

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the attention of the members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing from Madison Elementary School, Fargo, North Dakota, under the direction of Miss Schosson.

We have 110 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Linwood School, under the direction of Ms. Krashewski. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James.

We also have 80 students of Grades 8 and 9 standing from River Heights School, under the direction of Mrs. Mayor. This school is in the constituency of River Heights.

We have 20 students from the Crane River School, under the direction of Mrs. Habard. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

And we have 30 students of Grade 6 standing from the Whitemouth School, under the direction of Mrs. Rogers. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to introduce in your Speaker's gallery three newly elected members of parliament as of yesterday in the person of Mr. Terry Sargent for the Selkirk-Interlake Riding, in the person of Mr. Rod Murphy from Churchill, and Mr. David Orlikow, re-elected in the Winnipeg North Constituency.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister — but in the absence of the First Minister I would direct my question to the Acting First Minister. In view of the fact that the Constituency of Rossmere has been unrepresented since this past December and the good folk there remain without representation, . . . and River Heights and Fort Rouge presently go unrepresented, could the Acting First Minister advise us as to when the writs will be issued so that the people living in those constituencies will have representation in this Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in the first place, as the Leader of the Opposition recognizes, that decision is made by the First Minister and in due course, when the decision is made, it will be announced.

I would like to advise you that the First Minister won't be here today and will be away about a week, Mr. Speaker, so I would have to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that having not heard of any news regarding the topic he introduces, or asked the question on, at this point in time it would seem to be that perhaps unless he announces it from elsewhere, we perhaps won't hear anything from him on that topic until he returns.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Acting First Minister: In view of the announcement that there might very well be a special fall session, could the Acting First Minister assure the residents of Rossmere and Fort Rouge and River Heights that they will have representation during that special fall session?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, again, that sort of answer would have to come from the First Minister and it will be noted on the record; if he wishes to address it upon his return, that might be the

more appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. On Friday last he indicated that the Consolidated Revenue might not be impaired by one red cent by the Hydro freeze over the next five years. Can I ask the Minister whether the program that he has now instituted will make it possible for Consolidated Revenue to gain money on this program if the financial situation of the dollar turns around and you find that you are depriving Hydro of the preferred rates as against the domestic rates which you indicate they will have to pay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the key word in the Member for Inkster's question, which is entirely correct, is the word "might" and that applies to all aspects of the undertaking of the guarantee, which it is, and many of the questions regarding that guarantee cannot be answered in anticipation of what may be happening, because there are too many variables. But with regard to the costs, of the likelihood of a turn around in currencies sufficient enough to change \$350 million which we are now theoretically on paper in the red, Mr. Speaker, on the foreign currency exchanges, I would certainly hope that we may retrieve a large portion if things go well in our economies in Canada relative to other countries. I wouldn't want to speculate at this time, and would not speculate, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to get a turn around based on the direction of the relevant world economies at this time that will allow us to retrieve close to that amount.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister says he wouldn't like to speculate. Isn't that exactly what he is doing, he is speculating on the value of the dollar, and if the dollar turns around, not only will it not cost the treasury one red cent, but the treasury will gain money at the expense of Hydro. And would the Honourable Minister assure the House and the people of Manitoba that this so-called freeze, or guarantee, will be one which the government will accept full responsibility for; and if the dollar does turn around, the government will not be wagering on the dollar at Hydro's expense?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the member again, he's used another key word, "if" in addition to the "might" he used in his first question. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that I would be happy, and I'm sure that he would be, and most members of this House would be, if we could see the economies of the world shift, that we could retrieve half of that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister undertake to the people of the province of Manitoba that this so-called freeze will under no circumstances, no ifs, ands or buts, result in a cost to Manitoba Hydro which would increase their hydro rates?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the provisions — there will be provisions, there will be a bill coming before the House to spell out the transfer of the foreign funds and the Canadian dollars and the replacement of the debt dating back to the date when the issues were taken out, all that information will be before the House. But if it will help the member put it into perspective, over the period of the five-year guarantee there is, at today's exchange rates, in retrieving, repatriating the debt, if you like, to the province, — well, I can't think of a better word, Mr. Speaker, it's perhaps not one of the ones used in the financial world but it describes, it's a word that's used elsewhere these days and I think everybody understands what it means — repatriation of the debt to the province from Hydro if there is no change in the currency picture now, over the five-year period will cost the province \$110 million roughly. Mr. Speaker, the likelihood of that going to zero over that period of time, is so remote that I don't think we have to address the question. We'll address the question and address it happily, Mr. Speaker, if that does occur.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to address a question to the Acting Premier and ask the Honourable Minister of Finance if he can indicate to the House when the government intends to introduce legislation to bring into effect the proposals of the Manitoba Boundaries Commission? That is the recommendations pertaining to boundary changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, that question should be addressed more properly to the First Minister. It comes under the aegis of his Executive Council responsibility and would have to be addressed directly to him.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Finance can give us any indication whether this legislation will be brought in during this Session or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is repetitive. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism concerning the pamphlet, *Catch Our Good Nature*, and ask her if it is true that the province spent approximately \$100,000 to have this pamphlet printed, holding aside distribution costs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I believe I took an Order for Return for that very same thing, asking for the costs of our advertising. I gave a breakdown of my advertising during my Estimates also.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether she is satisfied with the omission of a number of important cities or towns in Manitoba such as Lockport, Lac du Bonnet, Sprague, La Riviere, Pilot Mound, Crystal City, and so on?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I'm very satisfied at the brochure but however, the brochure was never meant to be a thorough information piece for the people to use. All it was meant to be is precisely what we have called it — a lure booklet — to have people's enthusiasm and interest aroused, and we have many many booklets that we can forward to anybody that expresses an interest in coming to Manitoba or to different parts of our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister whether the pamphlet was proof read in view of such directions as, go from Roblin east to Yorkton, or go from Austin east to Brandon, because I assume that we're talking in terms of 25,000 miles or 40,000 kilometers? Was the pamphlet proof read?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the booklet was put up by our advertising agency. I didn't personally proof read it, but as I mentioned before, all it is is a lure piece to attract people to look at all the wonderful spots in our province, not as an authentic map as they would have us want to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Tourism to repeat again for clarification purposes whether or not she indeed is satisfied that that particular brochure does not make reference, or doesn't indicate, the community of Lac du Bonnet, which by the way happens to be one of the more important resort communities in this province.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I think I already did make reference to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that I was sorry that Lac du Bonnet was left off it. The people who have written in or called in and expressed disappointment at having either their tourist attraction or their location left off, I've asked them to write in. We are to rectify this. We are including them in our advertising accentuating their places of interest to make sure that they will be brought to the attention of anybody who would like to come to Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, the Minister obviously doesn't recall the last question that I put to her some one or two weeks ago, because that question dealt with the historic St. Peter's Church which was not mentioned in the brochure. Mr. Speaker, this is a second omission in that

part of the province and I simply draw it to the Minister's attention so that perhaps for the next year these omissions might be corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member a question? The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: I think, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet wasn't listening to me. I told him that any places that are left out of the booklet or off the map are getting preferred treatment from us, from the advertising, to make sure that their places will be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Despite the fact that the unpopularity of the Conservative government in Manitoba prevented Joe Clark from gaining a clear majority in the country, it would appear that the Federal Conservatives will still be forming the Federal Government, can the Minister of Finance now indicate when he will table the Manitoba Government's White Paper and position on tax credits, since we know now that it's the Federal Conservative promises that will be kept federally with respect to tax credits? Can he indicate now when the Manitoba Government will table the report that it didn't table when it filed this Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we indicated in the Budget that we would be tabling it within a few months, and I think we would all want to give the new government an opportunity to put forth its program with more definition before we attempted to dovetail it with any provisions within the White Paper. Now, Mr. Speaker, to be more specific, with the fine co-operation I know that the new government will get in Ottawa, that their program will recommend itself highly to the minority NDP Opposition in Ottawa, and I am sure that we can expect fine results.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the minister. Does his hesitancy mean that he feels that the Conservative platform needed more definition? And secondly, does he have a hesitancy about the Conservative government keeping its promises with respect to property tax credits, with respect to mortgage deductibility? Is that why he's hesitating in presenting the White Paper right now?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the only hesitancy that may exist if it does exist, would be due to the fact that there's such a hodgepodge of programs that were left by the former government that we're still sorting out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Highways. I'd ask the minister if he could indicate just when the restrictions will be removed, if he has any idea, or at least increased, so that those people who have to have fertilizer spread on their farms will be able to receive the chemicals transported to farms, which at the present time they are unable to do because of the restrictions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the department is aware of the lateness of the season and the calendar that is fast taking us into that time of year, where in rural Manitoba the movement of fertilizers and/or grains is becoming more prevalent as we finally get to seeding. I'm hopeful that the restrictions will be coming off very shortly. I'll perhaps be in a position to make some further announcements tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister indicate if he has any news as to the length of the shutdown at the Canadian Bronze plant in the city; and can the minister also confirm that he has been approached by the members of the International Moulders and Allied Workers Union in regard to Workers' Compensation covering their loss of pay, that has been as a result of the government shutting down the operation at Canadian

Bronze.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): There's been no confirmation, Mr. Speaker, on the length of the shutdown of the particular plant, or when they will be hiring back or bringing back, and I have had conversations with the International Moulders Union and will continue to have some.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister also inform the House as to what is causing the delay in providing the House with the copies of lead and air surveys that have been requested by an Address for Papers earlier this year; and can the minister indicate when we can expect those materials to be presented?

MR. MacMASTER: I would expect to have them ready very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a different subject — can the minister indicate if any decision has yet been made in regard to the supplementary funding for the Savage Island Fish Processing Plant?

MR. MacMASTER: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker. I have most of the material together, I expect, within the next few days I'll be able to have something concrete for the member on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and the interMember of the Legislature for Thompson. I wonder if the minister could tell us, Mr. Speaker, when the airstrips at Red Sucker Lake and Ste. Theresa Point will be reopened?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for The Pas is referring to myself, I'll attempt to answer the question. I don't know exactly when they'll be opened; I can determine that rather quickly and get back to the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister of Highways could tell us when they expect that Highway No. 283 from The Pas to Hudson Bay, Sask. can be reopened, and whether or not there is any preventative work that can be done to prevent washout of the shoulders on that particular road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice with respect to the condition of that particular road.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pose a question to the Minister of Education, and it deals with the Head Start Program that is being discontinued in the Village of Riverton. Would the minister take as notice, at least, or could he indicate whether some of the equipment and items that are used presently in the Head Start Program, whether they could be left to be used by the community if they could possibly carry on their program?

