

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 25 March, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

## TABLING OF REPORT

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** I am pleased to table the report of the Chief Electoral Officer on the Fort Garry by-election.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I want to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Commission for 1984. I believe copies will be available but they're not printed copies. Printed copies will be coming later.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. A. ANSTETT** introduced, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 16, The Heritage Resources Act; Loi sur le patrimoine.

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 17, The Transboundary Pollution Reciprocal Access Act; Loi sur les droits de recours réciproques contre la pollution transfrontalière.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; Loi modifiant le code de la route (2).

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 38 students from the Baldur 4-H Club, who are the 4-H Club winners. They are under the direction of Miss Nickel and this group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Executive Council- additional staffing

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier and it follows upon the revelation Friday of a further blatant misuse of taxpayers' dollars for partisan purposes by way of an addition of \$261,000 to the Estimates for the Executive Council Office for the Premier in the area of the management and administration.

My question to the Premier is, how many additional staff positions are covered by that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, first I think the honourable member should be informed that it is staff to the Executive Council and it is staff that relates to the area of health and social programming.

In fact, it parallels the excellent success that we've had in regard to staffing and support to the ERIC Committee of Cabinet; the ERIC Committee which has successfully provided a number of very successful programs. That is being paralleled, Mr. Speaker, by way of improvement in regard to the staffing and in regard to the social envelope committee in order to provide back-up support in regard to health, social programs, and the monitoring and co-ordinating of those programs to ensure that we have the similar type of success as we've had in the field of ERIC.

The precise number of staff, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to obtain that. I believe it's approximately five or six.

### Executive Council - Identity of additional staff

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, five or six at \$261,000 is incredible.

In view of the fact that a source for the government said that this was a very high-powered political group, can the Premier tell us who these people are?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, during my Estimate review, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition fully knows, the staff is made known to honourable members by way of distribution during the process of Estimates and that kind of detail can be provided at that opportunity.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the public is going to be facing four increases in personal care home fees this year and in view of the fact that this administration is asking people in the health care field to take a zero percent increase, can he not tell the people of Manitoba - and I quote from one of his political sources - who these "high-priced political aides" are?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, again, the honourable member has prepared his script and obviously can't deviate from the script in order to deal with the information that's being provided to him.

As indicated before, it is staff support to the social envelope committee of Cabinet which deals with

programs pertaining to health, education, and social programming; paralleling the kind of staff support that is provided to the ERIC Committee of Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, I make no apology to the honourable member or any member for the fact that it is crucially important to ensure that there is that kind of support that is provided to the development, the monitoring of programs.

Mr. Speaker, I know it's Oscar night, and I know that the honourable member is trying his best to win an Oscar award. Mr. Speaker, his acting is so very, very poor that I don't think he stands a chance tonight.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, all the public wants to know is who these people are so they can judge for themselves whether or not they are high-powered political aides or whether, in fact, they have something to offer to the people of Manitoba with respect to health care and social services. Is Terry Sargeant one of these people, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the honourable member that this information will be provided as it was in 1982, 1983 and 1984 during my Estimates, the list of names and positions held by staff within the Executive Council office.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member raises the matter of Terry Sargeant. Unfortunately, Terry Sargeant is not presently working for the Executive Council, but I think he makes a better contribution to this government than Pete Masniuk or Cecil Smith did to the previous administration of the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is the former political staff member from Ed Broadbent's staff, Joanne McNiven, one of the people who's included in this item?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, again, for the third time, I've indicated that the names and positions will be provided during the Estimates Review.

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

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Yes, I just want the First Minister to indicate that the Mr. Masniuk referred to is the same Mr. Masniuk that this government has employed for the last three years in the role of the Provincial Housing Corporation. Obviously, if he was of some help to us, then he was of some continuing help to this government - who now took retirement.

### **Day care centres - Subsidized and non-subsidized spaces**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. That is not a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. There is a story about a decision that presumably has been made by her administration in the area of day care. One of her senior staff is telling people that children from subsidized families, with respect to day care, are not allowed to play in the same area as children from non-subsidized families. Can she tell us why, Mr. Speaker?

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

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the number of day care spaces that can be supported by the public program is limited. The centre in question requested permission to have more day care spaces. We're told they were put on a waiting list, that we were not in a position at this time to subsidize them. They went ahead and opened the centre, and my official quite properly said that they had not come under any official coverage from us, and regrettably were not covered by the program. That is what underlies it, Mr. Speaker. We can't have the program expanding by virtue of people going ahead and pre-empting, as it were, the procedure that other centres must go through to get coverage.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, presumably the centre has made its decision and gone ahead and opened some non-subsidized spaces. Why is her department staff telling the centre that the children from the subsidized portion can't play with the children from the non-subsidized portion, when they're good friends and they've been playing together in the past?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think what was requested was that there be an integration of the books and the staffing and the space requirements, and that is what has produced the difficulty.

**MR. G. FILMON:** In view of the fact that the director of the centre was told to operate as though the children were five miles apart, not across the hall, what's the point in the government telling them that the children can't play together when it has nothing to do with, as she says, the fact that one is subsidized and one is not subsidized?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, what they were told was that the books and the equipment and the staffing requirements could not be integrated.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that it's okay as far as she is concerned that the children be integrated then and they don't have to be kept separate in the playground and in the play areas of the day care?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, if there is no transgression on the standards and the rules, I have no objection, but the rule does say that a day care cannot operate without a licence. In this case, they had applied not just for a licence to operate a private day care, but a day care that would include subsidized spaces. Since those, by the nature of the limited funding

and the limit each year on the expansion rate of the system, left no option, Mr. Speaker, but to give that message to the centre. They went ahead and opened the centre in defiance of those regulations, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is there any reason that the Minister has to believe that the children are not being properly dealt with in one section or the other, that they're not being adequately cared for? Is there any reason that she believes this?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, when the legislation was developed for the child day care, there were reasons for requiring a certain basic makeup of the centres. What we didn't want is precisely the development of a two-tier structure in day care. That's precisely why we had the requirements that they must be granted permission to have the spaces, that they must meet the minimum standards, and they must include subsidized parents as part of their client group.

