so much pride in.

When we look at Ontario—we will look in a while when they bring down their budget—we will look at a deficit of between \$8 billion and \$9 billion in Ontario. That is the projected deficit for this great province that our honourable Leader of the Opposition said that he is so proud of, that Bob Rae is doing a great job. Remember that line, Bob Rae is doing a great job. I will debate with pride at any time at what they are doing—a province that has not brought down a budget that has been in power now since September and nothing has happened there.

I would like to also point out one other line that the honourable Leader of the Opposition has come out with when he talks about the changing and the loss of jobs. He says: You are driving people out of work; you are putting them on welfare.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must point out to you the Ontario meaning of welfare, because there seems to be—as I said before and as I repeat, Bob Rae is doing a great job. I would like to point out what welfare in Ontario means. In Ontario, welfare beats work in Ontario right now. In fact, anybody making less than \$45,000 a year, should go on welfare in

Ontario, because Bob Rae, following the lead of the Liberal incompetent David Peterson, is paying pogeys equivalent of \$24 an hour or \$865 a week.

I must point out, as I mentioned previously, I think I said that the Leader of the Opposition has said, I will debate with pride—I want to get it right, pardon me. I will debate it, and we will debate it with pride at any time. The pride of having welfare.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people here in Manitoba, no one wants to be on welfare and no one has the type of vision that is where they want to end up on. Manitoba, here, is not a province of ordinary people. The party across here says that they speak for the ordinary people and the average person. -(applause)- Yes, they can clap and pray for that.

I believe that this side—that Manitobans are not ordinary and they are not average. The people of Manitoba are special. There is no ordinary Manitoban; there is no average Manitoban. The people in Manitoba are special. The people of Winnipeg are special, the people of my constituency of Niakwa are special. I believe that they all should be treated as very special people because they have needs that should be met.

* (1620)

For us to feel that because there is job loss that the alternative is welfare, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said, I believe is scandalous. Welfare is not the alternative. Nobody wants welfare. Yet in Ontario they feel that is the answer. In Ontario now, the NDP have increased the welfare payments by 17 percent. A couple with two children, an incredible thing, a couple with two children can get as much as \$1,800 a month tax free.

Welfare is not the answer and it should not be the answer. I do not believe that any member in this House would advocate that people would be on welfare as an alternative because they are out of jobs. People of this province are special and they will work and they will work hard to strive for what they want. Welfare will not be the alternative and will not be the answer, as put forth by our honourable Leader of the Opposition. When he says he is proud of what is happening in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize where that pride is. It is a misspent pride and it is misdirected. If that is the way that the Leader of the Opposition looks at what should be going on, we are in for a lot of trouble.

Within a very short time you will find the Premier of Ontario, Premier Bob, headed down to Ottawa with his cap and his cup in hand because there will be no more money left there.

In fact, once this government and the philosophy of our ministers here and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) start to kick into gear because of the astute planning, we may have to subsidize, and we may have to help our neighbours to the east, because they will not have anything left. It is like piranhas in a fishbowl right now, that is how they are spending down there. There is nothing left and there will not be anything left. -(interjection)- Well, we will not use that phrase but there are other ways of looking at it.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things that should be brought out and should be pointed out as we look at this budget. We cannot sit as our honourable Leader of the Opposition does and throw the one-liners and the little quips, GFT—we hear that little phrase of GFT. Well, I guess we could say, GDD, Gloom and Doom Doer, but we do not want to say that. We are not that type of people. We have other things on our agenda, and we have other visions to look at. The little quips and the little one-liners, there is room for those certainly, but there must be constructive suggestions come forth. There must be some positive answers. We have often said to our friends across the way there, our friends of the opposition, come forth with ideas, come forth with suggestions. These are the things that must make our province grow and grow, because over the years there was—

An Honourable Member: The word "grow" was not in the budget.

Mr. Reimer: It is a good thing that the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) came in because he does refer to one word that I will agree to. He has used the word "growth," and he uses that, that Manitoba does need growth. I will concede that is the truth. The Province of Manitoba, the economy of Manitoba needs growth and stimulation and a sense of purpose. At the same time the one thing we do not need is we do not need the growth of taxes, we do not need the growth of burden that our young people will have, and we do not need the growth of spending.

There we may differ. In certain respects, I will agree with the Leader of the Opposition only in the interpretation of the words. My interpretation of the

words and how they are meant is different than the Leader of the Opposition. -(interjection)- If we are looking at the suggestion of—as was mentioned across the way, we must look at the Disneyland approach that the Leader of the honourable Opposition is coming forth with, because if we look at the Disneyland approach and the fantasy land that they are trying to project, why, these are the things that we will be faced with.

You know, we are not like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) or the honourable Leader across the way where they can wave a magic wand like Tinkerbell and make things change. There must be sound economic decisions made, and these are the things that must come forth. To think things cannot change constructively, we must work and strive forward for these.

Unless we succeed in keeping our finances under control, Manitoba will find itself handcuffed by ever deteriorating finances. If Manitoba's finances get out of control, it will be Manitoba's creditors and the banks that will be controlling our province's agenda.

We hear a lot of times from the honourable opposition that it is a corporate agenda that we are running here. We are catering to the corporations. I wonder—we should define corporation and I think it is important because they use that phrase quite often, we are catering to the corporations and all the perks and everything else that they should be getting.

I think it is worth pointing out what the definition of a corporation is. This is from Webster's Dictionary—I believe that everyone would agree that is a fairly reputable dictionary; it is nonpartisan, it does not have any affiliation, so I think that it is quite in line—where it says the definition of a corporation is an association of employers and employees in a basic industry or of members of a profession organized and responsible for supervision and control of production, wages, working conditions and all matters pertaining to that industry or profession.

Now, it is worth noting—when we talk corporations and we keep hearing the opposition talk about the corporations getting all these breaks—there is only one responsibility that a corporation has, and a corporation's responsibility is to its shareholders. The shareholders of a corporation can be from various and varied backgrounds. A lot of them are people who put their

money into corporations for pension funds or because they believe in the corporation. They believe that corporation will give them a fair return on their monies, so they put the money into that company.

What has happened lately—and in a lot of places in Canada and the United States—is you have very large funds available for investment, and as was pointed out a little earlier by our honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), large pension funds and large mutual funds will put their monies into corporations because they believe that corporation is going in the right direction and they can get a return on investment, a profit that comes back in the form of dividends. This money that is put into some of these mutual funds, where does it come from, Mr. Speaker? Well, it comes a lot of times from, like I say, individual people who are buying shares. They buy into these mutual funds, but also who buys into these large mutual funds is large unions, trade unions. Oh, yes, they will invest their money into these mutual funds because their members are saying, we want a return for our money; we are not going to give you this money just for nothing; we want a return on our money.

* (1630)

What do these mutual funds do? They invest into corporations. Then, when they have their annual shareholders' meetings, which everybody comes to, everybody is invited—if you have a share in that company, you can come to that meeting and you have a right to vote. You have a right to let your voices be known because of how you want that corporation managed and how you want your monies managed. So what happens, Mr. Speaker, is you have these large corporations at these shareholders' meetings. As mentioned, the pension fund managers come there, the mutual fund managers come. They come there and they say, I represent this fund which has so many shareholders, so these shareholders will go then to that chairman of the board and say, make decisions so we can get a return on our investment. That is how you get it. You get a circle. You get—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): As one of my colleagues said earlier, it is not necessarily with pleasure that we rise to speak to this Budget Debate because of the severe impact that it has had on the

province of Manitoba, but nevertheless, it is a very important budget and signals return of the Conservatives to agenda in this province of Manitoba. Therefore, it is a very important budget for us to speak to, as well as all Manitobans to pay a special attention to.

I want to, following my MLA for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer)—he has raised a number of points which I thought were -(interjection)- Well, yes, he is my MLA. The member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) is not aware of that, of course.