The Metis Federation has a Community Drop In Centre and the Lutheran Church, where the Head Start Program presently is being operated out of, they would like to know whether some of that equipment could be left in the community when the province discontinues their funding of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Has he received an interim or supplementary report from the Tritschler Commission, either formal or informal, dealing with the capital financing of Hydro — existing capital financing of Hydro — which, in any way, comments on the aspects of the budget report, Budget Speech decision made by government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker. The only report from the Inquiry Commission was the first report, which was tabled in the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Minister of Finance then confirm that the decision made, as announced in the Budget report, is made independent of any recommendations that may or may not be made by the Tritschler Commission?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question then, now, to the Attorney-General. Has his staff finished perusing, studying, and is able to report on the report from the provincial judges, which he told us in Estimates he has had for some time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that report is still under review. There are some concerns within the department about the contents of that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a fourth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable the Attorney-General indicate when and if he intends to table the report for the House?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that report was made to me, at my request, from the Provincial Judges' Association. There have arisen, in the review of the department, some concerns about the practical implementation of some of the recommendations as reviewed by some senior Crown Attorneys, Mr. Speaker, because there obviously exists a difference of opinion over some of the recommendations — and not seriously. And I don't mean by saying that, Mr. Speaker, to any way downgrade the recommendations of the Judges' Association because it was a serious report by them. They spent a lot of time at it. But I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to table the report and then get into a public debate with the Judges' Association over the practical implementation of some of their recommendations. I don't think that we should put judges in that position, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with a fifth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering if the Attorney-General is prepared to confirm my recollection that he undertook during the Estimates Debate and at the conclusion of his Salary Estimates that he would table that report only after his department has examined and he has obtained the consent of the judges to that finding. Will he now indicate whether or not my recollection is correct, and is he now saying that he could not obtain the consent of the judges to the tabling of the report?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have not obtained the consent of the Judges' Association to the tabling of that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a sixth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the very obvious question: Has the Honourable the Attorney-General asked for consent to file the report, from the Provincial Judges, and have they refused to give it to him?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my senior members of administration of my department have discussed it with the Judges' Association and have not obtained the Judges' Association's consent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a seventh question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, to be specific to the Honourable the Attorney-General, does he intend to honour his commitment to the Committee of Supply, and will he therefore specifically request consent and then report that it has been refused? The Honourable Minister must realize full well that he has not stated that they have refused; he has only stated that it hasn't been received. It cannot be received . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question is repetitive. It's out of order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my impression that the Attorney-General was about to rise to respond to my question. If, however, you wish to make that point that you did, I want to request you to reconsider that because I worded my question quite specifically. I'll try again then, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I would ask the Attorney-General if he is prepared to honour his commitment made at the Committee level by specifically requesting the consent of the provincial judges, and will he report to us that they have refused to give that consent?

MR. SPEAKER: Again, I must say the question is repetitive and rule it out of order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I could ask the Honourable Attorney-General if he is prepared to undertake to request the Provincial Judges' consent to the tabling of that report.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to indicate the status of the review of the report to the Honourable Member for St. Johns. I am certainly prepared to personally request the consent of the Judges' Association towards the tabling of that report.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Attorney-General for his forthright answer, after awhile, and now I would like to ask him, has he received the Knox Report?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a tenth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. May I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General whether he does not expect to receive the Knox Report very soon, in view of the information he gave us during his Estimates Review?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I hope to receive that report before the end of the month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with an eleventh question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation for your counting the questions, so I needn't review them myself. May I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General whether or not he is prepared to undertake to table the Knox Report soon after it is received?

MR. MERCIER: No, I am not prepared to undertake that at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. In view of reports that the situation involving Canadian Bronze and lead poisoning is likely to occur in other plants in the City of Winnipeg and in view of the fact that there are difficulties pertaining to equitable compensation for those that are laid off as a result of such dislocations, I would ask the Minister of Labour whether he is now prepared to announce the formation of a Royal Commission in order to investigate all matters pertaining to lead poisoning in the Province of Manitoba and various steps that can be undertaken pertaining to same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the two particular plants that I have been involved in in the closing of same are two that have a history going back many years, some of them recorded back to 1974 and 1975. The conditions at those particular times — and I think the lead-in-air levels are going to indicate that — were in a majority of cases in excess to what they are today. The problem that I have is that somebody had to make a conscience decision as to what to do and to express some concern for the working men that were in those plants, a decision that was not forthcoming from the previous administration, for whatever particular reasons.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer, by way of supplementary, is the Minister then satisfied that he is prepared to develop some system of equitable compensation for employees that are laid off as a result of dislocation from lead poisoning?

MR. MacSTER: Well, one thing that we have done, Mr. Speaker, is assure ourselves that those that do have levels in excess of .08 certainly are referred to and are receiving treatment from the Workers Compensation Board in Manitoba. This is something that was not done during the years of 1974, '75 and '76 under the previous administration, and the records show that.

Sometimes there were numbers of 60, 70 and 80 people who, it had been determined, had excess lead in their blood, and the numbers were, and I'm going to table that particular piece of paper, the numbers were in the neighbourhood of 8, 9, 10 and 12 who finally found their way into the Compensation Board. So in the days of my friend the Leader of the Opposition, there was very little concern on his behalf of any compensation of any type for workers in that particular industry.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I prefer to not deal with some of the, I believe, unnecessary comments by the Minister of Labour in respect to his response, but to ask the Minister of Labour whether or not there is information that indicates very clearly, within the files of his department, that if, on the basis of information that was available in his department last September and October, that if preventative steps had been undertaken at that time and in the weeks and months subsequent to same, that the action of this past week may not have been necessary.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there is information that I'm compiling for the Member for Churchill that indicates very clearly that there was a very serious problem in 1975 when it first seemed to have surfaced, and again, my friend the Leader of the Opposition was sitting on this side, in government, within a Cabinet, who chose not to do anything about it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again insofar as the material that relates to information received this past September and October 1978, is the Minister presently reviewing same in order to ascertain whether or not, if steps had been undertaken some time ago, the action of this past week would not have been necessary?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the material, going back to 1975, if steps had been taken then, if people had had the fortitude or the concern, or if their conscience had bothered them enough, something might have been done in 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side, are finally glad to see that the Minister is getting around to making some conscious decisions after a year and a half of unconscious knee-jerk reaction to this problem.

My question to the Minister, as he seems to have been delving through the files, instead of

dealing with the problem as it should be dealt with, can he indicate if any person has ever come before the Workers Compensation Board for the problem of lead poisoning and been denied compensation by the board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I can't particularly answer that, but I have determined that there were literally dozens of people during the years I was talking about that should have been eligible for compensation that were never directed there. Of course, in those days, Mr. Chairman, there was no program in effect which would make them conscious of the fact, really, that they were entitled to it.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in those days there was no effective opposition to bring this matter before the House's attention. And now there is no effective government to deal with the problem when we do bring it before their attention.

My question to the Minister is, can the Minister indicate what other lead-using industries in the province of Manitoba that may be experiencing contamination problems, are currently being reviewed for the enlargement of his so-called lead control program?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, answer the last part first, the so-called lead program, this is the one that the members have been talking about that had no teeth, had no muscle, we needed Royal Commissions, we needed legislation, we needed regulations to do something on behalf of the working people. This is the program. And now we have a problem today, because of the program that's bringing and righting a situation that's been in effect for many, many years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now they have a program that forces the individual worker in the lead-using industries, either to face starvation or poisoning. I would ask the Minister if he is prepared now to enlarge that program to investigate other known lead-using industries that may well, in fact, be poisoning their workers for the purpose of determining the extent and the parameters of this problem in the province of Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: I have said many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we are, and will be prepared to expand that particular program and it's the very poisoning of the workers which is of major concern to myself and should have been a concern to others that were in office during those particular years preceding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways in his capacity as Minister responsible for airstrips in the north. Over a week ago, I asked the Minister if he would investigate the airstrip at Poplar River which apparently was not being maintained due to a broken-down grader in the community. I wonder if the Minister, in addition to looking at that problem, which I believe is still in effect since the grader was still broken down there this week when I was in there, can the Minister also investigate the airstrips at Berens River and Oxford House and Gods Lake and Cross Lake, where some upgrading and maintenance work must be done in order to maintain those airstrips in a safe condition for the scheduled aircraft to continue operating into those communities? And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that these communities really rely on these airstrips as their only link to the outside, particularly during the breakup and freezeup periods of the year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that with respect to the particular problem referred to at Poplar Lake, Poplar River, pardon me, the necessary repairs to the piece of equipment are on their way up. Again, the member will appreciate that much of the equipment is used equipment, or older equipment that has been stationed in some of these areas, that regrettably does break down from time to time. The maintenance on the other strips that the honourable member expresses some concern for will be maintained at a regular level. The honourable member might not have been present at my Estimates during that part of the discussion, but the level of maintenance is the same as in previous years, with some expansion and some improvement of capital order being called for on several of the strips. I would have to refer to

my Estimates to be precise on which ones.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. With respect to the Berens River airstrip, in view of the fact that this airstrip has been closed some 18 days since the middle of April, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if some major upgrading will be done over this summer period to ensure that that airstrip will be serviceable during the breakup and freezeup periods?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that particular strip, along with Norway House, if I'm not mistaken, and as well, of course, the expansion of a new airstrip at Lac Brochet, those are among the upgrading of the airstrip facilities that the department is providing in the north.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired we'll proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposal of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to join in the debate on the Budget as presented by the government of the day, the temporary government of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose we could call this day the day after the Poseidon event, at least as far as the Liberals are concerned. What happened to the Liberals yesterday would be similar to what happened in the movie, the Poseidon Event, and Mr. Speaker, Manitobans and Canadians awoke this morning to find that they had a new government — a government that will represent approximately 20 percent of the population of Canada. It would work out to about 20 percent. I haven't figured it out to the last percentage fractions, Mr. Speaker, but if you have about 70 percent of the people turning out at the polls, and you split that three ways, you end up with about approximately 20 percent of the people voting for the government that received the most seats yesterday. However that does not concern me that greatly, Mr. Speaker, because that is how our system works. But we have a party system and it is quite often that we have a government that does not receive over a 50 percent majority, and I suppose this is probably one of the worst situations that we have seen, as far as I can recall, for many many years, where a government will be ruling the country with approximately 35 percent of the popular vote.

But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else is the polarization of the people of this country, this great country of ours; and what we have seen happening should give us cause for concern because we are dividing this country on racial grounds. And that is extremely unfortunate and it does not bode too well for our country when you have a country that's divided on racial grounds. It's bad enough to be divided on economic grounds but when it comes to racial grounds well then we certainly must be concerned of what's happening in our country. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, if I may explain, what we have seen here is the government being elected by primarily the Anglophone people of our country. The Conservative Party seems to attract, primarily and by large, the Anglophone support; and on the other hand you see the Liberal Party being supported quite strongly by the Francophones, as we have seen in Quebec, and this is where my greatest concern is.