Mr. Speaker, if they're recommending opposite, that we should rush in and develop the system ten times faster and allocate that much more money, I guess, as an individual, I would be happy for that to happen, but as they well know the realities of budget development are that all the needs must be balanced out, one against the other.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister just stop promoting her class warfare and look after the needs of the children and can she tell us if she has any reason to believe that the children are not being adequately cared for?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat, the reason that the requirement was that day care centres be opened to subsidized and non-subsidized children was precisely to avoid the development of a two-tier day care system, whereby the rich families could afford a much richer, more enhanced service than the ordinary kids could. The whole thrust of the program is to develop good quality day care for all the children of Manitoba.

### **Law Enforcement Review Agency Commissioner - Statements re oppressive police behaviour**

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

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

I have a question for the Attorney-General. In view of the statements by Mr. Schneider, the head of the province's Law Enforcement Review Agency, that most complaints of oppressive behaviour by police are likely legitimate, and in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I dare say if a judge made a statement about a case that he was about to hear in such a manner, he would not be allowed to hear such a case, does the Attorney-General intend to replace Mr. Schneider, in view of this obvious bias exhibited in this statement about actions of the police?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** First of all, I reject the implication or, indeed, allegation that the Commissioner under The

Law Enforcement Review Act has shown any bias; secondly — (Interjection) — yes, I've read his statement and it also indicates that a number of complaints reviewed by him have been found not to be worthy of follow-up, which indicates that he's following his function very clearly and carefully and is not, in fact, prejudging. He simply made a statement of what has been the result of certain investigation to this point. He's not judging in advance of the fact, he has indicated what has happened after the fact.

His jurisdiction, in any event, is a very limited jurisdiction. As to the question of whether or not the complaint is frivolous or vexatious, all he has said is that a certain number of those that have come forward have not been frivolous and vexatious. That's the only jurisdiction he has.

After that, in terms of whether or not it proceeds and goes to adjudication, he does not adjudicate. He has no adjudicative function on the substantive issue. What he has said, I repeat, is that in terms of those that he has looked at to this point, some have had merit, some have not - a statement of fact, not a statement judging in the future.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schneider said that if the allegations we're dealing with now have substance, then the police officers should be taken to task. I think most of these cases are legitimate.

I ask the Attorney-General to consider whether or not those statements exhibit a bias against the actions of police officers without having heard those statements, without having heard those cases, which he indicates have not yet been heard, and should a person with a bias like that be the head of the province's Law Enforcement Review Agency?

**HON. R. PENNER:** I'll deal with the same statement. I wish the Honourable Member for St. Norbert could read a little better. Mr. Schneider said, "I must say if the allegations that we're dealing with now have substance, then the rest follows."

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, that is a responsible statement. If they have substance, then they must go forward. He didn't say that they must go forward whether or not they have substance; he said they go forward if they have substance.

Then he went on to say that if they have substance - and he didn't say just any evidence - substance, if they have substance, then the police officers should be taken to task. And indeed if they have substance, I suppose that is right.

Now, I think most of these cases are legitimate. It means that some of them aren't. And that's exactly, indeed, as far as he has gone, having taken that office as of February 1st, has dealt with a number of cases. Some he has found to be legitimate - and the story, if read in full, indicates that - some he has not found to be legitimate.

I repeat, and I conclude my answer, that his function is limited to deciding whether or not a complaint is frivolous or vexatious or not within the jurisdiction of the Commission. If it isn't within the jurisdiction of the Commission, or if it is frivolous or vexatious, he simply dismisses it out of hand, but if it has more than that, then he attempts to mediate. He doesn't even send it

for judgment without attempting - and he is attempting very well and he has great skills in this area - to mediate. I think the one who jumped the gun on this, besides the Member for St. Norbert, is Mr. Wickdahl.

### Labour legislation - introduction of

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question or another question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the layoffs at Motor Coach Industries of 207 workers, and in view of the promises to the people of Manitoba signed by the present Premier that Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs - up to 12 months' notice or compensation to employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than 50 people - does the Minister of Labour intend to introduce legislation at this Session of the Legislature dealing with this area, and if he intends to introduce legislation in this area, will he assure the members of this Legislature that the legislation will have the support of both management and labour, the Labour Management Committee and perhaps the Economic Advisory Committee under the Minister for small business?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is trying to anticipate legislation, and I think that the question is improper. He knows that, in due course, if legislation is going to be introduced it will be announced in this House and members will all get notice of it.

The honourable member seems to get up, and included in his question, in his preamble, is a statement in connection with layoff. Mr. Speaker, I tend to detect, on that side of the House whenever there is a reduction in the workforce somewhere, a degree of enthusiasm, a relish to rise on that side of the House and indicate that false concern, but when we talk about economic initiatives from this side of the House, there's doom and gloom on that side.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Labour assure this House that any labour legislation he introduces at this Session of the Legislature will have the support of both labour and management?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure honourable members that whatever legislation is introduced in this House will be legislation which this government will be proud of and I trust we will have the support of members opposite.

### Morgentaler Clinic - government's position

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and would ask him, this weekend the Attorney-General indicated that while he has to uphold the law as it applies to the Morgentaler abortion clinic, he supports the pro-choice position and favours changes to the Criminal Code which would allow

free-standing abortion clinics. Does the First Minister support the position as stated by his Attorney-General?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect our government, just like honourable members across the way, are part and parcel of a caucus that represents differing points of view in respect to this particular issue. It's a pluralistic society, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's time that we tolerate the points of view of others on this particular issue. I think, in fact, there's too much emotion-charged atmosphere in respect to this issue at the present time.

I would like to see there be, Mr. Speaker, more commitment on the part of all those that feel intense about this issue, to leave it to the courts to make a determination, as to the law and, in fact, if there is disagreement in respect to that law, then it is up to those that want change in the law to deal with the Federal Government in respect to any changes in the federal law.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister, a very simple one. Does he support the position as taken by the Attorney-General that he is in favour of the pro-choice position or is he in favour of the pro-life position?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, this is a government, as is society, with many different points of view in respect to this particular issue.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, my position throughout has been one in some basic agreement with the existing law, but that is my personal view. There are other points of view that I respect.

### Highways Department - irregularities, Carman area

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of his press release on the weekend in relation to irregularities in the Highways Department, particularly in the Carman area, I wonder if the Minister could assure this House that the practise as outlined is not widespread and is not being carried on in other highway districts throughout the province?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say, as I said on Friday, that I'm very concerned and deeply distressed about the allegations that have been made and I have no reason to believe that those kinds of things, as have been made by the allegations in the Carman area, have any existence in any other parts of the department.