Well, I have to say that the member for Niakwa has touched a lot of important areas in this debate, and he does not differ with us on a number of points, although he does not practise what he preaches. He talked about, welfare is not the alternative. I agree with him that welfare is not the alternative, yet his budget that he just spoke to, the welfare budget, is up some 13 percent because of the failure of this government's economic policies to create jobs and economic growth in this province. Welfare is the ultimate consequence of Tory policies in this province, and the member for Niakwa should recognize that fact. He talked about Ontario and about the falling indicators in Ontario, and he took a great deal of pride, if I can use that word, in referring to the words of my Leader with regard to debating the issues surrounding falling indicators in Ontario and the current stance of the New Democratic government.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The point is, though, and he admitted, the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) admitted, that the government of Ontario has not even brought in one budget yet. They have not even brought in one budget. They have been in place for six months, and they inherited the falling economy from the Liberals in Ontario. It was widely known, and I think even the member for Pembina, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), recognizes that.

As a matter of fact, that is one of the reasons why the former Liberal Premier Peterson called the election prematurely, because he had hoped to get in for another majority before he had to announce all the bad news with regard to the declining economy in Ontario.

So it is a fact that the economy was in a decline, and of course Bob Rae has inherited a very difficult circumstance to come to government in one of our

most prosperous provinces in Canada and certainly, after unprecedented growth, is now in a downward cycle.

We shall see how Ontario, with an activist government, performs and pulls through. We have one indicator already. They are increasing education spending by some 8 percent versus under 2 percent in this province. It was announced at 2 percent, but certainly many divisions are getting zero or negative, a decrease actually from the province this year. As a consequence, municipalities, local taxpayers are having to pick up huge increases in property taxes in many school divisions.

So we see the difference there in terms of priorities with Ontario in the education spending, and we will see other, I think, differences as the budget comes forward. We will be able to illustrate the difference between a New Democratic activist government in Ontario and a Conservative government following a Conservative agenda in Manitoba, which is retrenching, pulling back, cutting back and waiting for the so-called corporate sector, even under the member for Niakwa's definition, to pull the province out of its doldrums.

Of course, we saw that that did not happen during the Sterling Lyon period of time in government, and it will not happen now. As a matter of fact, that is why my leader constantly refers to the 10 out of 10 in terms of pulling out of this recession, because indeed with this kind of nonactive government, retrenchment of this government, we will not see economic growth in this province for a longer period of time than other provinces, and that is unfortunate. It means that we are going to have to suffer and bear the pain that much longer in this province.

I want to also reference the member for Niakwa's comments about Manitobans being special. Yes, indeed, Manitobans are very special. Certainly, I want to agree with the member for Niakwa when he says that the party on this side of the House, the New Democrats, represent the vast majority of those special people in Manitoba. In fact, he interchanged the word from "ordinary" to "special." I have to agree that they are special and that this party does indeed represent the interests of those special people of Manitoba. I think over the next number of months there will be a growing list of those very special people in Manitoba for supporting the New Democratic Party as they feel the

consequences of the policies of this Minister of Finance and this Premier and this government.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): They love it in Dauphin.

Mr. Plohman: The Minister of Finance says, they love it in Dauphin. I bet they love it, especially those 11 jobs that they lost at the correctional facility in Dauphin. Certainly that was one example of the kind of contradiction and I want to get to that.

I see, Mr. Acting Speaker, that one minister after another stands up in this House and talks about how they have to get spending out of control and how the New Democratic government did not have spending in control.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) just spoke and he said that we are doing the right things and, of course, we will see with that. The facts will come to light over the next year or so as to whether this government has done the right thing.

I will go on record now, as will my colleagues, that the government is doing precisely the wrong things during this time of recession.

He said that they are sorry about all the tough things they had to do, but Manitobans want this kind of action and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said, "They love it in Dauphin." The actions that he took. Well, we will see about that because we see a hypocrisy between the actions that they take and the statements they make, the rhetoric that they give, and this is—

I have to agree with the columnist Frances Russell in her comments on this issue, -(interjection)- Well, that is obviously the Tories' favorite reporter, all Tories' favorite reporter—when she talks about how the language has changed between 1981 and 1991—The member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) probably recognized that having been in both governments—when Sterling Lyon used to be quite direct and brash about his approach—and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) probably remembers that as well—and now with taking the same kind of Draconian cuts, and much deeper and harmful, and, at the same time, calling it and phrasing and using different terminology to soften the impact and to appeal to the vast majority of Manitobans' feelings about what is needed in terms of the economy in this province. When in fact what they are doing is hacking and slashing, the same way that they were in 1981, in 1980, in 1979, when Sterling Lyon was in government.

I say that there is obviously hypocrisy in the policies, in the statements versus the action. We can only look at decentralization for rural Manitoba, when we see evidence of this so clearly open to all to see. The minister responsible for Rural Development and decentralization (Mr. Downey)—It should not be called that any more because it certainly does not describe what the program was to be when it was announced so vigorously just before the last provincial election in the period of time of the minority government.

* (1640)

At that point in time, the government did not talk about all these difficult choices it had to make and about the difficult situation Manitoba was finding itself in, in terms of the finances. What they talked about was that they were going to put up to \$15 to \$20 million to decentralize in the first phase. There was going to be a second phase, at least a second phase, maybe many, many more phases.

I remember that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) went out to the municipalities to speak to them, in Brandon I believe, before he even had any kind of plans because there was no plan in place. They just said give me a number, give me a number. So he got a number. Give me a number, I have to tell them how many. So he came up with 700 and now the first phase is 600. They never use 700 or 750 any more, but they use 600 now. The 600 jobs are now about 200 jobs.

They started without a plan whatsoever with regard to decentralization. We have seen the results of that lack of planning by this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and the people he put in place to do that job because in fact the jobs are not moving. Now they have put \$5 million in the budget for decentralization, but they put \$20 million in the budget to lay off people, and many of them are the same people who were to be decentralized. There are other jobs taking the place of those that were supposed to be decentralized, other jobs being cut.

For example, in Dauphin I reference the 11 jobs at the correctional institute. It is a minimum security facility. It always has been, but they said they were making it a minimum security facility with this move. Eleven jobs gone and people and their families as a result of this move, and then they talk about moving in 10 or so jobs for Vital Statistics to Dauphin. At the same time we saw a number of operators over the last couple of years in the

Manitoba Telephone System cut, and it just goes on and on and on—this contradiction.

I say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), he could have just as well promised everybody that they would keep the same number of jobs in those communities, and they would have all been further ahead. They should have cheered because they are going to end up net losers out of this. He would have been able to save the \$5 million he has got in the budget this year, and he could have saved the \$20 million at the same time. He would not have had all those moving costs and shuffling people around. I mean, it sounded like good PR, but it is really a mess and a nightmare, and the people out there can see this contradiction.

They see the Minister of Finance, that he has such a contradiction in his policies, and they recognize that there is no sincerity there. I think that if the people of Dauphin were courteous and respectful to the Minister of Finance when he was down there the other day, that is to be expected because the people of Dauphin and the surrounding area are courteous, respectful and hardworking people, but they do not tell you the story.

They do not tell the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) the true story about how they feel in terms of the hypocrisy of his actions with regard to decentralization and cutting jobs at the same time, some 1,000 jobs, many of them in rural departments—Natural Resources department losing jobs in Dauphin. The vast majority are in administration, perhaps in the city of Winnipeg, but there are still jobs being lost in many of the rural offices as well. We see the reductions in Agriculture. We see them in Highways, particularly seasonal employees. It is going to affect a lot of workers over the summer in terms of those that would have had jobs. We see education cuts in the community colleges.

All of these are evidence that the government has botched its decentralization program and has made a mockery really out of decentralization. I cannot put it any nicer than that. It is a real mess, and I think this government has to be aware that is what the people are reading into the way the government has worked. They see a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in terms of the approach by this government from one year to the next with merely an election intervening in between the two.