I happen to be a person of French descent, Mr. Speaker, and I am very concerned at what's happening in my country today. I want to say though that I do not believe that the Leader of the Liberal Party is a person that could have dealt with the Quebec question, particularly with the Premier of Quebec. I think that these two people, these two individuals, certainly clashed with one another, and I don't think there was any love lost between either of them, and I feel that perhaps what has happened may be slightly better than the position we were in but however, when we look at what has happened to the Conservative vote in the province of Quebec, then again I think it's obvious that there will be just as much uncertainties in our country with the new administration. And I certainly want to wish Mr. Clark well, and wish him the best in his efforts to try and hold this country together and to improve relations from all corners of this country of ours, so that Canada can remain one country, undivided, and strong.

So I hope that Mr. Clark will be able to achieve those goals, however, as I say, the French people in Quebec fully understand that the main support of the Conservative Party comes from Anglophones and that is what is their major concern and that is why the Conservative Party is unable to make any inroads in the province of Quebec. And I believe that it would be better if both the Liberals and the Conservatives would go away, disappear someplace. What we need is a third alternative, and I believe that Mr. Broadbent would have been a better person, not because of himself personally,

not because of a lack of sincerity on the part of Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Clark, but rather because the New Democratic Party seems to be able to attract a wider support from ethnic groups.

I have no problem as a New Democrat obtaining French support, Ukrainian support, Anglophone support, many other ethnic peoples in my constituency, I have no problem receiving that support. But, unfortunately there are other problems as well that comes into the picture to make it more difficult to deal with Quebec, and of course that is a matter of culture, but that also is a serious problem in the non-Quebec French population as well. The French people in Manitoba see their culture is threatened as well. They have problems with education, and they will be asking questions as to why this government is going to support the Quebec government in regard to the French question in the Province of Quebec, and the Anglophone question in the Province of Quebec.

But, Mr. Speaker, this election, I think, is going to cause some very deep soul-searching. The results of the election yesterday, while it was a victory for the Conservative Party, there will be some deep soul-searching in the Conservative caucuses right across this land, and particularly in Manitoba, particularly in Manitoba, and I'm sure that there will be some soul-searching being done there to see what happened in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, yes, the New Democrats had some reverses in Ontario, and I think that I can understand what happened there. The reaction to the Trudeau government was so strong, and that has also happened in some cases in Manitoba, the reaction was so strong that many people voted Conservative in order to get rid of somebody, in order to get rid of the Liberals they would vote for the party that would have the best chance. You know, it seems that everybody is busy trying to keep somebody else out, rather than vote for their true conscience. I ran into people here in this province before the election who — in fact, I spoke to some very strong New Democrats, staunch New Democrats, who indicated to me that they would have to vote for Axworthy because, well, while they were not Liberals they had to keep Spivak out. And they succeeded, I guess, in doing just that. But in my opinion, this is not my way of approaching politics. I feel that one should have sufficient confidence in what he believes in to be counted. I don't think any vote is lost; every vote is a win for that particular person who casts that ballot.

But I want to go back again to say that there is a lesson to be gained here by the Conservatives in what has happened in Manitoba. While we did have a very good organization and the New Democratic Party is known to be able to come up with a good campaign organization, I want to say that our best campaign manager was Sterling Lyon. He was our champion. I think if we would have got off our butts, Mr. Speaker, we could have perhaps won the Dauphin seat as well, and maybe St. James here in Winnipeg. We were a bit complacent, Mr. Speaker. We could have won the Dauphin seat and it would have been a real upset and a complete upset for the Conservative Party in Manitoba.

But I hope that they will learn their lesson and listen for a change, because we have been telling them for 18 months that their policies were not acceptable by the people of Manitoba and that they were going too far. I'm sorry that the Member for Pembina is not here today, because I think that perhaps you will see some of the backbenchers pulling in their horns a bit when they get up to speak. I listened to the Member for Pembina expounding on the virtues of the private sector and so on, that was the only way, the only solution, after criticizing my leader in his remarks, and he referred to the comments made by my leader as NDP rhetoric, and after he was through saying that, he immediately went into the Conservative rhetoric, expounding the virtues of the private sector.

Well, we have never denied, New Democrats have never denied that the private sector isn't important; we have never said that. What we do say is that we do not want our country to be dominated by multinational corporations or corporations that can control the destiny of our country from outside of our borders. We think that there should be some controls on corporations such as Exxon and other multinationals who, by virtue of the financial positions that they hold in the country, in the world, not only in the country, that they are able to influence what happens in another country. This is where we feel that something should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the people of Manitoba and the position of the New Democratic Party — and the people, I think, gave their verdict yesterday — I think they said to the government, we do not want to be governed by the likes of the Great-West Life Assurance Company. I think that's what they were trying to say yesterday, Mr. Speaker — we want the government that we elect to govern us; we don't want them to be influenced by any outside forces in the economy or in the country. I think that is the message that we received yesterday and I'm sure that there will be some defeated Conservative Members of the Parliament who will be writing to this government and blaming them personally for the defeat that they suffered yesterday. —(Interjection)— Well, I know. My colleague from St. Johns says, well, they will get jobs, you know, they will get Senate appointments or they will get plushy jobs to recompense them or pay them for their efforts in the past. We will be watching very closely how this government is going to proceed from here on in.

It will be interesting to watch what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, you believe this or not, even last week when I was in my constituency, you wouldn't believe this, but you know what the people are asking me? They are wondering if it is possible to circulate a petition; and would it have the authority to ask this government to resign. Of course it wouldn't have the authority, but the people out in the country are telling me, we would like to circulate a petition and ask this government to resign; we want them out. They don't want to wait until 1981, Mr. Speaker, they want them out now — they want them out now. This is what the people are asking me: Could we sign a petition and get rid of these guys?

It's not only the small people at the other end, Mr. Speaker. I recently spoke to the manager of one of the, perhaps not a major insurance company but a large insurance company here in Winnipeg. I had some business with him and he said to me, "Oh, you're Mr. Adam?" "Yes." "Oh yes, I know you." He says, "When are you going to get those guys out of there? We've got to get them out of there." This is from a manager of an insurance company, Mr. Speaker. So not all the insurance companies are friends of the Conservative Party.

Although, Mr. Speaker, you know we've heard many times — at least in the last year and a half — how the economic climate is so healthy now in Manitoba. And maybe you're right, maybe you're right. Maybe it is right, eh, because, you know, Mr. Speaker, I received a pamphlet here from the Canada Life Assurance Association and the Life Underwriters Association of Canada and they speak very well of Manitoba now. Let's see what they say here. Oh, they say the investment opportunities are just terrific. And I will just quote here, Mr. Speaker, "An estimated \$1,417 million of Life Company's investments were attributed to Manitoba." And they're really pleased with what's happening in Manitoba. "This reflects the excellent investment opportunities in the province." And they go on to itemize how this breaks down.

So, there are excellent opportunities in Manitoba but, Mr. Speaker, they are not talking about 1979; they are not talking about 1980. They say that up to the end of 1976, up to the end of 1976, Mr. Speaker, an estimated \$1,417 million of Life Company's investments were attributed to Manitoba.

So I want you to take note that they are talking about the years when there was an NDP Socialist radical eyed government in Manitoba. And they say that during that period, Mr. Speaker, that there were excellent investment opportunities in the Province of Manitoba.

So not all the rhetoric that we have been receiving from the Conservative Party as far as economic development in Manitoba is concerned, not all of that is supported by the life insurance companies, and I have proof right here in my hands.

So they don't agree with you. In other words, the Canada Life Assurance Association doesn't agree when you say that money was leaving the province and that there were no investment opportunities in Manitoba when there was a New Democratic Party government here.

And, as well, I just mention that I spoke to another manager privately and he told me that he can't wait to see this government out of office. Now, I don't know why an insurance manager would be telling me that. I would like to know. Of course, we do know that Great-West Life has a major influence in the province today and a major influence with this government, but they were repudiated yesterday, Mr. Speaker. They were repudiated, and soundly, soundly repudiated.

You know, this government came in with a Budget, Mr. Speaker, a Budget that was intended to try and fool the people for another two years. That's what they thought. They said, we are going to bring in this Budget. I think it was a bit of a con game or a shell game some of my colleagues called it. I think the freeze on Hydro was definitely a con game.

MR. ENNS: Are you going to vote against it?

MR. ADAM: I haven't decided yet. The Minister of Highways says am I going to vote against it. Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say that at the moment. I will listen to the debates on both sides of the House and make my decision later.

But, nevertheless, I believe they upstaged the management of Hydro when they brought in the freeze, because I believe that the management of Hydro was doing a good job and they were bringing the Hydro around to showing a good profit. And I think it is unfair for the government to do this. And I happen to know that many of the Hydro people in management are very upset that the government did bring in this freeze. You know, it's easy to freeze something when you know it's not going to go up. It's not difficult.

And the press — and I congratulate the press for seeing through that sham immediately for what it was, a sham. And the next day we saw in the editorials that the government had lots of help from Hydro to bring in the freeze.

So I don't think that that is going to wash, not for an instant, Mr. Speaker, not for an instant. We're happy that there is a freeze, but there would have been a freeze anyway without the freeze.

Hydro had no intention of increasing Hydro rates. Some of my colleagues before me mentioned that it just endorses our position, the position taken to develop Hydro in the province in previous years.

And you know, if I had my way, I would increase Hydro production as soon as possible to have a tremendous supply of reserve power that we can tap in at a moment's notice, rather than let it go down to the sea, and try and expand our markets.

You know, a few years ago I recall that we were exporting, what? \$9 million worth of Hydro per year; now it's almost, what? \$80 million or \$100 million? It's well up anyway, Mr. Speaker, and selling power is just like selling wheat; it's just like selling beef; it's just like exporting any of our products here, it's income. It helps our balance of payments, and there is absolutely nothing wrong. We do not have any oil to sell. We are not as fortunate as Alberta and Saskatchewan in that regard. But we're very fortunate to be blessed with a lot of water, sometimes too much, as we saw this spring. Sometimes it's very unfortunate to be blessed with so much water, but we do have the sources to tap in for energy. It's there and we should build it as soon as we possibly can, at a lower cost than we would, taking into consideration inflationary trends, which this year is reaching almost double digits proportion. So the sooner we build the plants the lower cost it will be in the long-term. In the long-term we will be having the cheapest energy, probably, in Canada, in the long-term.

So I'm not concerned about the Hydro rates. We must remember that Hydro rates have not increased for something like 20 years, I believe, until the more recent years when we started to expand the construction of Hydro.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that the Budget, in my opinion, was not a Budget that I would say would be one that would tend to expand economics in the province. I haven't seen anything in there. I don't think it's a good policy to . . . The mining tax, I believe, I don't think there's anything wrong with the way the government wants to tax the mining group, but what concerns me is when they have done away with the Manitoba Exploration Mining Corporation. I don't think that any government should allow itself to be under the club of one group, and that's what's happening. And the moment, and it's only natural, the moment that the mining corporations realize that they are the only ones that will be able to be involved, I'm telling you that the price is going to come high. The price increases, and that is where the problem lies. The cost keeps going up. If you want to encourage industry into the province, they're going to say, "How much are you going to give me? We will come, but how much are you going to give me? How many years tax free? How many years without having to pay property taxes?"