I have no reason to believe that that is the case and we are proceeding, as indicated, quickly, with an internal investigation through the internal auditor to determine

the extent or the validity within the department of the allegations and certainly to look at the process and procedures that have been in place for many many years in the department.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister is considering investigations in any other districts throughout the province.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Not specifically, Mr. Speaker. What the department is looking at through the internal auditor and the provincial auditor, is to look at the procedures that are in place. That investigation is currently ongoing with no specific designation as to specific districts at all. It's a look at the procedures that are in place.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I thank the Minister for those answers, Mr. Speaker.

### Restrictions, road - changes in

**MR. D. BLAKE:** A final supplementary, in view of the road restrictions that will be in place shortly, and in view of the confusion that exists throughout a large section of Manitoba, I wonder if the Minister is considering bringing the road restrictions in this year in both the imperial and the metric measure.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, there was a question last week by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa with regard to road restrictions and I just wanted to point out that road restrictions will come into effect in the province next Monday, a week from today. At that time the road restrictions will take the same form as they always have over the last number of years in this province. We are not proposing any changes.

### Deficit, Manitoba - Projection in fiscal '84-85

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. We are now only six days away from the end of fiscal 1984-85. My question to the Minister is, is he still predicting that the deficit for 1984-85 will be some \$488 million?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the latest information I have available would indicate that we will be very close to that amount.

### Chemical Spill, Carman, Manitoba - Samples taken for analysis

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of the Environment indicate at what date samples were submitted for analysis of

the chemical found in the vicinity of the Boyne River and potentially polluting the town water supply?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The first samples were on the 28th, but were not pursued with. The samples of March 1st were the first to be analyzed. The samples submitted on the 28th were thought to be a fungicide which had spilled there the previous year already, so under that assumption the substance was collected and the first samples to be analyzed were those submitted on March 1st. Those did not bear any results, because, as I stated already in the previous answer to a question, the product book describing chemicals was actually incorrect insofar as the description provided for Dinoseb, specifically as its description referred to a colour.

### Chemical Spill, Carman, Manitoba - Cleanup

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of the Environment indicate what disposal procedures were followed for the cleanup that occurred about February 21st?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I had described that as well as part of the first statement. The substance discovered on the 21st of February was a small pile located directly in front of the potato storage plant in Carman and not on the slopes of the riverbank, as the member makes out to be in his answer to my statement on Thursday last, but instead directly in front of the potato storage plant and the pile was described as being three by five feet in surface.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the front of the potato shed drained into the Boyne River.

He hasn't answered the question as to what the disposal method was for that cleanup of an unknown and unidentified chemical.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, yes, the member is correct. I forgot to get back to that part of the question.

The materials collected in front of the potato storage shed on February 21st were disposed of, but that was part of a conglomerate of snow and soil which was scraped and all of that was disposed of in the landfill.

For the member's information, the substance or the chemical Dinoseb readily breaks down, I am told, in a matter of hours in soil, therefore the experts from Dow Chemicals, which I wish to thank publicly at this time

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll continue when I have order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the Minister of the Environment.

Is the Minister of Environment now telling us that on March 21st, his department disposed of an unknown, unidentified chemical in a landfill site on February 21st when the initial cleanup was done, that disposal in a landfill site was done of an unidentified chemical?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, the substance discovered on February 21st was by town officials and they, in touch with the local public health inspector, did indeed take a decision to dispose in the landfill site as a temporary measure, because as it turns out it would be readily possible to remove that from the landfill site if it was found that the substance should not be disposed of there.

As it turns out, Mr. Speaker, the best place to dispose of this substance was in the landfill site or in the lagoon where both of these substances went. Experts were consulted in this regard and so advised. In fact, Mr. Speaker - and I was starting to say this awhile ago - I wish to thank publicly the officials from Dow Chemical for having very quickly responded in this particular regard. They had flown in five individuals, three of them scientists, one a doctor and another - I forget his specific qualifications - to help us upon our request to deal with this matter.

### **Child and Family Services - Appointment of executive directors**

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

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services.

I understand that six new executive directors have been appointed to the six community-based Child and Family Services in Winnipeg. In light of this government's Affirmative Action Program, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House how many of these appointments went to women?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the executive directors were appointed by the respective boards. As the questioner no doubt knows, only one of the six is female, a balance that I hope, in time, will be rectified. But the whole affirmative action approach of this government has been to try to get more women in and moving up the ladders of the different job fields so that when such jobs come open they will, by ordinary competition, be found to be the lead candidates.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add and to clarify for all, the decisions were made by the duly elected boards in each region, each community region.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** A supplementary to the Minister. In light of the government's Affirmative Action Program and the type of lip service that I'm hearing from this government, are they not planning to have any control

at all over the boards that are dealing with this government, and to give women an opportunity? Did no women apply for this job? Is she telling women in Manitoba, the social workers in Manitoba, that none of them were qualified other than one person?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the process of affirmative action is a long-term process and it is, if you go for a community elected board, you then respect their right to make a decision.

Over time, I trust that in the community, as well as in this hall, we will move toward a more equitable 52 percent; but the members opposite are proud of being two out of 23 and I trust they, in time, will make progress as we on this side will.

### **Law Enforcement Review Agency Commissioner - statements re oppressive police behaviour**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have now noted further details in connection with the question asked by the Member for St. Norbert.

Of the 27 matters that have officially been dealt with by the Commissioner for the Law Enforcement Review Agency, 15 have been rejected and only 12 are in continuing discussion; so that the suggestion that the Commissioner, under The Law Enforcement Review Act, has found merit in most of them, is quite the reverse. He's found merit in less than half.

### **High School Program - review of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week I posed a question to the Minister of Education with respect to quality of education and why it was that she was feeling now that there was improvement required.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to that question. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees called for a total review of the high school system some 10 months ago within their resolution package. I would ask the Minister of Education why it took, firstly, some 10 months for her to respond to that request and, more importantly, as to whether or not the government is contemplating a review of the whole high school system within Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might remind the member opposite that the early requests for a high school review go all the way back to their days when they were in office, and I think that the organizations were asking for a high school review as long ago as that. So it's been an item on the agenda for quite a long time, not just recently.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the resolutions have not been brought forward to me for this year and I expect to be dealing with the trustees' organization when they

bring them forward and we are giving serious consideration to how to go about dealing with the question of the high school program. When we're ready, we'll make appropriate announcements.