There is another contradiction that is almost as glaring in this budget and that is the offloading. The Minister of Finance has found that it is opportune politically to now bash the federal Tories. He used to chastise the former New Democratic government in this province for bashing the federal government. As a matter of fact, he certainly bashed the government when the former Minister of Finance at that time, Eugene Kostyra, had an allotment for an office in Ottawa to ensure a fair share for Manitoba. He said that is not necessary, and he made a motion to cut it, to eliminate that office. He was going to find ways to save money for the government and reduce the deficit.

Well, now he knows. He knows, by sitting back with the door mat diplomacy of this government and letting the federal government walk all over them, it is much like saying, here is my wallet; take what you think is fair. That is the kind of approach that this government has taken with the federal government. They have not been standing up and fighting for Manitoba, but they have indeed complained about offloading.

Now even more, day by day, more frequently, they complain of offloading from the federal government, but what do they do? They turn around and do absolutely the same thing without consulting with the municipalities, the local organizations, education and school divisions. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) knows that. Now, where was he? Why did he not stand up and say, I am not going to be a part of this travesty of unloading, offloading 2,000 kilometres of provincial roads onto the municipalities?

I do not believe in doing that, and certainly the Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Downey) should have stood up. I remember, when we were in government, he stood up, and he was concerned because the LGDs were going to have some of their road work cut. He had a press conference on it, and he was going to stand up for those LGDs.

Well, we made some changes, but now this minister is part of a government where there is \$640,000 cut from grants to local government districts and \$500,000 in grant and aid reduction, 50 percent of the program, well, 33 percent of \$1.5 million, 33 percent of the program gone under this minister, this government and this Minister of Rural Development. Where were they? They offloaded onto the municipalities, onto the LGDs. They funded education far too small an amount in this

budget. They have cut back water services and engineering services in Natural Resources, and policing costs are being offloaded onto local governments, 13 percent reduction in revenue sharing to the municipalities—talk about offloading, talk about offloading.

An Honourable Member: You were going to—

Mr. Plohman: Yes, we were going to cap it at—what?—5 percent-plus. This is a 13 percent cut. Now, what are you talking about? Look at it. You are cutting back 13 percent. You could have said, we will not allow you to take less revenue. We will cap it at zero. We will top it up. -(interjection)-No, that is what they could have said.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said he has zero growth in his revenues, yet he expects the municipalities to make do with a 13 percent cut in the revenues in this tax-sharing formula. Where is this minister? Why is he not standing up and ensuring that the municipalities have in fact at least the same amount of money that they received the previous year? He could have topped up that formula. He could have topped up the formula to make certain that it happened. He did not do that.

He did not stand up for the municipalities, and at the same time, he offloaded on every single program to the municipalities. We saw it, and I have listed those that we have seen in terms of the offloading onto the municipalities and the local taxpayers. That is the unfortunate thing in this budget. When he says they are not increasing taxes, except for cigarettes and gasoline, which hurts rural Manitobans a great deal because of the distances they travel, he is increasing the taxes through the GFT, as my colleagues coined it, and I think appropriately so when the municipalities have had to increase the taxes as a result of cutbacks by the Tory provincial government. They have had to do that in education, and they have had to do it in all of these other services. They will have to increase taxes more to maintain and pick up the work that needs to be done as a result of cutbacks by this government.

Now, let us look at the third area of contradiction. They talk about mismanagement by the former New Democratic government, and they continue to throw the old lines out, yet at the same time, their evidence of mismanagement is clear when you look particularly at the example that I cited earlier, \$5 million to decentralize and \$20 million to lay off.

That is management? That is good management? That is a waste of taxpayers' money.

* (1650)

They talked about the New Democratic government wasting taxpayers' money. This government has been responsible for turning a \$55-million surplus, which they inherited from the previous New Democratic government, into a \$469-million deficit this year—over \$500-million turnaround in the deficit picture in Manitoba, from a positive to a huge negative.

They talk about management? Oh, yeah, there are all kinds of excuses, though: Our revenues are dropping. Well, I wonder why they are dropping. There is no confidence in this province, in this government, by the people of Manitoba, by all-size investors, by small business, by the corporate sector. There is no confidence in this government. Their friends are certainly letting them down in this particular year and for the last couple of years, so we see that turnaround then, that shift, in the deficit situation. I think it is a complete embarrassment to this government, and I am sure that they all wonder about how they can paint a nice picture to put a positive look on it when it is indeed a devastating situation for Manitoba.

If you look at the costs that are incurred by the average family in this province, the fact is, Manitobans are not as bad off as this government likes to make out, and how they like to paint the picture as a reason and an excuse for the draconian actions that they are taking with layoffs, cuts in programs and so on in this province. They try to paint the picture that Manitoba is on the verge of bankruptcy, on the edge, and that we have no alternative.

I say that the deficit certainly is a problem, but I want to tell the members that in the last number of years, under a New Democratic government in this province, the taxes and charges that Manitoba families faced were not as high as in other provinces, as a matter of fact the lowest, at \$25,000 total income for a single parent and, for a family at \$40,000 income, the secondlowest, in terms of total charges that are incurred by that family when you consider provincial income tax.

This is taken from the Saskatchewan budget, not figures that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) or any of our staff in the caucus have drummed up. The Saskatchewan Budget Address 1990, March

1990, the Saskatchewan Budget Address, Personal Taxes and Charges, and they give a province-by-province comparison.

This is very revealing for all of those members who speak with great commitment, I believe. They really believe, firmly believe, because they all sent out this pamphlet about all these tax increases under the NDP government, but what they failed to reference were the huge tax increases by the federal Tories, much higher than the provincial New Democrats had put in place in this province. The other aspect that they failed to bring forward—and I think they have a duty to bring this forward because these facts are important for the people of Manitoba and for the confidence that investors would have in this province—when you take into consideration personal taxes and charges including provincial income tax, tax credits and rebates, health premiums, retail sales tax, gasoline tax, car insurance, telephone, home heating, electricity—utilities, in other words through our Crown corporations—total charges and taxes, you will find that Manitoba, for a family at \$40,000 total income, is the second lowest in the country—second lowest in terms of those charges.

The charges for a Manitoba family would be \$4,755. Saskatchewan is higher than that, and they put this in their budget because they believe this is good news for Saskatchewan to see this. They are behind Manitoba, but they still think that is pretty good news to be third, so they are putting the figures in their budget in March 1990. It shows Manitoba at \$4,755 versus Saskatchewan at \$5,038 under the Tory administration of Grant Devine, Alberta being the only one that is lower than Manitoba in terms of those charges. British Columbia is at \$5,650, Ontario at \$5,842, Quebec at \$5,039, New Brunswick at \$6,044, Nova Scotia \$5,728, Prince Edward Island \$5,757 and Newfoundland \$6,817, Manitoba—the second lowest next to Alberta at \$4,755.

Why does not the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) put a table like that in his Budget Address, just like his colleague Lorne Hepworth did in Saskatchewan in March 1980 when he included this table in his budget? Why would he put that in there with Saskatchewan third and our Minister of Finance would not put that in his budget when we are second? It is positive news.

If he wants investors to have some confidence in the province of Manitoba and the people of

Manitoba to feel some confidence, he would be able to show that the income and charges are once the lowest in the country. Now he should have gone to the -(interjection)- well, let us not talk about fudging, this came from the Tory budget in Saskatchewan. Who fudged it? -(interjection)- Oh, they have been known to do some fudging. Okay.

I think the minister's finance argument is with his counterpart in Saskatchewan, not with the opposition in using these figures. -(interjection)- Well, he has a great deal of respect, and yet he says he fudged the figures here. Now, what is it?

They have been known to do some fudging, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said from his seat. He can correct that if they did not do any fudging in these figures. He said it is not accurate, and that is why he did not include it. Maybe he can explain that some time in this—but let us look at the debt charges. This is what the minister wants to include in those figures because we have all of the costs, the taxes and charges.