So, are we going back to the good old days, when we were spending more? More to provide services — public services, schools, roads, hydro, all the services that are required in a town such as Thompson. Are we going to go back to the good old days when we spent more money than we received in benefits? And I say this is sheer folly. This is sheer folly, and this also applies to when you get into enticing corporations to come and establish themselves into your province. They get one province competing against the other. And I don't blame them. They will get one country competing against one another, and see who gives them the best deal.

So I say that you should keep your options open at all times. And that is why we fought so strongly for the Land Lease Program. We think that rather than remove one option from young farmers who want to go into farming, the government should have come in with another option. Bring in another option, never mind just one option. You buy or else you don't farm. That is the only option that our young farmers have today. The government should have brought in other options as well as buy the land yourself, lease it if it suits your purpose, or bring in some other option to assist them to get into farming. That program was a very good program, excellent program. So I say the government should keep its option as well.

I know that, well the man that farms my land now, I've leased him 300 acres, I believe, on my farm. The young farmer, married about two, three years ago, has one young child about a year old maybe. He told me the other day, he said I would never have been able to get into farming if it had not been for the Land Lease Program. He bought out his brother, at least through the Land Lease; he bought out his brother and it's this neighbour of mine, he's on the same section as I am, and he now farms 1,700 acres, Mr. Speaker, and he is quite successful. I don't know how it's going to work out this spring because of the lateness of the season, and the water that's flowing around our way, still on the land, I don't know how it's going to work. It's not as bad as what we see down south. But this was a good program, and I think it was very much maligned by the Conservatives for political purposes only, and, you know, big government grabbing all the land, state farm, try to insinuate all kinds of things — scare tactics is what it is, and I think that the government was very misguided, very misguided in doing away with that program because it was assisting quite a number of young farmers, to get into farming, who would not have otherwise been able to. And it also assisted many older farmers, who wanted to retire and needed some

capital to build a home or have a little bit of money in their retiring years. And this was one way to accomplish that.

Now, perhaps the government of the day, the government could have come up with some other alternative as well. But what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They did away with this program without having one in place, without having another program to immediately come in and take over. So, as a result of this, there was no program there for at least a year. I believe there is something now in the process or, I'm not sure whether it's working at all. I'd be anxious to hear how many people are involved or how many applications or whatever there is available, how many loans are being made either through the comprehensive loans or to the direct loans.

But, Mr. Speaker, I've had many people come to me, farmers and say, well, what is there available now? I want my son to buy my farm, and what is there? Well, I'm sorry, there isn't anything yet. So, we're just hoping to see the day when the government will come up with a program that will give you the options that you had in the past. But I understand that it's not that good of a program, but I stand to be corrected. I want to be shown how it is working. You know, is it a program that will protect the banks — if there's a risk of losing a red copper on the deal, if there's any losses to be made, that the people of Manitoba should absorb the loss, and if there's a profit to be made on a loan, is it the bank that's going to make it? These are the questions that we want answered, and I believe that we will find, I'm sure, that if there are going to be any losses on any loans, it'll be the public sector that'll take it. And if there's any profits to be made, you know, this government wants to make sure that the banks don't lose one solitary copper, and I'm sure that that's what we'll find, Mr. Speaker.

So Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina was criticizing the previous government for not removing some taxes for clothing and so on, as if to say that the previous administration had brought in the sales tax. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows, everybody knows in Manitoba that the sales tax was brought in by Duff Roblin, and we're not condemning that — but at least call a spade a spade.

Then that was just what happened in the Budget, Mr. Speaker, peanuts for the poor and big concessions to the mining industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that I wanted to speak briefly on rail abandonment. I have a resolution before the House; I don't know whether we're ever going to get back into it. If we go into speed-up, I expect that we probably won't be dealing with Private Members, and I would have really appreciated hearing some debate from the honourable members opposite on what their position was on rail abandonment. I'm hoping to hear more views from the members opposite; I'd like to hear the Member for Dauphin speak, and he doesn't speak often, and I wish he'd get up and speak.

You know, you would almost think, to listen to some of the backbenchers up there, that everything is fine in their constituency — you never hear, no problems; I can tell you that there's lots of problems. I can tell the Member for Dauphin and the Member for Minnedosa that these elevators are plugged; the grain is not moving. Well, we know what happened — one guy out west got the message yesterday as to why the elevators are plugged. He got the message yesterday, he got the word, he got the word yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: He got the word. He got the word.

MR. ADAM: He got the word yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not too disturbed about him getting the word the way he did.

But, there are a lot of problems, but we don't hear the the Member for Portage, who's not in his seat and is speaking, who seldom gets up to tell us about the problems in his constituency — there are no problems in Portage la Prairie.

And the Member for Swan River — I hope, and I'm sure that he's about ready to stand up now and speak as soon as I sit down, I know there are a lot of problems out there. Rail abandonment, congestion of elevators, transportation, and we'd like to hear what's going on.

There's problems in my area — we are going to lose a 1,000 miles of rail between now and 1981, and I want to hear from members opposite where they stand on this question, because the only one I've heard is the Minister of Agriculture and he flatly refused to adopt my resolution or support my resolution, that would accomplish just what he himself says he desires. He does not want to see rail abandonment just yet' he says, just yet. You know, not this week, next week, but he does not want to support a resolution that will accomplish just that.

MR. ENNS: We'd like to go along with you, Peter, but we don't like your insurance friends.

MR. ADAM: I know the Minister of Highways understands, and he knows what I'm speaking of, but I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Agriculture refuse to adopt a resolution that would freeze all rail abandonment between now and at least 1990, and perhaps beyond. Why would the Minister of Agriculture adopt that position? He says, "Oh, you didn't spell it out. You know, what happens if a rail is taken out and the elevator is left?" That's all provided for in the Hall Commission recommendations. We would truck the grain out. Then the minister would have to build more highways and spend more money; yes, the minister would have to build more highways, and he's going to have to build better highways, and lots of them, so he'd better start coercing his colleagues. If they don't want to help me to stop rail abandonment, they don't want to support me, you'll have to coerce those other guys . . . —(Interjection)— they won't have any choice; these fellows won't have any choice on this side either. —(Interjection)— We're going to have such a bottleneck by 1985 in the grain transportation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Honourable Members of the Opposition were all here today wearing their red flowers, and sitting there with smiles on their faces, but I don't know what they've got to smile about. Quite frankly, you know, the popular vote in Manitoba in 1977 for the NDP was 39 percent and that's what it was yesterday. Very, very . . . no increase at all. If they wanted to take a look at one part of the province, they dropped 8 percent; and where they did have any gains at all, it was slightly over 1.5 percent. So they come in smiling. Who can smile, Mr. Speaker, when you've only got 17 percent of the vote in the whole of Canada, and only 26 members? My goodness. You know, I tell you — if I ever came in smiling about that, I'd really think that I'd have to write home and ask if I'd been brought up the right way, or if I hadn't been turned around some way or another.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this great act that we saw today was something that was just a little bit astonishing. You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't buy it; I just wonder if they read the newspapers. The newspapers says that the Conservatives are in power in Canada. Do you understand that? Now that I know that they understand that, they're not really celebrating their victories that they're talking about, because they didn't have any; they're with us, celebrating the defeat of the Liberal Party — that's the only thing that I can see those red flowers could represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have seen for 10 years in this House the Members of the NDP get excited over nothing, but they have to do it, because they've got nothing to get excited over. They have to make great big shams, they have to make great big shows because they really haven't accomplished anything of that nature.

I'll give you all a little chore over there. Take a look at the number of members you've had in Manitoba for the last 15 years, and you'll find you were down to 2, you'll find you were up to 5 once ' before, you will find you were at 3, you know you've jumped up and down like a yo-yo, and that's basically what they are — just a little piece of wood on a string that doesn't really know where it's going, controlled by the people up top, and that's all there is to it.

Mr. Speaker, I really have to comment on the accusations that were made by the Member for Elmwood. You know, one thing I would like to say, when he says that I'm the most efficient Minister in the Cabinet — coming from him, I've made it. I really feel that I feel sorry for my other colleagues that they haven't had a comment from him, because coming from him, anybody that gets that kind of a statement is made.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that he commented on my leader, the Premier of the province's statements about his leader just before the election, and how terrible it was, how terrible it was that he made some comments about the fact that he stood in front of a grocery store, or a fruit market or something of that nature, and then he thought it was, oh, how terrible, that the Premier of the province would be concerned about the fact that we had a flood and concerned about the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would only like to say that I have never in my life heard anything so ridiculous, but what really bothers me is the complete twisting that was done by the NDP and the Liberal candidates in this election; the complete misleading statements that they went out and said, "Medicare is going to end."

You know, my colleague from Roblin just came back from England. Did you know what the theme was just before the election in England by the Socialists? "Medicare is going to end." No, it isn't. You see, they said that. The Honourable Member for Brandon East stood up in this House, trying to give the impression that senior citizens rents were going to go up, purposely, just before the

election.

Insinuations, innuendos, nothing was ever done, nothing ever done to really justify any of the statements that they made.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that they did — they went along and they said that it was the Government of Manitoba who gave them this great victory that they're talking about; and I've just explained that they didn't have one.

But Mr. Speaker, none of their candidates had the guts to run on the NDP national policies. Most of them came running out talking about the Conservatives of Manitoba. No guts — just basically, no guts. You know, really we saw a campaign — (Interjection) — it was typical — I've been through four of them, or I've been through provincially and federally, lots of them, but the usual type of innuendo, twisting, sneaky ways of trying to make people think that somebody else is doing something they're not doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, they have nothing to celebrate about. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that they can talk as they like about changes, and I just repeated — let them go over the last fifteen years of how many members you've had, and see how it jumped around like a yo-yo. The Honourable Member for . . . won't be smiling all that much. Of course, he's an arrogant young man and he just smiles all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the Member for Ste. Rose talk about the decision to freeze the Hydro rates in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, and for some reason or other, the honourable gentleman on the other side again are twisting and maneuvering, trying to leave an impression that is not true. Mr. Speaker, the Hydro rates as has been explained by my colleagues before me speaaing went up 150 percent while they were in power. The then Premier said they will continue to go up by approximately 15 to 20 percent a year, and it's right in the papers — it doesn't have to be looked up in Hansard, it's in the papers.

Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no reason why the Hydro rates in this province had to go up that much if it hadn't of been by the bungling of that government of Hydro — the NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that the bungling of not going for the flooding and the diversion when they came into power because it had been a promise during 1969; that they had an election campaign that this wouldn't be done, or that wouldn't be done, brought in the great Cass-Beggs to give them a report to prove that they shouldn't have to do it, or do it another way, then turned around and went on the diversion a little differently — they decided to go into Jenpeg.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that Jenpeg cost about \$350 million, not including the interest, increase of interest because of the dollar which would probably raise it up to about \$600 or \$700 million. There's no question about that and do you know it's the most inefficient power plant in the North American continent. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, you could purchase all the power that that power plant would turn out for about \$50,000 to \$100,000, and I heard a member say, "Not so." It is the most inefficient; everything that was put in had to be reworked, rewelded. It took twice as long to put it in. It was probably one of the worst-devised situations of Hydro that we have ever seen in this province, or anywhere in North America. Mr. Speaker, if that government, when they came to power in 1969, had followed the plan, had followed the diversion and developed along the routes that were laid down for them when they came in, but because of election promises and twisting in 1969, they brought in Cass-Beggs to write them a report to tell them to do something else.