**Education, Department of - change in name**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, last week when I made reference to a letter sent by the Department of Culture to school libraries, that letter made reference to Manitoba education and that term sort of intrigued me.

My question to the Minister, is the Minister of Education considering changing the name of her department to "Manitoba Education?"

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think there has been a change, Mr. Speaker, that goes across all of the departments to have some consistency in terms of the names and the Department of Education is now called "Manitoba Education."

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the First Minister then, why is this name change being sought, given that the Department of Education has been so named, probably for decades, and how many other departments of government are going through this change?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter that would be much better dealt with during Estimates.

**Deficit, Manitoba - Projection in fiscal'84-85**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance, following upon his previous answer.

He indicated previously that the government expects to lose some \$80 million in the last three months of this fiscal year from income tax revenues, but that that would be offset by established program financing grants from the Federal Government. Can the Minister give an indication of the amount of money that he expects, the increase in the amount of money he expects in established programs financing grants?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'll take that question as notice because I don't have the exact number, but I believe it's a net loss of approximately \$60 million, which is basically being made up for in decreases in expenditures on the other side.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish permission to make a non-political announcement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** This past week, Mr. Speaker, saw the Court Assiniboine No. 4 and the Court Lorraine L-1737 host the Canadian Foresters' Curling Championship in Portage la Prairie.

It is with great pride, Sir, that I can announce that Manitoba curlers were awarded a further championship award in curling. A father and son team from Portage la Prairie were winners of the Foresters' title. Barry Wright, with his two brothers, Brian and Brent, and his father Lorne, skipped his team to the national award. I wish you to join with me in congratulating this sporting group from my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** I thank honourable members for granting me leave, Mr. Speaker.

In November of 1984, Mr. Doug Wood, who farms at Kelwood, in the constituency of Ste. Rose, won the world championship for wheat with sample of Columbus wheat at the Royal Fair in Toronto. The championship was brought back to Canada by Mr. Wood.

In 1985, Mr. Wood won the Manitoba and Western Canadian championship for Hard Spring wheat, and the Manitoba and Western Canadian championship for oats at the Brandon Winter Fair. I invite all members of the House to join with me in extending congratulations to Mr. Doug Wood of Kelwood, Manitoba on his achievement.

**CLARIFICATION**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to make a correction in the Hansard for Thursday, March 21, 1985, Page 279. In the Member for Pembina's remarks, Mr. Speaker, he makes the reference that his "colleague, the MLA for Radisson is not with us unfortunately this afternoon," after I have just read the statement in the House. I would hope that the member would make that correction and realize that his own critic is the Member for Niakwa and not for Radisson.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't think that is a Hansard correction.



## ORDERS OF THE DAY BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important when dealing with this Budget to, in effect, to take the opportunity of dealing with the three Budgets that have preceded this one. This is the fourth Budget of a very tired, very incompetent government. What Manitobans will be asking themselves, what the people throughout the 57 constituencies will be asking to pass judgment on is, what has this government accomplished in these four Budgets? I use Budgets as a particularly useful instrument of this House to measure governments by.

Mr. Speaker, I've been one who has not necessarily held the point of view that we may not see this Chamber again during the course of this Legislature, but I do believe that this will indeed be the last Budget that this government will have the courage to bring down.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's examine this — (Interjection) — well, foolhardiness, day dreaming. Somebody called it a dream Budget, day-dreaming Budget. Nightmare is more like it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to use this opportunity of speaking cumulatively of the three Budgets plus this one. So, when I charge them, Mr. Speaker, with having done certain things in the Budget, I speak of all four. I say that at the outset, so that there will not be points of order raised by honourable members if I'm referring to a particular measure that was introduced, not necessarily in this Budget, but in the four Budgets that I'm speaking of.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that Manitobans will come to the conclusion that so many of us already have come to, particularly when you look at the facts. Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party Government has increased taxes: the sales tax to name one; the personal income tax; introduced novel, new and unique and and punitive taxes, like the payroll tax; increased all user fees; licences; increased tuition fees for our students at the universities; increased property taxes for every property owner in this province; increased — would you believe it — rental accommodations under their supposed rent legislation; the record shows that in the voluntary years of voluntary rent control and rent restraint, the increases were less than what they have been in the three years, going on four years now, that we've re-introduced compulsory rent control legislation to the Province of Manitoba.

While they've been doing all this, Mr. Speaker — that's fine if you're going to have an activist, militant government that's going to do a lot of wonderful things for people — at the same time that they've increased this general level of taxation, virtually covering every taxing field that we have; sales tax, personal tax, corporate tax, fees, plus introduction of brand new taxes like the payroll tax, they have added to our deficit in a way that no other government has, Mr. Speaker.

Again, speaking of the four years, the four Budgets, they have now managed to accumulate a deficit of close

to \$2 billion; \$1.8 billion. The debt servicing of that debt, Mr. Speaker, is approaching \$260-280 million, \$280 million. Let's pause just for a minute, Mr. Speaker. What would not any government give, what would this government not give to have that \$280 million available to it, particularly in an election year, to do something for the people of Manitoba. How about giving the Highways Department an extra \$20 million, so they can spruce up the roads? How about giving the health care services some extra money, so that the Minister would not have to increase the per diem rate charges as he is increasing them today? How about giving them to the same Health Minister so the chiropractors can carry on giving the same service that they did under the Lyon administration? How about giving it to the universities, Mr. Speaker, so that tuition fees need not rise? Or even worse, Mr. Speaker, that quotas are not necessary in so many courses. Accessibility to an education is getting harder, Mr. Speaker, not easier, at the time that this government has increased all levels of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, what our friends the socialist often like to talk about is that they are not concerned about deficits particularly. They also speak courageously about having the will to tax, a program is needed, the program is in the public interest. But Mr. Speaker, if you take an examination of these past four years, we have really the worst of all possible worlds. We have suffered the tax increases. We have suffered going deeper and deeper into debt. Mr. Speaker, is there anybody opposite that can really convince me or too many Manitobans that our general level of services has increased proportionately? — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture says from his seat, they're holding their own, and he is correct. They are trying their best to hold their own.