We look at the debt of provinces as of March 31st taken as a percentage of gross domestic product. In that case, Manitoba is seventh highest in terms of our debt as a percentage of gross domestic product—seventh highest, high being the worst for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). There is only Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia who have a lower debt charge as a percentage of gross domestic product at March 31, '89, and then we are seventh. Then Saskatchewan is higher, P.E.I., New Brunswick, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

When we look at the per capital net direct debt, yes, as a percentage of gross domestic product, their debt is higher. As far as the per capita net direct debt 1990-91, here Manitoba is right in the middle at fifth.

So let not those backbenchers and those cabinet ministers stand up in this House daily, day after day, giving the impression that Manitoba is on the brink of bankruptcy, that our charges are much higher than other provinces, that it is so much more difficult to do business in this province because of the tax regime and it is so much harder, more difficult to raise a family in this province because of the tax regime. The fact is, the facts speak for themselves in terms of our debt burden. We have a debt burden that is about average in this country. -(interjection)-

Well, I just gave the figures from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Now he wakes up. He did not comment when I was giving those figures. Now he wakes up. In terms of charges and taxes I have given the figures there. We are the lowest at \$40,000—second lowest at \$40,000—and he ignores those particular pieces of information that are pretty important in terms of telling the true story of the whole picture, giving the whole picture to the people of Manitoba, when we try to frighten them into accepting the kind of draconian measures that they have taken in this budget simply because of the debt and that we are going into bankruptcy. They are trying to worry them in. That is the message, and they do not give the true picture. -(interjection)-

* (1700)

The member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) should really take a good look at these figures. She should take a good look so she does not actually believe the rhetoric that she puts on the record in this House, that in fact—and I have heard her on a number of occasions in the throne speech and budget speech and the throne speech in the previous session where she has come forward as a new member in this House, putting forward the same kind of rhetoric on the table, on the record in this House as Sterling Lyon and as Premier Filmon is doing at this particular time—it does not give the whole picture. It does not tell the whole story in terms of Manitoba's financial situation and the situation Manitobans find themselves in with the tax picture.

I also want to point out, Mr. Acting Speaker, that this government is failing in a number of key economic indicators, the employment growth situation, for example. Manitoba during the NDP years was just under the Canadian average. Now, between 1988 and '89 in Manitoba it was .6 percent and Canada's was 2.6 percent, so, way off the Canadian average there.

In terms of the unemployment rate in Manitoba we were always below the Canadian average. This '88-89 shows Manitoba even with Canada.

In investment, Manitoba was a way ahead with public and private investment at 8.3 percent versus Canada at 5.7 percent. Yet in the Conservative years, two years of '88 and '89, they were 8.3 percent versus 11 percent, so comparatively speaking, a gigantic drop with regard to the rest of Canada.

Retail trade—we were very close to the national average at 8.3 percent versus 8.5 percent. Now it is 3.8 percent versus 6.1 percent, a tremendous relative drop-off again. The ministers and the members, the backbenchers of this government would do well to look at these comparative figures when it shows how Manitoba is doing under the Conservatives versus the New Democrats in government in this province.

The fact is that this government is failing, and this government's policies are failing, as indicated no better than in the gigantic drop off in corporate sector revenues to the province, some \$84 million projected in this budget, some 47 percent drop in the corporate tax revenues, under this government. That indicates more than anything else, as my Leader pointed out, that since the Depression there has not been that kind of a drop. That indicates that the province is in real trouble and the corporate sector is stalled. That engine is stalled, and this government is relying on that stalled engine to pull Manitoba out of the recession.

Therein lies the problem, and that is one of the reasons we are going to be in this recession for a lot longer than most people would ever have believed possible and a lot longer than other provinces, because, in fact, this government is not taking any action to get us out of that recession, to stimulate the economy.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Seven minutes.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Acting Speaker, I could go into a lot more detail on the situation in terms of the comparative performance of our economy, but I want to speak for a moment about agriculture as a trade, for seven minutes I have here, both in terms of the trade agreement and the current situation we find ourselves here in Manitoba.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) stood up in this House the other day and he talked about how the trade agreement was so good for Manitoba. He talked about how so many commodities had gone up with regard to their volume of sales to the U.S. He talked about wheat went up twofold, oats twofold over the last two years, canola fourfold, and so on, beef. What he did not talk—and then he said that hogs were down, and that the reason all of these other ones were up, these other commodities were

up, was because of free trade. The only ones that had countervail on it, they were down.

Well, I will be the first to say that there is countervail, and we want to get rid of countervail, but this trade agreement is not synonymous with free trade where we have an expansion of products that would have taken place—

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Rural Development): Durum wheat.

Mr. Plohman: Yes and durum wheat, the Minister of Rural Development. All of these commodities would have expanded in any event and nothing to do with the trade agreement. These members on this side, who sit on the front bench, have not been able to show, at any time, that the trade agreement had anything to do with the expansion in the volumes of sale of those commodities to the United States over the last couple of years, but what we are able to show is that the trade agreement has failed to deliver. Where it comes to the issue of countervail on Manitoba and Canadian hogs, it has not been able to deliver.

The Americans say that they do not agree with the decision, and they are going to use extraordinary appeals. Now, they may eventually lose that, but it has cost the hog industry hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight this, and it has cost the trade agreement, I think, a great deal of legitimacy in terms of how a lot of people who may have been supportive at one time, view that trade agreement, including John Crosbie who said, we are going to take a serious look whether we are going to get into the Mexico trade deal.

Well, I want to tell him what is happening under this trade deal is precisely what we said would happen and that, in fact, the trade agreement with the United States has not provided the solutions for Manitobans. The latest commodity that is being attacked, of course, is alfalfa, which is not even being shipped to the United States, to third markets. The trade agreement now gives them an excuse to come in and meddle in our own domestic affairs in terms of our transportation policies in this country with regard to the export of alfalfa to third countries. That shows how much we have gained from the trade agreement in this country and in this province particularly.

I once again challenge this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to do some independent definitive studies

to show how the trade agreement has impacted on Manitoba.

They talk about 50 new processing factories and all of this in Canada. How many have closed? Where are they in Manitoba? Where are the positive results in Manitoba of this trade agreement? We have not seen any of that analysis.

Now, while I go after the Minister of Agriculture on GRIP in the Legislature on frequent occasions, we are pointing out to this minister the reason that we do that is because he has a tremendous opportunity during this crisis in agriculture to bring together—which has happened—people from all political stripes to try to find a solution to stabilize and deal with this crisis, to stabilize the incomes of farmers, but they are missing the boat with this program. It has been an exercise in offloading by the federal government onto the province.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

This province is bragging about their \$43 million which they are going to put into a program that is going to ensure that farmers continue to lose money and will lose more and more each year. What kind of a program solution—is that good management? Is that the way to spend \$43 million? At the same time, it acts as a deterrent to maximize production.

Are farmers going to go out and put fertilizer and chemicals on, that are required to get the best crop? Are they going to go and spend that money when they know they are going to lose money in the first place, and they will lose more money? The more money they spend, the more they will lose on putting their crop in. So they are going to cut back. That is what they are telling me in southwestern Manitoba. They are telling me that even in other areas of the province.

An Honourable Member: What about The Pas? What are they telling you in The Pas?

Mr. Plohman: Well, in The Pas they have told me that their costs are some \$160 per acre because of the higher costs of transportation, of fuel. You all know, gasoline and diesel fuel are much higher in the North. The higher cost of chemicals and fertilizers are \$160 per acre if you include all of the fixed costs and the variable costs. The same variable costs and fixed costs that are outlined in southwestern Manitoba would come to about \$125 an acre. So there is a big difference and yet they are still going to put a program in place across this

province that is not tailored to the unique regional needs of this province.