Mr. Speaker, there was no need for Hydro rates to jump up by 150 percent, as that government did, and this government comes to power, takes a look and analyzes the whole situation of the power problems in the Province of Manitoba, who have members of the rural area and in the country and in the city who walk up to them and say, can you please do something about the power rates of this province? Do they have to continue to go up, or do they have to continue to go up the way the NDP said they would go up? The NDP said they would continue to go up, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, for some reason or other, the Member for Ste. Rose, and I only mention him because he was the last one to speak, seems to think that the water resource in the Province of Manitoba shouldn't belong to the people and the people shouldn't benefit by it. He keeps talking about, worrying about whether the Hydro has a lot of profits or not, but he doesn't seem to think that the people of Manitoba should benefit from their resource or their heritage the same as they have benefited in Saskatchewan and Alberta from their heritages.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the member say "resource." Is water power, hydro power, not a resource, a renewable resource? If the honourable members on the other side don't think so, it makes it pretty obvious why power rates went up by 150 percent while they were in power — absolutely no knowledge whatsoever of what was going on, other than to spend, spend because they had made statements during a 1969 election, spend so badly that they had to raise them and had to charge the people of Manitoba for Hydro rates when there was absolutely no necessity

for it with all the power and water resource we have in this province. But, oh no, again we have them coming up and they start to twist it again, and they say, we can do it because of the job they did. If they had done any type of a job at all, there would have been no necessity for those increases.

Mr. Speaker, I refer now to the Member for Burrows, but briefly; he's not worth much time. Mr. Speaker, he said that he was disappointed that we raised the furniture, second-hand furniture, from 25 to 100. That's about 300 percent, isn't it? You know, Mr. Speaker, he is concerned. That really says that anybody who wants to buy second-hand furniture that is not buying it in large quantity I will probably pay no tax on it at all, and there are all kinds of people who buy used furniture, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of people. Mr. Speaker, lots of people buy used furniture.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about the 50 to 20 on used shoes. What did you want us to do, leave it the same? Are you going to vote for it? Yeah, there we are. Well, it really means that unless you are buying large quantities, you are going to get a break in that commodity.

Mr. Speaker, it's a tremendous, not a tremendous concession, but in the Hydro rates that we spoke about earlier, that was the main part of the Budget, is a concession that will help everybody who turns on a light in this province. And these fellows — I want to know — you know, when I sat on the other side and I would be speaking on the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I used to see them sitting over here and they would say, "Are you going to vote for it; are you going to vote for it?" they would keep saying. They always had a few little tricks in there though. In theirs, they always had some concessions, but they always had some little tax digs that would hurt somebody in the long run, tax increases. And we used to get up and we would debate those tax increases, and they would say, "Are you going to vote for it?" Let me ask them, Mr. Speaker, there is no tax increase in this Budget; we are going to give the people of Manitoba a guarantee that their light bill, or power bill, will not go up for five years. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about this Budget, Mr. Speaker. We are saying that we are going to make some small concessions that we wanted to make. We are saying that the mining industry will be in the same classification as they are in other provinces, which will create more jobs in northern Manitoba, and they say this.

Mr. Speaker, I'll ask them; I'll wait — in fact I won't ask them — I'll wait. There is no tax increase in this Budget. There are concessions in this Budget to help. There is a concession to everybody who turns a light on in Manitoba.

Let me talk to the honourable members right now about power. Mr. Speaker, your Hydro bills, according to the law, when this Budget goes through and the bill is passed, can't go up. Now, are you going to vote for it or not? It's very simple.

Mr. Speaker, the previous Premier of this province stood up in 1976, in the beginning of 1977, and said Hydro rates will continue to go up by 15 percent for the next three years. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not wrong; you can look it up.

Mr. Speaker, so now we have a situation where we talk about industry. If we get a power-intensive industry that is interested in the Province of Manitoba and heating the building would be peanuts, the power requirement would be peanuts compared to the power requirement that would be used in the industry or in the production. If they built their building to withstand electric heat, that industry would be saying, if we go to Manitoba, we will not have an increase in our energy rates for five years. And you gentlemen don't think that's beneficial? Well, Mr. Speaker, with everything that's going on, with the problems that they are having regarding fuel in the United States and some of the problems they are having with atomic fuel in different areas, if you don't think the Province of Manitoba is sitting with a benefit that we have offered to the rest of North America or anybody in the world who wants to come here and manufacture, you are wrong if you think that we haven't offered something not only that will benefit everybody who is in Manitoba who turns on a light, but Manitobans can benefit from the people who will come here because we have made that decision, and then they will further benefit because the economy of the province will go up. But those members don't think that way; they don't think about the future being planned on a sound basis. It was just spend, spend for the sake of a 1969 election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, let me again relate something. They keep talking about the economy — the Member for Brandon East is not here — let me tell him that in new company registrations, corporations, in the year 1976, well 1975, were 2,188; in 1976, 2,356; in 1976-77, 2,398; in 1977-78, 2,747; in 1978-79, 3,195 — going up every year. Mr. Speaker, in 1975 we start down at 1,992 in companies that came — and we now, in 1978-79, we had 3,536, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, licences to operate in Manitoba have gone up from 334 in 1975 and in 1978-79, we had 434 come along.

Mr. Speaker, the people who came to Manitoba, the gentleman who is the president of the Investment Dealers' Association, Mr. Neiwasser (?) — Mr. Neiwasser and Mr. Pitblado commented in the interview that a meeting with about 20 business leaders left them with the impression that business prospects here have improved greatly in recent months. "All 20 reported profitable

said Mr. Neiwasser. Some who had plants elsewhere were repatriating activity into Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, those statements, he didn't have to make them; he made them because they are true. The economy of the Province of Manitoba is going to be helped and from the province's point of view, the freezing of the Hydro rates is one of the things that has helped do it, as I explained a few minutes ago. There is no question that a power-intensive energy user has to be very blind if he doesn't take a look at the offer that the Province of Manitoba has given them, not only given them, but everybody who turns a light on in the Province of Manitoba.

One of the reasons the members on the other side are so annoyed is that they have been had. They are sitting there with their butts burning, because they raised the rates by 150 percent and they had to do it because of 1969 promises, as I said. And they didn't have to go up if it hadn't been for their spending, their wild spending on different Hydro projects instead of good planning. And, Mr. Speaker, they are just so mad, and what do we hear? We couldn't do it unless they built it. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, there would have been no necessity to even have to look at this. Hydro rates didn't have to go up in this province except for the bungling of Hydro by that government.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the Honourable Member for Inkster talking from his seat, which is something he very seldom does. The Honourable Member for Inkster these days is defending himself. I see him go into Committee and he defends himself; he changes accounting systems to defend himself. He is like a lawyer. He has hired himself as his own lawyer to go in and twist things around. He said, you know, here I am sitting in this Committee and I'm defending myself so I've got to make them believe that where it says that there is not a profit, that there is a profit. That's some of the twisting that he does. And he says, oh, it's the accounting practice, and I guess you could call it that, but it hasn't been used as a good practice with the Corporations for a long time. So he basically defends himself.

The Member for Inkster has also done something else that I'm very disappointed in. In this House, he's a very respected person, but because he hasn't been able to make his arguments heard, he has been dropping down to a type of debate that doesn't become him — "Fred Stupidly" — that's to get attention. —(Interjection)— "Ted Stupidly" — that's to get attention. And in committee, "You rotten Conservatives, you're rotten." —(Interjection)— Yeah, in the House, fine. Then he said — oh, he's called us names like you wouldn't believe in committees, and only because his broken-down arguments that he has been giving for years are not getting any attention any more and he is grasping for straws.

He talks about Morden Fine Foods, about how these things happen to be turned around. He mentioned it in committee, what about the profit, the giveaway? Do you know how they were going to make a profit on Morden Fine Foods? There was an inventory there, and you know, Mr. Speaker, on every bit of food product today there is a date stamp — those members don't realize some of those things — do you know how they were going to move that inventory? Well, we have the memo, Mr. Speaker. We have the memo from the then Minister of Public Works, that said all government institutions will buy from Morden Fine Foods, even if it is outdated. That was the way they were going to get rid of the inventory.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, there is no memo saying that you will buy Morden Fine Foods even if it is undated. There is no such memo, that is a criminal charge that the honourable member is making, and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues said, even if it is outdated, and I repeated it, I don't know that it's a criminal charge.

MR. GREEN: Was that in the memo?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, no, it was not in the memo. And don't be such a little boy. —(Interjection)— Oh, here we go.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has accused a Minister of the Crown . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has accused a Minister of the Crown of

having sent a memo directing government agencies to buy food with an outdated stamp on it for public institutions. He says, Mr. Speaker, that it was not in the memo, I ask him to withdraw it and it's as simple as that. And if he wasn't a little boy he would withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has raised a point of privilege. I will check the tapes of Hansard to make sure the words are as used. The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think if you check the tapes, you'll find that I said, "even if it was outdated." I didn't say it was, I didn't say he said it had to be. So the honourable member again, playing his new game, to attract attention. —(Interjection)— Just a game to attract attention.

Mr. Speaker, we mentioned the basis, the Member for Brandon East keeps continually reading from a report that seems to be his favourite report, and I have regard for the Conference Board of Canada, but he always reads one line. He did it when he was in my Estimates, and just to make the matter clear, I'll read the whole thing.

"Although real domestic product in Manitoba is forecast to expand by only 1.6 percent this year, significant output declines are restricted to two industries. Provincially, as nationwide, a drop in farm production is anticipated, particularly in the livestock sector. The construction industry is forecast to experience weakness on both residential and non-residential fronts, and this sector alone costs Manitoba nearly one percentage point in overall growth. Mining, manufacturing and utilities, on the other hand, are all expected to turn in excellent years, while the service industries are seen as repeating their modest 1978 growth performance."

"Employment has grown very rapidly in Manitoba since mid-1978, but is forecast to level off for the remainder of this year. Nevertheless, the 5.3 percent unemployment rate expected in 1979 represents a significant improvement from last year's 6.5 percent."

Mr. Speaker, and if you take the reports of the Bureau of Statistics, as a matter of fact, you find that agriculture, the current month was 42, previous month 39, a change of 7.7. Same last year, it was 39, but the change we had is 7.7. Other primary industries, they're up by 14.3 change. Manufacturing is up by 10.3, construction is down. We know the housing construction is in bad shape and there is no sense building office buildings like the honourable members over there were going to do when there are office buildings empty all over this city.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation has remained even. Trade is up 5.1. Finance and real estate, because of the housing market, is down by 13 percent. Service industries are up 5.8. There is one that's down, public administration is down minus 10.3.