We hear from the Minister of Health, in his contribution on the Throne Speech, serious attempt to encourage co-operation about the major problems facing the health delivery system, that he needs our co-operation, that innovative new ideas will have to be brought forward simply to hold our own, to stay where we are. In fact, he's giving us warning that it will not be possible given the trends that he is challenged with every day in his office, and that some new answers have to be found.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans will of course have an opportunity of measuring that relatively straightforward recording of events with the four years just previous to that, the Lyon administration. That administration has been characterized by members opposite as being a mean-spirited, cruel, restraint-minded government. Accepting for a moment the worst scenario and trying to deal with this matter as truthfully as I can, what did the Lyon administration do in an equivalent four years? We had four years, Mr. Speaker, and for sure this government is only going to have four years; we know that. So there will be two set pieces where you can kind of measure a government's performance in a very precise way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's true we had no Jobs Fund. There were no green and white or blue and white Jobs Fund signs. There was no Jobs Fund created when the Progressive Conservative Party was in government, Mr. Speaker, but there were more jobs created, 33,000 to 11,000; there were fewer people on unemployment and there were fewer people on welfare. That's what people



will remember. In 1981, in the City of Winnipeg, there were some 2,100 people on welfare; today there are 7,000 people on welfare. In 1981 there were some 18,000, 20,000 people unemployed — (Interjection) — 24,000 people unemployed; today there are 48,000 — (Interjection) — 48,000 or 54,000, but, Mr. Speaker, we had no Jobs Fund.

Mr. Speaker, we reduced taxes. Remember? They raised them; we reduced them. Let me talk about one particular area where we reduced taxes, and I thank the dear Lord every day that I sit in this House that this government has at least had the wisdom not to tinker with that bit of forward looking legislation that was brought in by my colleague, the then Minister of Natural Resources and Energy and now the Member for Turtle Mountain; I'm referring to our modest changes in the royalties and the taxing regime that regulated our energy, our petroleum, our oil industry in the southwest corner. Mr. Speaker, our - admittedly - not overly large, but nonetheless significant oil patch industry in the southwest part of the province was missing out completely and totally in the Schreyer years from the activity that had begun to generate in 1973 as a result of the rising oil prices after the formation of OPEC.

There was oil exploration and oil being discovered and developed in Saskatchewan, in North Dakota and Alberta, but not in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, it didn't take a massive infusion of public funds; it didn't have to lure them with \$40 million or \$50 million of taxpayers' money to increase that activity. No, Mr. Speaker. All it meant was to bring our taxing regime into a competitive position, a comparable position - no giveaways - but a comparable position to those of our neighbouring jurisdictions, Saskatchewan, Alberta. And we've had activity in the oil industry, that surely this government likes to take every measure of credit for, but even they acknowledge the truth of the matter and how that came about. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the biggest credit to the former Conservative Government is that while they see fit to tinker and change with so many things, they haven't dared touch or make any changes to those policies, because those policies are working.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm trying to make in some of these comments is that Conservatives often and I, in particular, like to talk about less government rather than more government. But then that often is interpreted by my socialist friends that if you're not developing a new program, a new government program every other day, then you're not doing anything for the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it's amply demonstrated here, demonstrated better in the United States, that if you leave sufficient elbow room for people to do their own thing, they generally do it and they do it better, and they create more jobs and create more wealth while they're at it.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose one of the harshest criticisms that I and members of that Lyon administration took during our brief four years, 1977-81, was the constant and highly irresponsible criticism of the deterioration of our health system. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge a good job when I see it and they did a job on us. I have no doubt at all that that contributed substantially to our election defeat in 1981.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had it this very afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture saying that their job is not to

improve or not to rebuild, as their election material says, or to restore, their job is to try to maintain the health care system and they're not doing a good job at that. Look at the lists of people that are waiting for elective surgery, for instance.

One can go into the details. I'm simply asking what has this government accomplished, what has this government left Manitobans in the four years? What major new facilities have come on stream? What major new initiative has there been in any field? Has there been any particular breakthrough in any area of government activity? Absolutely none, Sir. But we are saddled with a record breaking debt and all levels of taxes have been increased in the four short years.

Mr. Speaker, you can compare that to governments of the past and, quite frankly, we can be very appreciative of the fact that they've managed to do some of the notable things in Manitoba without burdening successive generations with an onerous debt that becomes a millstone around their necks.

I'm often amazed, Mr. Speaker, when you go back through the Estimates of not that many years ago, that an administration in the sixties, for instance, could expend upwards of \$100 million for flood protection in the Province of Manitoba and still not get the province and country into the kind of fiscal problems that we now have.

I even go back to the coalition governments of D.L. Campbell, that could introduce a rural electrification program throughout this province and recognize what these programs were; the scale of these programs relative to the resources at hand. Mr. Speaker, you can recall, as many have, although that's been forgotten now - I still remember it - that that particular administration was so tight-fisted or it was so worried about spending money that it held back the development of Manitoba, and I suppose to a certain extent, it's true, but at least it didn't put Manitoba into debt; and when the '60s came along there was a tremendous development in all that area's activities of government. You can say the '60s brought about the modern development of the province as we now know and the Departments of Education, of Health, of Agriculture, of Highways were all developed in those years, the Roblin-Weir years; but, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Weir left office there was a \$55 million surplus on the books and that closed off the decades of the '60s. The total budget that year was some \$358 million.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm trying to make is what this government is going to be judged on. They have left us with a legacy of higher taxes in every tax field; they are on the verge of placing in massive debt all Manitobans for a mega project, Limestone, and while all this is going on, by their own admission, all they have to offer is perhaps they can maintain the level of services where they were at. That, Mr. Speaker, is surely the worst of all possible worlds.

If you're going to have to suffer higher taxes and if you're going to have to suffer higher debts, then surely there ought to be something tangible there for us to see. Mr. Speaker, that's the insidiousness of the fiscal irresponsibility of our friends opposite that so often is missed.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall another Budget Debate asking them what level of debt service charges, what level of debt is acceptable to that government?