There should be a minimum coverage. They do not want something for nothing. The farmers do not want coverage for nothing. They are even willing to pay the premiums, but they want to be insured. Yes, they want to be insured of getting their costs back and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) should recognize that. He does not even know if he is going to join up for the program. I guess he is going to announce it one of these days and a number of others. -(interjection)- Well, maybe he will because he has already said he was not sure and he did not know, so he has announced that in response to questions across the floor—

An Honourable Member: I did not announce it.

Mr. Plohman: Well, across the floor you did. So in fact now we will expect that the ministers will say what they think about this program at some point.

I am really shocked at this government, seeing a carrot being given by the federal government to get them into the program for two years to pay the NISA cost premiums, provincial costs, and to force the farmers into signing by giving them a 25 percent reduction. They are short term benefits for the province. I will bet this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is going to bite on that. He is going to jump right into it, because he is going to see that it is not going to cost them very much in the first year, maybe only about \$10 million to join NISA at 1 percent.

* (1710)

What is going to happen to this province is that future administrations are going to have to pay for those costs that the federal government is holding back on for the first two years and then is going to unload on the province in the future years. The NISA program is one example.

I say to the government, they should continue to hold out. This is a federal responsibility with regard to NISA, and they should mobilize their counterparts in other provinces. I understand that this Minister of Finance and other ministers have an awfully difficult time when they have a Conservative government in Saskatchewan ready to go an election but want to hand out everything they can before an election. It is hard to get them onside.

There is a province that should be fighting with Manitoba and they have lost their best possible ally.

It is regrettable that this is happening before that election. The election timetable, of course, is obviously the engine behind the whole program. In any event, I think most people have seen that, including most Manitoba farmers, that the timetable is geared to Grant Devine's agenda.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be out of time without having had the opportunity to deal with many of the aspects of the GRIP program that I would like to see changed. We will continue to raise those in this House day after day to push this government to improving the program to reflect cost of production and be equitable and humane across this province.

I know that farmers who do sign up will do so under protest. We will continue to use that protest to force this government to come to its senses and the federal government as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand and speak on the budget before us this afternoon.

I want to start by indicating in general terms that I think Manitoba today, economically and demographically, now finds itself with an increasingly small role to play in a small portion of Canada's population. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago Manitoba was 7 percent of Canada's population. Fifteen years ago we were 4.7 percent. Today we are 4.2 percent, and it is shrinking.

If we had maintained our ratio of even 4.7 percent—that is the percentage of Canada's population we had 15 years ago—we would have 130,000 more people today than we have. During 1988 Manitoba suffered a net loss of 9,600 people. That is the most recent year that I have this breakdown from and 67 percent of those were between ages 18 and 64, and 40 percent were between the ages 25 and 44.

We are clearly losing our young professionals and craftspersons at an increasingly alarming rate. These are the people who have graduated from our secondary institutions and universities who are in their highest expenditure years. The Minister of Finance and this government should be greatly concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, the loss of young people in Manitoba between those years.

These are the people who get married and have children and populate our schools and raise families and pay taxes and traditionally carry the highest

debt loads they will ever have. Of course, as I said, they pay taxes and generally have children who populate our schools. To lose people in that age group, between the ages of 18 and 44, is a tragedy for this province and it is not one we will recover from.

Fueled by this out-migration, we see that whereas in 1969, 350,000 of us in Manitoba were under the age of 17, by 1989 only 290,000 were in that age bracket. That contrasts to other western provinces all with higher percentages of their population in those early years, in the young income earning years. Conversely, whereas in 1969, 95,000 of us were over the age of 65, now we have 140,000 seniors, a rise of some 47 percent in seniors population in 20 years.

We are seeing in this province the trend of greater numbers of people who need the social services we provide, and fewer numbers of people who are in those years where they can pay the taxes to provide those services.

With respect to other trends in our economy, Mr. Speaker, by 1988 the Manitoba economy had underperformed the national economy in 18 of the last 27 years. That is truly a legacy that was left to us by the New Democratic Party, a legacy of shame in terms of keeping up on the national scene. In 1969 we produced almost 4.2 percent of the gross national product; by 1988 we were down to 3.6 percent. Gone are the days when we can be confident and complacent about our so called well-diversified base.

The effect on jobs has been similarly instructive. Old-time jobs have declined to representing only 81 percent of the jobs in Manitoba, and it is shrinking as we speak. Most of the new jobs are part time, they are non-organized service sector jobs. Let me give you immediate examples of that. In the last year the number of part-time jobs in Manitoba went up by 9,000; the number of full-time jobs went down by 2,000. In addition, real total income, after inflation, has fallen consistently in recent years and while this is a Canadian trend and I admit that, it is meant that the number of two-earner households has now gone to 64 percent of Manitoba households. In 1951 it was 30 percent.

So as Manitoba enters the last decade, Mr. Speaker, as our province faces difficult and unprecedented changes in the world economy, we will be increasingly forced to rethink some of our

economic assumptions and either join the move to a global economy or be lost in the backwater of a medium-sized nation. We now have the Free Trade Agreement to deal with which will continue to rationalize our traditional economic mainstays, and I submit, pulverize our more vulnerable industries like the food processing and garment industries. We must also now increasingly be prepared to deal with a federal government retreating from national funding programs that have historically defined Canada's social contract between the two levels of government.

But, Mr. Speaker, lest I depress members of the House, I want to tell you that I think there are ways to make this decade one of unprecedented growth and prosperity in this province. To reverse the depopulation of the province and the shrinking of our economic output in real terms is a challenge that faces us all. I believe that we should start, first and foremost, with a new approach and more than any conclusions or goals which we may ultimately share with either of the other two parties. I think we all in this House do aspire to make Manitoba strong and a better place to live. More than any specific goals, I think that I want to offer—our party wants to offer and we suggest—a new style of government that attempts to balance rather than polarize the competing interests in our economy, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen through decades in this province now that society as a whole—for the first time since Sterling Lyon first got elected—has the presence of a party from the middle of the political spectrum in Manitoba. That is what we seek to bring to this debate. We cannot take, we think, a dogmatic shotgun approach to our future, and sadly that has been the consistent approach of the other two parties.

* (1720)

The Conservatives, in their fundraising literature in the last Legislature, made clear that they had been itching to get out of their sheep's clothing and enter Phase II. We now see very clearly what Phase II entails on the Conservative agenda. They said in that letter, that fundraising letter of February 7, 1990, that without a clear majority they would be unable to embark on Phase II. They did not get that clear a majority, but they did get a majority, and they certainly have embarked on Phase II.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the NDP still ascribe to the view that government knows best,

always. That philosophy brought us to the brink of financial disaster in 1988. To that extent, I do agree and ascribe to the view put forward by the government that it is high time we had some sense of fiscal responsibility in this province.

I do agree that payments in the neighbourhood of \$550 million a year, which, if you look at last year's budget, is only a larger sum of money of all other 18 departments except Health and Education. Last year, only Health and Education spent more than \$550 million in one year. That is approximately four times the entire Department of Agriculture budget. That is approximately seven times the entire Department of Natural Resources budget that we spend that is committed before we buy one book, before we pay for one hospital bed, and that is a tragedy.

The real tragedy is that we all understand, as they did in the 1930s when we needed to get out of the Depression, that governments have to spend money to get out of recessions and depressions. That is what Keynes was all about. The other side of the Keynesian equation was when times are good, you are supposed to restrain, you are supposed to pull back and pay the debt you have incurred in the tough times. What Keynes did not predict clearly was a government addicted to excessive spending. Mr. Speaker, 1984 to 1988 were good years for the Manitoba economy. Those were growth years, unprecedented growth years, and we had four years of unprecedented deficit growth in this province, absolutely irresponsible on the part of the New Democratic administration.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do believe that we do not want to saddle our children and our grandchildren with the legacy of excessive debt. Because even though the NDP were turfed out of office, we pay for their mistakes today. They are gone, their legacy is not. Their legacy is debt payments coming close to \$550 million per year, which as I say is only outstripped in terms of last year's expenditures by two departments. Every other department spends less than that, and it is a multiple of many of those departments. I have cited a few.