Mr. Speaker, the other little thing that the Member for Brandon East likes to talk about is the .07 increase that the Conference Board discussed as being the increase in 1979 in Manitoba. Let me tell the honourable members that in 1978 we had an actual first intention of 3.6 increase, the actual investment was 8.5. in 1978. If we did stay at .07, the actual increase in the private investment will be an increase of 3.7, but again, again, your public investment will be down. But the private investor is the investor that's investing in the province of Manitoba, and it's happening all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economic Development, during 1978, has worked with companies that were intending to expand or come to Manitoba to create 1,235 jobs. They're here, Mr. Speaker. January to March 1979, so far this year we have worked with companies that are expanding or coming to Manitoba for 216 jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have worked with several companies, you can see the press releases, he can see, any time he wants, many times in the paper that they're announced all the time. Mr. Speaker, for the honourable member to keep yelling "who?" like an owl, we have lists of companies that are available, I had them there at my Estimates, —(Interjection)— Well Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can't stand, again, he's sitting there with his butt burning because he knows it's happening and he doesn't want it to happen. I've never known a member in this House that does not want to see the economy grow in this province more than that member.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: For whom?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, for whom? For people to have jobs. or people to have jobs, Mr. Speaker. That's what we talk about. Those gentlemen on the opposite side talk about working for the poor; and Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to realize that the poor really want to work for themselves if given the opportunity to do so, and that is the plans that we work to — Economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the word "fire." I said public investment is down. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen

on the other side are going to have to make a decision, a decision on a budget that doesn't have a tax increase in it. As I said, I can remember speaking on budgets when I was on the other side of the House, and having them yell across, "Are you going to vote for it?" But I accepted it, because in those budgets there was always some sort of a trick of or an increase somewhere with the decreases.

Here's a Budget that hasn't got a tax increase. Here's a Budget that has not got a tax increase. You'll have to prove it to me because you can't, there are no tax increases in this Budget. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the global funding to the city of Winnipeg was as great or greater than it ever has been, and the members can talk about that as they like. They can talk about that as they like. This Budget does not show a tax increase. —(Interjection)— Does it show it in this Budget?

A MEMBER: Sure it does.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, it doesn't. This Budget has shown decreases in taxes, it is showing, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the province of Manitoba that turns on a light will benefit because their rates are frozen, and they wouldn't —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the member has come in halfway through. I'll tell you, as I told the others, your previous leader stood and said the increase would go up 15 percent per year for the next three years. So, we turned around and we did it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, they've been had. And they're burning about it.

Mr. Speaker, let them tell us if they don't want to see the Hydro rates held for five years. You can vote against it. You can vote against the fact that an energy-consuming industry with problems, with hydro rates that are going to be going up, with the problems that they're having in the States, as I mentioned, and I'm repeating myself, you can have all of those problems that are going on down there, and here we are in Manitoba, saying to high-energy users that your rates will be stable or won't go up for five years.

MR. PETER FOX: And you'll pay for it in taxes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there's no tax increase. I don't recognize any tax increase that the member announced, the Minister of Finance announced. I don't remember him saying there would be a tax increase when he gave this Budget. He gave a Budget that's been debated in the House so the members have the opportunity; they have the opportunity, and we'll be very pleased to see what they will do, or how they will vote on a Budget that has no tricks in it like they used to have in theirs. It's just as simple as that. The Honourable Member for Inkster again trying to attract attention. He doesn't seem to be able to get it anymore.

So Mr. Speaker, we have shown the people of Manitoba that we can do it, we started out last year, we've carried on this year, and we intend to carry on even more. And with all their twisting about Medicare, with all their twisting about Hydro, the people of Manitoba know and realize that this government is doing things to benefit them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance is not here, I regret so, because I wanted to commend him for his presentation when he introduced this Budget. I know from experience it is difficult to prepare a Budget, to spend days and weeks on it, with staff, to put it into shape; and whether I approve of the Budget or not, I have to acknowledge that it's a lot of work and it takes an awful lot of effort, and I'm sure he addressed himself to it in all good conscience, and very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a number of speeches, perhaps the one that made its greatest impact on me was the speech by the First Minister, and I will deal with that in a moment. But I've just listened to the Minister for Economic Development, and he hurls the challenge across, "Will you support this great Budget?" Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister knows that the motion before this House today is a very simple one. The motion says, "that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government." That's what the motion is. That's what we have to vote on. The budgetary policy of the government. And I want to tell the Minister now, I have no qualms at all about voting down a resolution which says that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government. It's the total budgetary policy we're talking about, and I have no hesitation, no qualms and no doubts in my mind that in voting against it I'll be doing the right thing. Perhaps the Minister doesn't agree.

So when he hurls that challenge across about the Hydro rates and about the freeze, etc., etc.,

I say to him, look at the motion, what you're asking us to vote for, and then wonder how we're going to vote. I think the Minister is naive, because the fact of the matter is that in voting against the budgetary policies we, on this side, will be very, very consistent; far more, as a matter of fact, than the members opposite.

The First Minister's speech, however, is the one, as I say, that intrigued me most. Because what I witnessed was a speech by an arrogant, self-indulgent individual, who espouses the theory that only greed will get you anywhere, who espouses the theory that only people scrabbling against one another can and should rule, who espouses a theory that if someone disagrees with him that man is his mortal enemy. There can be no middle ground with our First Minister. There can be no shadows or shadings; no grade, no concept that there are, perhaps, certain virtues, certain positive ideas, certain values espoused by somebody else. Not so with our First Minister. With the First Minister of Manitoba you are either with him entirely 100 percent, or you are his mortal enemy. And that includes not just people who are in the political arena but the people who also may support another idea, because if they support his mortal enemies, they, too, will become his mortal enemies. That's the message that I got from that speech that was delivered on Friday. And I assume that it was delivered on Friday because it was a desperate attempt to try to influence the voters or because now, I gather, the First Minister is off to Europe. I suppose he has business to attend there which is more important than the business of Manitoba, but that's his decision and I don't quarrel with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have heard from him — and he sets the tone. You know, I have been in this House for a number of years and I have been through sessions where tempers flared and where there has been some animosity and tempers, as I say, people have been irritable, but I have never sat in the House where there is such viciousness as I feel pervades these seats under the dome — and I attribute it entirely to the tenor which was introduced by the First Minister. Because, as I say, he starts from the premise of hate and carries it through. And his backbench and his colleagues, I think, pick it up from him. And the so-called "taunts" they throw across the way, the level which he sinks to, they are rapidly sinking to.

And I find it strange that the Minister who just spoke and other members who spoke earlier were very incensed at some of the speeches made on this side and feel that somehow the NDP has twisted and misled; that the speeches on this side have been personal attacks. Mr. Speaker, we are amateurs compared to the First Minister. When it comes to being vicious and personal, he is a master.

You know, he sits there very often in the speeches and he mumbles from his seat, which I very often hear, about how the people on this side, the NDP, the Socialists, they are always looking at the world through a sewer pipe. Mr. Speaker, he should know about sewers; he spends most of his time there. I have never heard in all my years in public life — and I have spent 25 years in it in various levels — the kind of vicious, arrogant, ugly, mean, petty, small, very small — and I'm talking about not physical — small-thinking and the personal vindictiveness that one hears from that First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, he has poisoned the atmosphere in this House, which at one time could very often put aside just straight partisan positions and deal with each other and speak to one another as individuals. In the last 18 months that has disappeared from this House, and I don't see it returning with the kind of person that's leading the Province of Manitoba today.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Manitoba are now realizing what I've just said, that this is so. I think the people of Manitoba, without really knowing what it is, feel ill at ease, feel embarrassed that their Premier, my Premier, has shown himself to be the kind of petty individual and vicious individual that he is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I may be attacked — I don't doubt I will — for making my remarks somewhat personal, and I have refrained up to now but, frankly, as far as I'm concerned, the gloves are off and so long as that First Minister can sit in his seat and mumble and throw barbs across — what he considers barbs across the way — of a very personal nature, well then, frankly, as far as I'm concerned, the gloves are off. And I want Manitobans to know the kind of individual they have serving them. Because on the face of it he often sounds very noble when he talks about the fact that the people have entrusted him with their affairs and the fact that holding public office requires a person to give of himself, and it's a privilege, etc., but when it comes down to having to deal with an Opposition or to cope with views other than what he holds, positions other than what he holds, he lowers himself and, in doing it, lowers, I think, politics generally to a gutter level which I have not heard in this House by any member at any time before this.

Mr. Speaker, I will have no trouble voting against this Budget simply because — or voting on this motion, the motion to approve the budgetary policy of the government — because, frankly, the budgetary policy of this government is simply a continuation of acute and protracted restraint. They stand up proudly and say, "We have spent less than any other province. Last year 2.9; this year

5.6, between the two years 8-½ to 9 percent." The lowest spenders in the country, and they're proud of it. They are obsessed, really obsessed, with their contention that only the private corporate sector can move an economy. They are totally obsessed with it. The Member for Pembina said it; the Minister for Economic Development said it; and the First Minister certainly said it, as well as the Minister of Finance. They really believe that only the private sector can create a healthy economy.

The First Minister, of course, scoffed at the people on this side. He inferred that somehow in certain countries, perhaps, the philosophy of the New Democratic Party of Social Democrats might be acceptable, but not in this country. Is he forgetting that throughout Europe the kind of economic policies that we espouse are being followed today in West Germany, in Sweden? Does he realize that he is talking nonsense, or maybe he is just trying to scare people. But obviously people aren't going to be scared enough. —(Interjection)— They were not scared yesterday and I think they gave a message, a clear message, but you know, Mr. Speaker, I hope he doesn't learn from the message. I want him to go on his merry way because if anything will defeat that Conservative government it is their leader with his backbenchers applauding every time he opens his mouth.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hear, as I say, their attacks on the New Democratic Party, that the New Democratic Party would spend money; that only the private sector can achieve economic security, economic base, economic growth; that public spending is sinful, that public spending is tainted and that public spending is stealing from the public. What utter nonsense. Where are they? Do they realize the kind of public spending that is taking place in countries like Japan and Sweden and Switzerland and Finland and Norway and Denmark and Holland? —(Interjection)— Yes, and in Israel. And he shakes his head, that's terrible.

Mr. Speaker, they are so committed, so absolutely wedded to an archaic concept. And I think the First Minister inadvertently indicated that. He was telling a story. He talked about the pictures, the movies about the Indians who used to sort of get around in a circle and then to erase their tracks. You know, he still thinks he is living in the wild west. He still thinks that this, in this 1979, that we are living in an economy where it's virgin land and people moved in, and the strongest survived and they did well at the expense of everybody else, that it was a race and a battle. That's how he views life; it's a battle. The idea of a co-operative society, he finds that obviously not only distasteful he finds it's something that he cannot accept, that he cannot live with.