**A MEMBER:** What was the answer?

**MR. H. ENNS:** There really was no answer, Mr. Speaker, but that worries me. That worries me a great deal when you see examples around the world today of countries that have so allowed the management of their fiscal affairs to take them to a point where, indeed, virtually the entire resources of the country are required, not to provide services, not to improve the quality of life, not to bring about a single redeeming feature that man wants, expects his government to provide for him, but simply to pay debt and also, in many cases, massive international debt.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not encouraged at all that this government has learned anything in the four years - oh, they've learned enough to play the little game of politics with respect to what deficit means, and they're even a little worried that it may bother them or it may hurt them or may cost them more for the money they will need for a major project like Limestone so that they'll play a cute little game of trying to appear somewhat constraint-minded by keeping the deficit this year below the \$500 million mark. They are fooling nobody, least of all themselves, when they put into their Budget expenditures, which they have no right to place it, certainly not at this particular time, I'm referring, of course, to the \$72 million.

I hope, along with all members of this House, that the Federal Government will acknowledge some further responsibility to Manitoba in the transfer payments and be of some assistance to us; but the law is the law and a law, Mr. Speaker, I remind all members opposite that they agreed to and that they negotiated with the former Liberal Government and they are getting precisely what that formula calls for. Of that there is no question. The question is only, if because of the way that formula impacts on Manitoba and some other provinces, will the present government in Ottawa, which is severely beleaguered from all quarters with respect to requests for additional funds, and its own massive debt to deal with, whether or not they will have the capability or whether or not, in their judgment, they will decide to increase the level of funding that that government, that Minister of Finance agreed to as being fair and equitable a number of years ago. That little game of including that in the Budget is a matter for them to answer to in the event that it doesn't work out that way.

Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that whenever this government has to go to the people that the average Manitoban, with a little bit of assistance from people like myself and 56 other Tory members, will simply remind Manitobans that they're paying a higher sales tax today, that they're paying higher gasoline taxes today, that they're paying higher cigarette taxes today, higher liquor taxes today, dreadfully higher property taxes today, that they've got that unique privilege that only one other province in this country has, that if you go and employ somebody, you're going to tax him - the payroll tax.

For that same Manitoban who does take the time - and I believe that there are more and more that worry about it, that will say, even if I were a very public-spirited individual, I might be convinced of paying these extra taxes, but surely that's helping me to decrease

my debt; surely I'm paying a better portion of our expenses and we're not going to be asking future generations to keep paying for it. No, Mr. Speaker, that's not happening either. Our debt is going out of sight; and then he's going to ask himself the final question, well, if we're paying all these extra taxes, our debt's going up, then surely that highway I'm driving on is now next to being paved with gold; surely the Health Services are such that I don't have to worry about my aunt and uncle living in Woodlands. She needs elective surgery. Bingo, I can take her into the hospital at Stonewall or Winnipeg and I know that she'll be cared for, he'll be cared for in a day or two. There'll be no six-month waiting list for that kind of thing.

Surely if I happen to be one of those who require the services of a chiropractor, I'll have at least the same level of services that a restraint-minded Conservative Government was providing. Then all of a sudden he'll say to himself, that's no longer the case, that there's virtually little or no work being done in the agricultural area for those concerns where there's drainage or dam building. They've interfered further in such programs allowing the small individual family farmer to do something like raising chickens.

Mr. Speaker, I predict - and funny things happen in elections - but I predict that there's going to be 99 chickens that are going to come home to roost on this government. Those 99 chickens are going to bother this government more than Limestone will give them any credit for because people of ordinary common sense can't understand a government that says you can't grow more than 99 chickens; it's against the law. If you grow 100 chickens, we're going to put you in jail. The Attorney-General won't put Dr. Morgentaler in jail but he'll put me in jail if I have 100 chickens on my farm.

Mr. Speaker, those 99 chickens are going to come home to roost.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** They're going to come home to roost on this government, come election time.

When that Manitoban adds up the check list . . .

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, when that Manitoba voter adds up the checklist, he will come to his own conclusion. That conclusion will be very simple. It's the kind of conclusion that many of us make every day in our daily lives. We're paying too much for something we're not getting, or worse, we're paying too much for something we don't want, and we're paying too much, period. We're just paying too much and we're not leaving enough to the average citizen to do with what he can. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, we'll tell him that in spades.

Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that when you add up the effect of this now the fourth Budget, put them all together with the other three Budgets, that there has seldom been a government, - well there's never been a government - that has imposed so heavily on its citizens and provided so little.

Thank you.

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased to take part in the Budget Debate and to present my pride in the Budget that the government has put together and to indicate my support and my particular perspective on the reasoning that's gone into that Budget and the principles that it supports.

Mr. Speaker, I've sat here very patiently - well fairly patiently - during the Throne Debate and through the Budget Debate to date, and I've been listening for the framework and the principles and the directions and the solutions from the other side, to give us some real critique of the Budget as presented.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and myself on this side have spent hours and days and weeks clarifying what principles we believe in and what principles should go into the construction of this Budget. We've sought realism, first of all, Mr. Speaker, what really is going on in each industry throughout Manitoba, what's going on in the economy and in the social world here in Manitoba and beyond, and even beyond that, what is the world context within which Manitoba functions. We've looked for realism, Mr. Speaker, because, although members opposite often like to paint us as caricatures of their own beliefs and think that whatever they are for we must be against, what we are for is realism and balance and fairness in both the economic policy and the social policy that our Budget supports.

Mr. Speaker, we have also tried, in building the Budget, to have a broad view, to include all Manitobans, to look at that their needs in depth and to define what is the role of the government in supporting them and enabling them to help themselves.

I've listened for another framework, a critique that comes from a position that albeit different, nonetheless, hangs together and offers some corrections, some helpful criticism of what we have proposed, because that is the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, that the government proposes, the opposition critiques and, hopefully, out of the blend will come the better result.

But I've listened in vain. What I've heard is a series of small, rather picayune criticisms of what we've put forward, labels, time-worn criticisms about deficit tax and so on, but not set in any context, Mr. Speaker; a complaint about increases in fees or taxes with no indication of what's been going on in the rest of society, what inflation has done to costs, what inflation has done to revenues, what's really changing in the broader economic world.