We need to deal with the economic challenges of the global economy and the reality of the fact that we simply cannot tax our people anymore. We cannot tax them anymore. We cannot tax people any more than they are in this province. If there is one message that is clear, that is it. People in my

constituency—not wealthy people, the working poor, people who are struggling and working night shifts and evening shifts to make \$18,000, \$20,000 and \$22,000 a year, and try and feed a family on that—are telling me, enough, we cannot pay any more taxes; do not take any more taxes out of our pockets; we have a hard enough time meeting mortgage payments or rental payments and putting food on the table. That is true, Mr. Speaker.

I hear them, and those are people who you might traditionally expect to have supported the New Democratic Party. They do not on that issue, Mr. Speaker. They believe in fiscal restraint, but what they also say is that at times like this, we must have a government that is willing to account for its priorities more than ever before, because when money gets tight—and everybody knows this, I think, in their personal lives—when times get tight, the choices you make become all the more important. You have to look at where you spend each dollar closer when you know that at the end of the day you do not have enough to meet even the basic needs of what you want to do. In order to deal with those conflicts, I think we need a government that both respects the advantages of the private sector and knows their limitations, because we all know they have limitations. At least in this party we know that the private sector has limitations.

We cannot trust in the invisible hand of Adam Smith. You cannot trust the private sector to come to the conclusions which are best for all of society. The private sector will increasingly turn to monopolization, and we have seen that with the merger mania in the last decade, where people have expended billions and billions of dollars by selling junk bonds and other forms of raising money, the savings and loan scandals in the United States. We have seen first hand that if you give handouts to business, they will not create more jobs unless they have to. They will not invest in new ventures because those are risky. What they will do is they will turn to monopolization. The corporations will get bigger and bigger and bigger. They will buy up other corporations; that is what happens; that is the lesson of the last decade.

The trickle-down theory—first talked about by Mr. Friedman and first implemented by Mr. Reagan on this continent—does not work. If you put large sums of capital and you give large breaks to the very rich and expect them to have that trickle down to the poor, the fact of the matter is the money stays with

the rich. The monopolization of capital continues and increases. You must be able to, as a government—if you are going to give breaks to the wealthy—impose spending obligations. You have to tell them that they can spend their money only in certain areas, and that is the advantage of a tax system. That is the idea behind giving people tax breaks who have money is that you guide their money. You say, you can have tax breaks if you spend money in a Canadian corporation or if you spend money to create jobs in Canada. That was the idea.

That was the whole point of tariffs in this country for 120 years. That is why we built the country. We built the country in saying to people, you can come to this country because we only have 20 million people. It is very hard to get any industry of any size going with only a 20-million-person market, and we are a huge country to boot. So it is very difficult to build up a manufacturing sector except in southern Ontario.

We said to Americans, come up here. You can build your branch plants, but the profits must stay here or a certain percentage of them. That is how we develop companies like Imperial Oil, Canadian General Electric, Ford of Canada and all of those multinational corporations that set up Canadian subsidiaries and had to expend and invest a certain amount of their profits derived in Canada in Canada. That is what we did.

Free trade threw that all out the window. Free trade means that we can no longer say to offshore companies that they have to retain a certain amount of their profits in this country. They are free to take increasing percentages, and in most cases, 100 percent of their profits wherever they see fit. They do not have to create jobs here with the profits derived from our natural resources. They do not have to reinvest in this country. They can take it wherever they want. That is the tragedy of the Free Trade Agreement.

While we have access to a market of some 220 million people or 240 million people, which is the largest and the richest in the world—and I acknowledge that is an advantage—I say that what we gained was nowhere near what we lost. What we lost was the ability to restrict access to the one thing that we have, Mr. Speaker, which stands on the world scale as unique and that is our natural resources. That is what we had as a nation.

We have a very good and a skilled work force, that is true. We have a good transportation system and a good communications system, but what we had that was unique to the world on a global scale was our natural resources. If we did not use those to keep investment in this country and keep the manufacturing and the processing jobs here, I submit that we have sold what was our ace card, what was our birthright, and what we had to use to solidify the future of this country in the coming century.

Having said that, I do not say that we cry over spilled milk, and we say we cannot do anything in the free trade era. The free trade era is here. It was passed. I did not support it, but it is here. We have to do what we can with what we have. So I say that we have to look to what we can do to mitigate the effects and to maximize the opportunities under the free trade era.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly instructive to me is a report written by Mr. de Grandpre, a very respected and eminent economist and a very, very well-known expert in international trade and labour matters. He was commissioned by Mr. Mulroney to write a report on free trade and what its effects would be on Canada. He wrote a report, and I think the title of that report says it all. The report was called *Adjusting to Win*. It is a mammoth report. He spent a lot of time putting it together.

* (1730)

His thesis was that if Canada wants to win under free trade—and he believed that they could, and I may dispute his conclusion on that front—but even he said, if we want to win, we must adjust. It was called *Adjusting to Win*. It is pretty simple, Mr. Speaker. Yet we see in this province and in this country no desire to adjust to the free trade environment for our workers to keep them in this province and in this country in the free trade era.

He concentrated on the labour market. He said, you know, the average Canadian worker is likely in the coming century to go through no less than five changes in their employment. He said the days of somebody joining a company and spending 40 years are coming to an end if they are not at an end already, because the global economy is such that a company is going to have to change what it does and how it does it rapidly if it is going to keep up. So does government, as the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) points out, and I agree, but

the private sector needs to recognize and government needs to recognize that we are going to have a population of skilled people who are going to have to change those skills three, four, five times in a lifetime.

So how do we do that? Let me tell you how we do that right now in this province, Mr. Speaker. Right now we have a branch at the Department of Labour; it is called the Labour Adjustment branch. That title might give you some comfort because, you might say, I have read the de Grandpre Adjusting to Win. Here is our branch, Labour Adjustment, these are our people, these are the people who are going to help Manitobans stay in Manitoba, get new skills and take on new jobs. We are going to bridge people over difficult times where they happen to be in the economy.

That branch received in new funds—and this is in a time when we, as I say, in the last year have lost 4,000 full-time jobs. We just lost another 958 at the behest of this government alone. That department received in new funds \$12,000. That is approximately two to two and a half cents per Manitoba worker. That is an absolute joke in terms of dealing with the real needs of the labour force in Manitoba as it seeks to adjust to a changing economic climate.

The only job of the Labour Adjustment branch is to react to layoffs. It only kicks in after someone has laid off 50 people or more. Then they call the Labour Adjustment branch, they get involved, they set up a committee and they try and do something. I do not down play that. The committees are good and there should be labour adjustment committees for layoffs, but the point is, where were they before the layoffs? Where were they in attempting to study the effects of free trade and mitigate the effects of free trade? They are nowhere to be seen, and again you see the Conservative philosophy of hands off for the government. Business will take care of this, business will want to help people bridge the time they need to retrain and get back into the work force successfully.

Well, Mr. Speaker, business will not do that on their own. Some very few, very enlightened will, but the fact is they need government participation and encouragement to do that. If they do not respond to that, they need government to step in and say you must do it as a cost of doing business, you must assist in retraining. Do you know what? In my experience, the business community has been

nothing but receptive to the putting out of a hand by government in participating in training and retraining programs.

They understand that it is in their interests to have a work force that is committed, loyal and stable, and as their business changes, they understand it is in their interests to take the existing worker and see first and foremost if you can retrain that existing worker into a new position in the same firm. That is the way they want to go; that is the progressive and enlightened way.

All they are waiting for is some impetus, some sign of enthusiasm from this government and any government in this country in terms of assisting that bridging of people between jobs.