I don't know where he is going to move to, because the places that he can run to are few and far between in this last year of the 1970s, and it's going to get tougher for him in the '80s, the suggestion that government spending must never exceed, must not exceed the gross provincial product because government spending, far as they're concerned, is the reason for inflation. You know, Mr. Speaker, we've had two budgets. They've indicated government spending is down. I believe they claimed that it's — the Member for St. James said that the government spending as a percentage of the gross provincial product has dropped by a full 1 percent, and he says that's terrific, that will help inflation.

Mr. Speaker, are they not talking to people? Do they not know that people today have been and continue to be faced by an inflation that is so horrendous that it's putting the squeeze on them, that the fact that the government has dropped its spending by 1 percent under gross provincial product —(Interjection)— well by 1 percent of the gross provincial product, does not translate to the people who are just trying to make ends meet, whether it's in buying a home and maintaining it or renting, whatever. You can't translate the two. You're not living in isolation by yourself. You're part of a national, international economy, and what Manitoba does insofar as spending in gross provincial product will have absolutely no effect on inflation because the cost is still there.

By coincidence, I got my property tax bill yesterday, and I looked over that same two year period — so my taxes went up \$100, no, \$99.50, I should be more exact. So did the inflation drop because the gross provincial product dropped and it dropped because the Property Tax Credit has been frozen? No! He just pushed it onto the taxpayer, that's all. The overall totality of cost hasn't dropped, it's the method of paying for it that has dropped. Let the individual carry the burden. That's the message you're giving. To suggest that by lowering the spending of the province, in other words, by lowering the spending by the pooling of all the resources of all the citizens; if you're suggesting that government spending which means the public spending, if taking all the tax moneys raised in an equitable way to reflect ability to pay, thereby reducing that, you're going to reduce the individual's costs — nonsense. You're not going to reduce anybody's costs except the provincial government and their books and their Minister of Finance, and their First Minister, who will say see, we are spending less.

But the expenditures are still being made. They're being made by the transit rider, they're being made by the property taxpayer, they're being made by the fact that they're deductible, and Pharmacare is now \$75 instead of \$50, they're being made by the increases in the personal care home rates, they're being made by parents who send their children to community college, to

These costs are all being paid. Inflation is still increasing those costs. The only difference is how are they going to be paid and they say if you, the individual, pay, if you, the schoolboard pay, you the city or the municipality pay, if you the hospital board — if you can raise funds from outside by some bequest, if you get it that way that's fine. But as long as the government doesn't pay, then we are heroes. That's what they're saying. Their arithmetic has always astounded me, and I just don't understand how they can keep spouting that kind of nonsense.

You know, the Minister of Economic Development said there were no tax increases in this Budget. I won't argue with him. There were no increases, not visible anyway, but there were some very nice decreases in taxation in Manitoba in the last 18 months. Right off the bat there was a tax decrease in personal income tax, not based on ability to pay. No way! The higher your income the more you benefit. If your income was \$10,000 a year, you benefited to the tune of \$13 a year. If your income was \$50,000, you benefited to the tune of \$267. And of course there was a corporate tax reduction. And in last Tuesday's Budget there was another reduction. It was not highlighted. It was very quiet. It was the income tax surcharge which, when it was introduced it was slated to end this year, 1979, and it was just announced that the income tax surtax will indeed be phased out. But you know that income tax surcharge — there's a tax reduction my friends. If your income is \$25,000 there is no benefit. You only benefit \$1.00, but if your income is \$50,000 you benefit \$792 — Yes., Yes! Poof! So in that, you know, those few short months this government has been in office — 2 percent personal income tax cut for that person, \$267, plus another \$792, we're looking at \$1,100 in income taxes, right off the bat for the wealthy. I won't say the rich. I don't like the business of the rich or the poor — for the wealthy — for those who have the ability to cope with inflation — for those who have the elbow room — for those who have options. They benefit the most.

Now of course members opposite will say what's he complaining about? After all these are the important people in society. You know, these are the ones that are the executives. These are the corporate directors that we woo and that we're looking for, that we're seeking so desperately, as the Minister of Economic Development just indicated a few minutes ago. You know, he reported, as I gather, that the — or he read some letters saying that the business outlook in Manitoba looks so good. You know, Mr. Speaker, if there has been an improvement in Manitoba's economy, it has occurred not just in Manitoba, it's occurred nationwide, and it occurred for various obvious reasons. One, the exchange rate which on the one hand, they're always . . . The Minister of Finance made cracks about the terrible mess of the economy because the Canadian dollar is low compared to other currencies. At the same time he had to admit that it was because of the lower Canadian rates, the lower value of the Canadian dollar, that in fact exports have risen and risen drastically in Canada. So the fact that there was some spillover in Manitoba too, shouldn't surprise him, and so it's true, exports have risen. Because anyone who is now producing a product into an international market, offshore market, has a 15 percent edge, which surely is a tall competitor and should put him in the market place, should make him competitive.

The other factor is also a very simple one. When the Federal government, in order to shore up certain industries, imposed definite quotas on what could be imported from Asian countries, and as a result certain parts of the garment trade did in fact benefit. There is no question they benefited. That plus the exchange rate made the difference. But for them to take credit for it is just a bunch of nonsense, however, if they want to take credit they can.

In the final analysis I'm not going to say, and I never have said — that in fact there has been an improvement in economic business conditions in Manitoba, yes, but not for the reasons they maintain. They would have us believe it's because they are somehow putting out the welcome wagon or what they call good government. Of course I indicated their idea of good government is a government that does as little as possible. They've said so. The less government is better government — that's what they espouse, that's what they believe in. Hear, hear, all around. That's right.

You know, they are so wed into this blind philosophy that I'm astounded. You know, the Minister of Mines, in dealing with the idea that somehow the government should own shares of a mining company, that there could be or should be joint ownership between the private sector and the public sector, he finds that abhorrent, and he got up I believe, in this House, and he said, this is the difference between us. And I find it absolutely strange. Why should it be so abhorrent to those gentlemen, to those people — because there's one lady amongst them? That it is, not only that it's good and proper that the Prudential Insurance should own some of INCO, but that the Government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba should not own part of INCO. I don't understand it. Why is it that a consortium is put together of five or six major multi-national companies, and a consortium is formed and they invest in something — that's okay. But if a part of that consortium happens to be a government, as in Pan Arctic, that is a no-no. And that I just don't understand. You know, the . . .

MR. DOERN: Tory dogma.

MR. MILLER: It is a Tory dogma. You know, what's wrong with not only the state getting revenues through taxation? What's wrong with people, the people who own that resource, why shouldn't they as well get the profit that as shareholders they would get, as well as the taxes? Why limit yourself to the one area? What is it? What is your hangup? And why the hangup? I guess the only reason is because in their eyes it's Socialism.

My friends, it's not Socialism, it's damned good business. And any good businessman will tell you that if you can get in on the ground floor of something, that if you own it, you don't divulge yourself of your interest in it and say, well, you take it over and maybe some of it will rub off on me. No business operates that way. And all we have, and all the public has is the natural resources, and human resources — that's all that they have. Now, either they're harnessed through their government, their elected government that represents them and acts on their behalf, or we have to simply wait for the goodwill of somebody to come in here on their terms to do something in Manitoba. And it'll always be on their terms, always. Because if you put yourself at their mercy they will take full advantage of you, as they should, because their concern, their responsibility, is to their shareholder, and not to you, the government, nor the general public. They are there representing the investor who says, "I'm putting my money in there with you, you give me a return, or out you go." And that's who they owe it to. And that's who they'll always represent, always. And I don't blame them. That's what they have to do. They're working for them.

Mr. Speaker, the . . .

A MEMBER: . . . a one-track mind.

MR. MILLER: It's a one-track mind and it's in a rut, and I tell you for a group that came into office claiming that they represented and could think in a businesslike way, I'm shocked, because as investor businessmen, they're not.

And the idea that only the private sector can provide meaningful permanent job creation — that's nonsense. The public sector has moved in more and more into areas that traditionally were private sector. In the field of health it's pretty well 100 percent public sector. And are you going to tell me that if someone is working in the field of health or in social services, that they're parasites because they're living on your tax dollar? And if, on the other hand, they were working in a privately-owned hospital, and were paid by the owner of the hospital as still occurs in the States, that that's okay, because then that nurse's salary that is being paid by the consortium of doctors, or in the States it's not even doctors. It's investors who will actually own a hospital, and hire doctors and pay the shot, and they make money on it. So the nurse under those circumstances, well, she's okay, she's fulfilling a very positive function in society, and she's being paid through the private sector, not through tax money. Whereas the nurse working in a publicly-owned hospital, that is a parasite? And that's the kind of nonsense you hear from this side. That's the kind of nonsense you hear from the Minister of Highways all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James, made what I felt is a revealing remark. He referred to Proposition 13 and he said, as his First Minister did that, "We on this side have lost touch with people and what people are thinking and we don't realize that there's been a change in attitude, and a change in the mood." And I'll grant him there's change — there's no question. No, even with last night I'll grant him that change. I will grant you that throughout Canada, North America and perhaps even Europe, there is a tendency, a mood of concern, of disquietude which translates itself very often and today it does, into a feeling of, I have something, I'm afraid to give it up — a great deal of selfishness comes into it — a concern for the next fellow is being put aside for the moment. Proposition 13, as the Member for St. James referred to it, was certainly something that came up, and is certainly a reflection of the mood that prevails.

But you see, Mr. Speaker, those people there will jump on a mood and they'll ride with it. If it gains them political power, that's all they really care about. Whether Proposition 13 is right morally, whether it's right for the society as a whole, whether it's right in the long run, they don't care. As long as they can ride on that bandwagon and get elected they will do it.

Mr. Speaker, Proposition 13, as I say, is with us today. In one form or another you see it right across the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, I predict that just as it came, so it will go. It will move because there's no way that people are going to be prepared to go back to the kind of thinking, the kind of selfish thinking of a society which says, "I'm all right Jack, nuts to the next person. If I've got it made, that's all I care about." There are people in our society that'll do that, but by and large the bulk will not do it. Today they're frightened. Today there's such unease about the economy and about their own position in it, their own security, that they're drawing back. But in the long run I have absolute confidence that that will pass, it'll be a phase; we'll look back on

it very much as they look back on McCarthyism in the States today.

With regard to the mining activities in Manitoba, and the claim by the minister or others who spoke about the great activities that are taking place and of course the extra \$10 million in revenue, which they received towards the end of the year, I think generally I'll leave most of my comments to the bill itself, except to say to the minister that mining activity will take place in Manitoba when the price . . .