I've heard many statements that sound true, Mr. Speaker, but when I analyze them more closely what I find is that they are half-truths. They look at only one portion. They talk about deficit but it's out of context. They talk about taxes, but no question about what taxes are being raised for, who is paying, and who is receiving benefit. I hear talk about the private sector and the need to encourage the private sector. Of course, that's an important principle and one to which we ascribe, but it is not the only actor in the field, not the only group with responsibility. Government also has responsibility and it's the blend of the two that's going

to produce the security, the prosperity, and the fair deal here in Manitoba. I don't hear that kind of coherent and thoughtful and thorough analysis that I think we have a right to expect from our opposition.

If the world stood still, if the numbers pulled out of the '60s and the '70s could be applied directly to today's world, maybe some of the criticisms that the speaker we've just heard would stand up. That isn't the case at all. We've had a world that's gone through enormous shifts in economic balance, in interest rate impacts, in economic activity, not only the ups and downs, Mr. Speaker, of a very unstable world economy, but we have also had terrific shocks to the economy of North America, of Canada, and Manitoba that must be understood before they can be remedied. I don't hear that kind of analysis coming from the other side.

I also get the feeling that social programming is looked at somehow in isolation from economic programming, that somehow we can talk about small business people and farmers, important as they are, but neglect some of the other Manitobans that I deal with every day; the single parent who needs day care; the family with a mentally retarded child or young adult who they must find some way of caring for; children in distress; Native people who have lost their cultural bearings and are seeking their fair role in this society. I don't hear any talk about those groups or how they're going to fit in, how they're going to have a fair share of this full employment and this Manitoba economy which we are all trying to develop.

But those are the key questions, Mr. Speaker. Economic growth in and of itself, private sector prosperity are important, but equally important are the questions as to how all the groups, all the people in Manitoba are to be included in, are to participate, to contribute and to benefit from this economic growth. It's only when you bring together these two streams of thought and programming, the social and the economic, that you get real economic development. You get a society where all its members can take part and contribute and feel that they are a part of the Manitoba community.

We hear talk every once in awhile about partisan politics and that somehow we are guilty on this side of being partisan. I came into politics without any illusions. To me, politics was about values and it was a recognition that people in our society have different values, that the political process is the very way in which we debate those different values. We have different ideas about how the world works and how it should work, how the world of the economy works, how the world of social programming works. That kind of debate is healthy. What we're about is trying to present our vision, our values, our ideas about how the world works and how it could work better, and present a real political choice to the people of Manitoba.

What are the values that we base our case on, Mr. Speaker, when we're building a Budget, building our programs? We are comprehensive in looking at all the issues. We don't just select single ones and look at them in isolation. We're inclusive. We are a government for all the people and we share some responsibility for what happens to people. Surely people themselves have a responsibility to look after themselves, to be creative and enterprising, but we too as a society have a responsibility to ensure that people have access to

employment, to health, to education, to training, and so on and any program that doesn't deal with the special needs of particular groups with particular disadvantages doesn't stand the test of being a sound policy.

I think of women - often called a minority in our society. It's a minority in terms of the political and economic power that we have access to, but in terms of numbers, we are well over 50 percent of the population. Surely, any group of that dimension deserves very special strategies and very special programs to ensure that, increasingly, what has been that invisible part of the economy - our contribution has been invisible, unseen, not rewarded economically - gradually gets moved up into the mainstream of the economy where women are able to contribute fully and benefit fairly from the results.

Mr. Speaker, another principle in building our programs has been that in building realistic solutions to problems, we realize that there are no simple solutions, that there are complex answers to complex problems; that the solutions are multi-pronged; that affirmative action in and of itself isn't enough; that looking at pay, at access to training, at promotion in jobs, at early attitudes, for example, of young women as they go through school and feel that they, too, can do anything out there in the society at large, that they're not condemned forever to one or two minority areas of the society and the economic activity. That is the type of multi-pronged approach that's important for women and for every other group, the disabled, Native people, people in the remote areas up North, immigrant people. We need multi-pronged programs that meet their special needs, not that they get favouritism, but that they get a chance to overcome their particular barriers so that they too can contribute to the total economic development of the province.

Mr. Speaker, we are sometimes accused on this side of claiming that we have a corner on caring. I don't believe that's true. I think the sincerity of other points of view is real. But I think the test of caring is whether people are able and willing to go through the kind of analysis and brainstorming and hard work to see that the kind of programs that result truly do benefit the different groups. It's no good caring in isolation. Caring must be integrated into the very substantive programs that are put forward. Not only must the programs from the government end make sense, they must be the kind of programs that people perceive as helping them to stand on their own feet and to live freer lives; programs that support them, not programs that sit on top of them and control their lives or inhibit them; programs that genuinely recognize the role they have to play in the larger community and are worked at and fine-tuned over the years, until they in fact do that, because, Mr. Speaker, not all people in the community are strong and capable of independence without some extra support.

Some of the philosophy that we hear coming from the other side would make sense if everyone started equally and if everyone started with the full strength and capacity of a well-educated, healthy, mature person, but that isn't what the community is made up of. For one thing, we have children who need special nurturing and special care until they reach maturity. We have elderly people, who, in their declining years, often have special needs that must be supported and they cannot

always manage on their own. We have people who, through no fault of their own, have disabilities, undergo accidents and so on, and if we're not prepared to share the wealth and build in opportunity and security for those people, what right have we to call ourselves a caring society? The test of caring is in the programs we develop and the honesty with which we look at those programs to see if they're really effective.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about the farmer, and I guess there's a lot of friendly debate goes on back and forth across this House, as to which side really understands the farmer and which side really has the remedies for the farmer's ills. If the ills the farmer faced were simple, Mr. Speaker, maybe there would be a simple answer, but they aren't simple. They rest in the very nature of the enterprise of farming the land, when people first open the land to see that it's adequately drained and that they have access to it through roads and so on, and then over time, Mr. Speaker, that they are able to keep the soil quality and the water quality, so that it is truly a renewable resource for our children.

Then they get into the whole financial aspect of farming, all the costs of inputs which tend to be beyond the control of the farmer. The fact that the farmer is tied to the land; the fact that the cost price squeeze seems to catch the farmer without much influence over the price of the product. And then we hear questions opposite where people say, don't tell anyone how many hens they can have or how many eggs can be laid by the hens. I could believe that as a serious comment if it was said 50 years ago, 100 years ago, but in 1985, when we've had experience with oversupply in basic farm production, oversupply that doesn't lead to bigger markets and more income, it leads to depressed prices and reduced marketing, the argument that we can't put our heads together and figure out how to stabilize the supply and stabilize the market and the price so that farmers can look forward to some security over time, just boggles my imagination, Mr. Speaker.