Mr. Speaker, what we need clearly is a government that is willing to look past the pat answers of the past, and that is what we have seen from both of these two tired parties, unfortunately, in this Legislature in prior years. They have both sold their souls to one side of the labour equation. The Tories have clearly sold it to business, to the Chamber of Commerce. They believe in the free hand, let the business community do as it will; get out of the economy, they will take care of it. That is the answer of the Conservatives.

The NDP on the other hand have sold their souls to the leadership of organized labour, Mr. Speaker, not the working people of this province, and that is important to point out. It is not the working people of this province who derived any benefit under the New Democratic administration. The fact is that when a very select few union leaders said, "Jump", Gary Doer says, "How high?" So has their government in the past, and that is not right.

If you look at the truly socialist governments of this world, the truly socialist progressive governments in this world look to a co-operative approach between business and labour. They do not look to a hostile, antagonistic approach between labour and government. The truly enlightened people understand that it is a co-operative approach, and that is sadly lacking because they know who they are playing to, Mr. Speaker. Both sides on this equation know who they are playing to, and you can forget the working person in this province who gets caught in the battle and totally forgotten.

I do not know about you, but I am sick and tired of that old fight which produces very little except a lot of rhetoric, a lot of rhetoric. I truly hope that

those, as I say, who have sold their souls to one side of the equation fight to the death, and I can hardly wait until they do, because the vast majority of Manitobans understand that there is a need for a sensible co-operative approach to economic development. We have to have that, Mr. Speaker, if we are in any way going to survive the coming decade.

I want to move on to talk about how this particular budget, in my view, does not do anywhere near what is necessary. While I have indicated that I do applaud fiscal restraint and I do, I have also indicated that in times of fiscal restraint, those in government must answer more than ever for their priorities.

Mr. Speaker, let me—well, I see the member for the New Democratic Party talking about corporations. I had the distinct pleasure to review the contributions to the New Democratic Party in the last year, and I want to just enlighten some of those members, some of the people who donated to the New Democratic Party. I saw, quite to my surprise, the Toronto Dominion Bank on there, Mr. Speaker. Can you believe it? I saw Repap as a donor to the New Democratic Party. I saw Power Corporation as a donor to the New Democratic Party. Imagine my surprise to see those large corporate conglomerates donating, and large institutional banks donating to the New Democratic Party in the last year.

Let me tell you what I also saw: \$157,000 in donations from unions, 21 percent of all donations over \$250 came from organized labour, \$57,000 alone from the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers. If that is not an indictment of the prior government, I do not know what is. Let me say that I am the first, and I have always believed that our rate of unionization in this province should increase. I have always said that our rate of unionization, which is approximately 35 percent to 36 percent, should be double that. I have always stood for a higher rate of unionization in this province. What is interesting to note is that under the New Democratic administration the rate of unionization in this province went up 1 percent, or 2 percentage points, that is in all of their years. They were an absolute disaster for the working person in this province getting an organized workplace. What they did was they satisfied the select few at the top of the major organizations.

Wilf Hudson and Bernie Christophe, and now Susan Hart-Kulbaba have an absolute carte blanche with that party and, Mr. Speaker, that is indeed unfortunate because, while it is extremely important to recognize them as the significant stakeholders, or one of them in the economy, in the economic development, what you cannot do is sell your soul to anybody if you hope to do what is best for the majority of Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, that is a shame that that has happened.

*(1740)

Mr. Speaker, let me go through what I consider to be illustrative of some of the priorities of this government in this budget. They axed 958 jobs, 958 jobs. Now let us start with page 14, Department of Agriculture, Executive Support, Salaries up. Let us go to Co-operative Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Executive Support, Salaries up. Let us turn to Education and Training, Executive Support, Salaries up. Energy and Mines, Executive Office, Salaries up. Let us turn to Finance, Executive Support, Salaries up. Government Services, Executive Support, Salaries up, what a surprise! Mr. Speaker, Health, Executive Support, Salaries up—I am almost done, I promise.

Housing, Executive Support, Salaries up, and now Industry, Trade and Tourism, Executive Support, Salaries up. Natural Resources—this one particularly interested me—231 people lost their jobs in the Department of Natural Resources, on the front lines, preserving our parks, monitoring our beaches, watching our forests, doing water management work—Executive Support to the Minister, Salaries up. Finally, and I think I have gone through almost every department, Urban Affairs, Executive Support, Salaries up.

Mr. Speaker, how do they account for increasing the salaries of their executive support at the ministerial level when they are hacking 958 jobs on the front lines. How do they account for that? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) owes an obligation to stand up and explain that absolute contradiction in priorities when they tell us that they are doing all that is sensitive and all that is sensible for the province. Well, fair is fair and window-dressing is window-dressing, and that is what this government has really done when it comes to cutting back its own largesse at the highest levels.

I want to turn to revenues. I have quoted some statistics about where this province is going, but let

me illustrate more clearly. Corporation income tax. Now this government says the economy is great, the province is doing great, investments up, jobs are up, things are fine, that is what they say. Well let us look at the facts. The corporation income tax which is a percentage of profits is way down, in fact, it is \$81 million down.

We turn here to corporate and business fees under the Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Those are fees you pay when you start a new business. Those are fees you pay when you reorganize and when you set up new shareholder arrangements. That is a sign of dynamism in the business community when you get a lot of fees in the Department of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Corporate and business fees are way down, Mr. Speaker.

Turn to the next page, page 5, land titles fees. That is not the land transfer tax because the land transfer tax is based on the percentage of the value of the property that sold. The fees represent the number of transactions because you pay a fee per transaction. Let us look at that. That is down by \$1.2 million. That is on a total of \$7 million last year. That is an outrageous drop in one year. I can guarantee you, it is not because the fees went down. The price of the transaction did not go down; it is the number of transactions going down.

Clearly when this government comes to the black and white on the page, they have absolutely no basis for saying that this province is in for anything but a very rough time under their governance.

Mr. Speaker, I took some interest in the comments from the former speaker for the government. Let me just give the government some of the information I have with respect to comparing where we are at now and where we were in 1982, in which year we were indeed in a deep recession. Personal bankruptcies in 1990 were 1,890. In 1982, in the depths of the last recession, we reached 1,114. That is some 780 more personal bankruptcies in 1990 than in 1982. Business bankruptcies similarly were 373 in 1982 and jumped to 417 in 1990.

If we are comparing 1990 to 1982, we are not doing better, Mr. Speaker, we are doing worse. We are in a worse recessionary cycle than we were in 1982. The provincial gross domestic product, the Royal Bank predicts that in 1991, it will increase by .1 percent—.1 percent. Healthy normal economic growth is 4 percent for a provincial economy. We

are at .1 according to the Royal Bank. The Toronto Dominion Bank is a little less optimistic. They say negative .5. Let us not pretend that all is going to be well with the province. It is not.

Clearly we know from the figures of the experts that Manitoba is increasingly sinking into a morass in this country. We appear to be in a classic stagflation position, and when this term was first used by the Leader of the third party, the former Minister of Rural Development stood up and said, what is stagflation. He was not sure so I want to enlighten members on what stagflation is. It is an economic term and it was developed in the '70s because for the first time economists realized that both increasing unemployment and increasing inflation could occur at the same time.

That was unique. It was always felt that it was a trade-off. You either had unemployment or you had inflation. That was the idea. In the 1970s, the North American economists realized that you could have both, and a new term was coined—it is called stagflation. That is what we appear to have at this point, and it calls for drastic and innovative response from government, something which is sadly lacking.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to quote what appears in the Manitoba government news release. The news release reads, Budget Building Foundation for Economic Renewal—Manness. There is one paragraph in two pages that actually talks about economic renewal. What it says is, the budget also provides for economic incentives aimed at stimulating mineral exploration. I am all for stimulating mineral exploration, but let me tell you, mineral exploration right now, on the global economy, is about as low as it has ever been, so I hope we are not looking to the international mines market to stimulate the Manitoba economy. It would be nice, but it ain't too realistic.