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

MR. MILLER: Thank you. When the price of the mineral is high enough. If the international price is down, if the commodity price is down, all the tax concessions you give will not mean a darn thing, unless the tax concessions are so great, the subsidies are so great, that they can mine and sell at the low market price, the low international price and still make a dollar. Because in the final analysis that's all they're interested in, is making money. And as I say, I'm not blaming them for that. But mining will occur in Manitoba, not because this government likes them or doesn't like them — mining occurs because there's something in the ground to mine. And so long as there is a mineral there, people will come to mine it if the international price is high enough.

When nickel and copper prices fell, mining activity dropped everywhere — not just in Manitoba, everywhere — worldwide, and prices dropped. Now they're on the rise and I think nickel now, no, copper rather I think is about what, \$4.95 or \$5.00, which is about a 70 percent increase over a couple of years ago. And when it hits that price they will mine. They'll produce. They'll produce whether you have a flat 18 percent mining tax or a two-tier tax of 15 and a windfall tax of 35, because that's what you're talking about. The first stage is 15, the windfall one was 35. So, Mr. Speaker, what they're talking about is the windfall one, which they haven't hit in the last while because the sales were down, the prices were down. So what you're going to do is protect them so when the windfall comes along, the bonanza day comes along, you'll make sure they get it. That's all you're doing with your mining tax. You're not going to help or hinder for that matter, the mining exploration or mining development in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister made a statement the other day, which I do want to comment on. He said, "Why doesn't the NDP admit that they want to expropriate the means of production?" Mr. Speaker, it's an example of the kind of a hyperbole the man uses, it's the kind of comment that . . . it's a McCarthy kind of thing, but apart from that, that man really isn't with it any more.

We haven't been talking that for years. Times have changed. Conditions have changed. It's no longer necessary. What we did say, and say now, and what the Minister of Mines should be doing — he should be making sure that the mineral exploration of Manitoba is active and alive and working, so they can be owners, part owners with the private sector, work with the private sector, use the expertise of the private sector. I don't say throw them out; there is no need to. Use their expertise, by all means, but be a shareholder, as you are now. In the resource, itself, continue to be a shareholder as it is developed, developed for the benefit of all people of Manitoba. In other words, not only benefit through taxation, small taxation, benefit in the profits that accrue. And profits there will be, because these companies do not go into business to lose money; they go in because the mineral is there and because they know they can mine it, and because they know that, perhaps not this year or next year, but when that market moves the other way they can make money. And that's what they have done for decades and decades, and it's high time that people opposite realize that the idea that somehow we're going to attract multinationals, somehow these nameless faces, people sitting in Board of Directors rooms across the nation or in New York, that somehow they will make decisions which are in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, and that whereas government, as shareholders who are elected by the people of Manitoba, that they wouldn't make even better judgments on behalf of the people of Manitoba is absolute nonsense.

I am not critical of the nameless face as director of the corporation. He is there to invest his investor's money at a profit to the investor. He does not care whether the money he then makes is taken from Manitoba and put into Newfoundland or to Guatemala or wherever it's put in, because dollars don't need any passports. They are free to move wherever.

The other day there was a story in the Los Angeles Times. They said, "The Canadians are coming; the Canadians are coming", and it referred to the fact that Canadians are one of the heavy investors in California real estate. And do you know where the money came from? The money came from here, from the windfall profits which you won't tax, and they are taking the money and are going to Los Angeles where they are investing and will make more money. And they will come back here when it pays them, and no concessions on your part, or subsidies, will make them come here.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to acknowledge, at the outset, the tremendous task that was accomplished yesterday by Mr. Clark, the Prime Minister Elect, and the Progressive Conservative government and party.

It has been a difficult struggle over the years, Mr. Speaker, to bring this change about and now that that major victory has been accomplished the next task now facing the Prime Minister Elect, Clark, and his government, is going to be to demonstrate how the positive progressive policies of the Conservative philosophy can be put to work to return this country to the economic stature which it is capable of attaining but which, under the management of the previous government and under the period of time when they were in full co-operation with the NDP Party from 1972-74, that record will be turned around I am positive, and we will see, Mr. Speaker, we will have an opportunity to see how the positive nature of Conservatism can be put to work.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks interprets the swing across the country and in Great Britain, interprets that swing to Conservatism as some type of fear that something is going to be taken away, some sort of greed that people don't want to give up what they have for someone who needs it more.

Mr. Speaker, that is an interpretation of the circumstances which I certainly reject and I'm sure which the majority of the people that have elected Conservative governments rejects. But I think we should look at some of the features of the election that took place yesterday, because I get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable members opposite are celebrating some type of victory. And as my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, said, it can only be the election of the Conservative government. Because if we look at the significant features of that election and we see that the Progressive Conservatives in 1974 had elected, I believe, 95 members, Mr. Speaker, and they now, yesterday I believe the figure was 136 members, an increase of 41. That, clearly, is the significant factor.

I think another significant factor, Mr. Speaker, is the collapse of the Liberal strength outside of the Province of Quebec. That is a particularly, not a frightening prospect but a prospect that we, in Canada, are now faced with, that so much of the Liberal strength is concentrated in Quebec; the NDP has no strength in Quebec at all and the Conservatives have very little. The Liberals have very little strength in the west; the NDP and the Conservatives do. So we do have a situation that is going to require a very positive approach by the new incoming Conservative government.

One of the other significant features of the election, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, was the total failure of the CLC-NDP perfect union. Now, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that probably turned out more like the odd couple than the perfect union, because in Ontario, where one would certainly expect that the strength of the perfect union, the strength of the CLC behind the NDP Party would have been felt. But, Mr. Speaker, what happened in Ontario? I believe the NDP had 8 seats in Ontario in 1974 and I believe I am correct in saying that they elected 6 members in Ontario yesterday.

Another significant feature of that election was the failure of the NDP to return to their 1972 level of seats. Again, as I recall, in 1972, they elected 31 or 32 members — 31 members. Well, yesterday in this great event that's being celebrated by the honourable members opposite, they failed to return to that 1972 level. They also, Mr. Speaker, managed to increase that popular vote from, I believe, some 15-something to 18, but still in that range which classifies them as a splinter party, which they have been unable to break out of over the decades. Their numbers go up and down, Mr. Speaker. They had 25 or 26 members back in 1945, I think, but 26 members now is just one of those aberrations that takes place with the NDP Party. I fully expect that come the next election we will see the same kind of thing take place that took place in the 1974 election.

Now, the members opposite seem to attach a considerable significance to what has taken place in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to acknowledge that the forthright, honest efforts that this government has made to bring fiscal responsibility back to Manitoba has in fact been successfully misinterpreted by the NDP. It was a triumph, Mr. Speaker, a triumph of organization of the NDP in managing to misrepresent the position.

Things like Medicare, for instance. The usual tactic, the Honourable Member for Roblin advises, was simply just imported from Britain, from the election there. It was used, by the way, in the New Brunswick election; it was used in the Nova Scotia election; in Britain and now it was used in this election, as well. Well, it will take some time, Mr. Speaker, for the public to realize that the doom and gloom predictions of the honourable members opposite are not, in fact, going to take place but in fact the situation in this province is going to improve. And that is going to become evident and, at that point, the tactics that the honourable members — not these honourable members; I wouldn't want to say that they were doing it — the federal arm of the honourable members opposite were using will, in fact, be unsuccessful.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Minister of Finance on the Budget which he introduced into this House a week ago yesterday, because that, Mr. Speaker, was a Budget that was set in philosophical terms, that outlines the approach of the Conservative government, that gives a perspective to what this government is attempting to do. The Budget did not present simply a few disconnected actions, but rather it set those actions within the perspective of a Conservative philosophy, and I'm sure that that Budget, Mr. Speaker, that document, is going to have a positive positive impact on the future of this province for years to come. I congratulate the Minister of Finance as well, on some

of the individual items in that Budget. The tax reductions, Mr. Speaker, while small, I certainly — and I'm sure the people of the province — much prefer to see small tax reductions than small tax increases, and those reductions, coupled with the reductions which we were able to introduce last year, continue to move us in the direction in which we want to go; continue to fulfill the promises that the party made in the general election in 1977.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely significant to note that the percentage of the gross provincial product that is now taken up by government expenditure has been reduced. We had seen, since 1969, a steady increase in the proportion of the gross provincial product that was taken up by government spending, with the exception of one year, which I will acknowledge, when I believe it dropped from 16.3 to 16.2 percent, which was an election year and I would judge that the honourable members in government at that time felt that perhaps that was a prudent thing to do in light of the election.

But the general trend has very definitely been upwards, and the Minister of Finance is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has been able to reduce that percentage.

But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most significant item about that Budget is the move to stabilize the Hydro rates. Because in view of the 150 percent increase that has taken place over the past five years as a direct result of the management of Hydro by the previous government, we have seen that kind of increase, 150 percent take place in five years, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think I need to tell you what kind of an impact that that has had throughout the province, and what kind of concern there was for that issue during the election, and the concern that has continued to exist right up to now on the statements that have been made by Hydro members and indeed by the former Premier, as to the kinds of increases that could be expected to take place with Hydro rates, and the impact that that had in terms of potential investments that people might make. This move, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance has made to stabilize the rates, is certainly being extremely well received by any group of people that I have had the opportunity to talk to, whether it's business people, whether it's farmers, whether it's householders, or people with some responsibility for running their community rink, those people are all extremely pleased to see some sort of stability introduced into the rate structure.

They recognize full well, Mr. Speaker, that it's 150 percent higher than it was five years ago, and I believe the honourable members opposite have argued that it's only through their management and foresight that we were able to bring about this stabilization of rates. Well, it's a set of circumstances, Mr. Speaker, which has enabled this to take place. Unfortunately, the rate is 150 percent higher than it was five years ago, and even though it's stabilized, the people are not going to forget that that sort of increase has taken place. And it is perhaps only because of the concurrent, but essentially unrelated increases that have taken place in the costs of other forms of energy, that have made that 150 percent increase as respectable as it is today.

Can you imagine the situation that we would have been in, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of increase — and I'll acknowledge it may not have been that high, because towards the tail end of the construction I would guess some of the effects of inflation were already being felt on the construction materials. But basically, without the OPEC increase, without the large increase in the price of oil, we would have now been faced with a Hydro rate that was completely out of line with alternative forms of energy. And what sort of situation would we have been in then in attempting to attract investment into this province, and indeed to keep people here, who wish to continue to live in this province, and to invest their dollars? Mr. Speaker, that certainly is a major step forward and it will certainly be recognized as such by the people of this province.

The opposition members, Mr. Speaker, have criticized the Budget as not having any job-creation aspects involved in this Budget, and that really seems to me to fairly clearly outline the understanding or the lack of understanding that the honourable members opposite have with respect to what in fact results in the creation of jobs, what in fact results in the creation of wealth. They seem to think that a Budget that does not have so many million dollars directed to some sort of make-work program, whether it's manufacturing log cabins that are worth \$70,000, or whatever it is, without that, they see it as being a Budget that doesn't have anything to do with the creation of jobs. Mr. Speaker, that Budget has everything to do with the creation of jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the honourable member will have 23 minutes when this next comes up for debate. The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)