Encouraging employee ownership in businesses, that indeed is a good thing, a \$2 million fund to be set aside so that employees can buy businesses, but they are only going to buy the business after it has gone bankrupt. The whole idea is that a business is going down, so the employees take over ownership, and that is great but, again, that is after the fact. The business has already reached a crisis stage.

Thirdly, promoting the creation of small business, I assume that what they are talking about there is the tax break for small business in the first year. Mr.

Speaker, anyone who has been involved in small business knows that the critical years for small business are between the second and the fifth year. Generally, if a small business makes it five years, it will make it 10. On the other hand, in the first two years, people generally expect to take a loss or break even and hope for a profit in the third year. That is what is hoped for in the usual small business situation.

A tax break in the first year is nice for some, but for most, it is useless because you do not pay taxes on losses. If you really wanted to help small business, you would offer them a tax incentive in the critical years, year 2 through year 5. That is when a business will make it or not. The first two years, no one expects realistically, in any size of a business, to make a profit. They hope for profit, but they plan to break even. Mr. Speaker, if you want to make this work, you have to go beyond the window dressing of a one-year tax break, which is good, but it falls short.

I want to turn again to another one of the press releases. It says that the Natural Resources department was going to lose 231 positions, and it was fairly comical the way the news release talked about the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): It is not that comical to the people getting cut.

* (1750)

Mr. Edwards: As the Leader of the Opposition says, it is not comical. It is not comical at all that it was cut the way it is, but it would be comical if it were not so tragic the way this government put it. This government says the Department of Natural Resources will receive 14 percent less funding than the previous fiscal year, and then get this. The next statement is: Manness said this is made possible—as if it is a good thing. I have made it possible to cut it by 14 percent by the integration of engineering and construction.

Well, if you turn the next page, you see the real story, Mr. Speaker. The real story is not internal rationalization. The real story is that 17 positions are cut in engineering and construction, in-house sewer and water services, 13 positions are cut, 24 overall in the reduction of engineering and water services to rural municipalities. Positions are cut all over this province, mostly in rural Manitoba. So you now have a decentralization policy of this government which calls for massive

increases—700 jobs, it was talked about at the outset, are going to be created in rural Manitoba.

They have done nothing but cost jobs in the manufacturing sector and the agricultural food sector in rural Manitoba. Now the majority of jobs, or many of the jobs are being cut which directly impact on rural Manitoba or in fact are even located in rural Manitoba. The hypocrisy of that position, which some would call hypocrisy, is absolutely apparent. Let me conclude by indicating that we in the Liberal Party subscribe to three things. We want to live in a just society which maximizes the sharing of wealth. We want to be a caring society. We also want to be a participatory society. Thank you—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have tried to listen attentively and to glean some wisdom from opposition speakers from both official opposition parties over the course of this Budget Debate. I have to tell you I have a little bit of difficulty attempting to find any suggestions that will benefit Manitobans coming from either political party. I guess that is the great disappointment of this Budget Debate.

I listened to the latest contribution from the second opposition party. I guess when one listens to them you can understand that they would have no suggestions on how to govern because they have not been there for a number of years. When they have been there, in other provinces or federally, in action they have not done anything that would better their respective community.

The last speaker, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), talked about Keynesian economic theory and decried the record of the NDP under Howard Pawley where it was spend, spend, spend. Then he made the caution that there were good times, the latter part of the Pawley administration, and they continued to spend. They did not set aside money for the next recession or downturn in the economy.

What my honourable friend, as a Liberal, did not point out to the House is that David Peterson underwent four of the strongest growth years in Ontario's history, in Canada's history. Those growth years in Ontario led the Bank of Canada to set punitive interest rates, dollar policies which pillaged the resource industries of western Canada, agriculture included. All the while that the Liberal Premier of Ontario was there he spent, spent, spent,

taxed, taxed and taxed and never set aside a single nickel of future funds in a reserve fund to take care of unemployed in Ontario in today's downturn of the economy.

I suggest to my honourable friend in the Liberal Party and other friends in the Liberal Party that they are not consistent in what they say in this House and then what they end up delivering when they come into government.

That is why last week, Monday, we faced the spectacle of the Finance critic of the Liberal Party in this Legislature supporting a budget which come to grips with the difficulties in the Manitoba economy, and then doing a flip-flop, a pretzel trick on Wednesday in Question Period, saying, well, I am disappointed in the Finance minister because he did what I suggested on Monday and would support doing on Monday.

But then, of course, you know I am used to that because from time to time, my honourable friend the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), the Health critic for the Liberal Party—and we agree on certain topics and I know this is the kiss of death for him electorally if he agrees with me, but at least he has some integrity where he recognizes where we have done right. But that kind of integrity is not duplicated by his Leader when she stands up and decries initiatives of this government that her critic supports.

Now you see you cannot have that kind of inconsistency, and I have made this point to my honourable friends in the Liberal Party because I want to tell you, I want you to be here because the reason I want a strong Liberal Party is because when you have two parties to choose on the left, it makes a better chance for us to govern and that is what Manitobans need. After all, Mr. Speaker, if you take a red tie off a Liberal, you just have an NDPer. The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) says he feels bad and he is not even wearing his red tie today.

As I have indicated to my honourable friends in the Liberal Party and where they have had difficulty in the past coming to grips with their eminent rise to government because just two and a half short years

ago, as the Liberal Leader sat where my honourable friend from Concordia now sits, it was government-in-waiting. But, of course, that was government-in-waiting one day and then the next day she indicated that looking after her caucus of 20 was sort of like looking after an adult day care centre. I mean, not a great deal of consistency and confidence builder in their ability to govern because the Liberal Leader ran a one-person show and the people of Manitoba said, we want a team in government, not a one-person show.

I want to tell my honourable friend from Concordia that is his problem right now, because my honourable friend from Concordia has got a lot of inconsistency in his caucus, a lot of dual positions on the environment. You have on the one hand this New Democratic Party wanting to tell the environmentalists that they are the only party that can defend the environment, and then we have the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) recommending to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) that we kill all the cormorants in Lake Winnipegosis.

Now, you cannot be consistent to the environmental movement with those kinds of dual positions on the record, which is the real New Democratic Party? Who speaks for them on the environment? When my honourable friend, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery), just the other day asked the question about water supplies in southern Manitoba and indicated that we have to build more structures to store water, my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party, a number of them applauded that and said that would be a good initiative. Yet when it comes to Rafferty-Alameda they are against it. They will be against every single environmental project in water storage that comes before this House. That kind of inconsistency will get you nowhere.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hour being 6 p.m., and in accordance with the rules, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8 p.m., at which time the honourable minister will have 33 minutes remaining.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, April 22, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Oral Questions		Business Names Registration Act	
ESL Programs		Maloway; McCrae	1039
Doer; Mitchelson; Derkach; Filmon	1032	Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba	
HealthCare System		Cheema; Orchard	1040
Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard	1033	Substance Abuse	
Medicare System		Cheema; Orchard; Derkach	1040
Carstairs; Orchard	1034	Tourism	
Health Care System		Storie; Stefanson	1040
Carstairs; Orchard	1035	Nonpolitical Statements	
CareerStart		Family Physician of the Year	
L. Evans; Gilleshammer	1035	Connery	1041
Fishing Industry		Doer	1041
C. Evans; Enns; Downey	1036	Cheema	1042
ESL Programs			
Lamoureux; Filmon; Mitchelson	1037		
Wards Boundary Review			
Friesen; Ernst	1038		
Harvey Pollock Case			
Chomiak; McCrae	1038		
The Brick Warehouse			
Maloway; McCrae	1039		

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Budget Debate

Carr	1042
Praznik	1046
Martindale	1053
Reimer	1059
Plohman	1065
Edwards	1073
Orchard	1080