What we are offering is the best of a family ethic. We approached the Manitoba population as though they were members of a family, that some will need special supports - not too much, not too little because the goal is to encourage individuals to stand on their feet and become full contributing members, but not to reject them out of hand and say they have no right to a share in the opportunities and the benefits of the community.

But the opposite view, Mr. Speaker, leaving them to fend for their own, believing that some hands-off - variously called the market system or the dollar system or whatever you want to label it - work its magic and that somehow all people are going to get their fair share, again may be a sincerely held belief, but again I could understand it being said 100 years ago. I can't understand anyone who's looked at the results of a completely untrammelled money system, making that claim today. It's a narrow view. It's short-sighted and it's shallow. There must be a recognition that government has a role as the balance wheel, the distributor, yes, the value setter in society, and the value setter in an open and democratic way, so that the public knows what values are being espoused and built into the programs, so that the community has a real choice as to what kind of society they want to build in Manitoba.

I think we get down to a habit that the opposition often shows, they see us as their mirror image. If they

believe that they're pro-business, they figure we must be anti-business; if they're anti-labour, we must be pro-labour. So they look in the mirror and try to characterize the government as the opposite of what they are, and then they scold us if what we seem to propose doesn't fit that label or that mold.

We're told that we are suddenly getting into the business of encouraging businesses to come to Manitoba and invest here and we're told we shouldn't do that because that doesn't fit their view of us. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's part of the problem. We are much more than a mirror image of opposition beliefs. We're a bigger image, a bigger view of the community and the economy and the society. We attempt to build our approach sector-by-sector in the economy according to what the real problems are and what the opportunities are, what the public sector can do and what the private sector can do, and what we need to do in co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, that is an economic strategy that can give promise of full employment in the long pull here in Manitoba. And the Limestone project, Mr. Speaker, is being developed with that kind of philosophy and approach. Somehow we get told that we shouldn't go into Limestone until we meet only the engineers' or the financiers' narrow view of how you develop a resource. But what we're doing is adding something new, fresh and important. We're saying the resource of the province should be developed for the benefit of the citizens. It should be used to help train people and give them skills that are transferable and that are lasting, that should be used to build the human resources of the community. I think the genius of this particular approach to Limestone that has been put together by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, and many others assisting, has been to give reality to that vision. It's not just a lip service. There is a program in place to increase the benefits here in Manitoba, both on the manufacturing side, the technology side and in the people-training side.

I think one of the most gratifying things for me was to find that without having had to make a particular and impassioned intervention to ensure that women were given a fair share of this development, I found that the training program in Limestone targets 50 percent women. It may not achieve that and it may not quickly persuade women in the North to go into the non-traditional areas, but the target is there, the political will to try and to encourage to create that kind of a more egalitarian economy in the North is there and, as I say, I guess I've spent most of my life travelling an uphill road trying to persuade other people of the justice of including women in their thinking and trying to meet their special needs. I can't tell you how gratifying it's been for me on this occasion to find that my brothers, my colleagues, have stepped ahead of me and have, in fact, got into place an egalitarian training program for women that I think deserves notice right across the country. I don't know of any other projects of this sort that has fine tuned its social goals so well with its economic planning, and I for one am extremely proud of that type of achievement.

It's not going to be easy to reach that goal. I guess we know when we start that we won't reach it, but we have a goal and we're going to do what we can to enable people to have that opportunity and have a broader, deeper view of what they can do and can become in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we also hear a lot of discussion about what the private sector should do and what the public sector should do, although generally from the opposite side I tend to hear that the public sector should do nothing or should stand still in its tracks, except when there are individual criticisms and then the message is always spend more, why don't you put more money - no consistency, Mr. Speaker.

What we're saying from our side is that there is a role for both public and private sectors on the economic development side and on the social development side. There's some things we need to do together and what we're willing to do, in a pragmatic way and in a very realistic way, is to work out program-by-program to see just what the right balance is.

The public should do what the public can do best and the private sector should do what it does best. Negotiating where the boundaries are and how the programs should be designed is going to be a task that will be with us for my lifetime, but the will to see the broader view and the greater energy that can come from this blend is, I think, the particular strength of this government's approach.

We hear about, occasionally, criticisms that we're the ones that contribute to class warfare, that we're hostile to business, and you know the litany we get, payroll tax and we get a few others. What we never get is the other side of the coin; we never get the fact that our statement is we are pro business and labour. I must say I'm not an admirer of everything that the Prime Minister of this country says, but I think he is, in some of his public statements, charting a new path, when he is saying we need each other and that we must seek ways to blend the different goals of deficit management and reduction and job creation.

I may have a solution as to how he could pull those dispirit aims together by things like tax reform and that's going to be a debate that will occur at the federal level for many years to come; but I think the main point I'd like to make is that I don't think hostility to business or the other side of hostility to labour is an approach that we would like to support. We believe that fear and suspicion from either side toward the other is the very thing that inhibits economic development. By the same token, if you can turn it around to trust, to shared information, to sitting around the same table and sharing the same information and charting how to achieve those goals, that labour will be found to be responsible; labour will not make unrealistic claims for pay increases; they will not be irresponsible about technological change, if their concerns and their interests are listened to and dealt with along with the others. So what we have is a vision of how the whole community can work together for the betterment of all.

I listened very carefully when I was being lobbied by businesses in the Economic Development portfolio and I used to find that different businesses in the same sector would come and they would be asking for quite different things. I used to ask them why they did that; did they not have any overall view as to what would be good, say for the electronics or electrical products industry, and they said, no, we don't believe in the sectoral approach. What it came down to was each firm was promoting public policy that would best suit their particular needs. Some made all their products here and wanted to have access to other markets, so

they would argue for a lot of free markets and no provincial barriers.

Others produced a mixture of items in one place or produced all of a product in one - I've got the thing wrong now - produced all their products in one place and they wanted to negotiate some special privilege for what they produced in other provinces, in this province, using a completely different argument. We used to say to them we would like to do what meets your need and Manitoba's need. What's your view of what good public policy would be? The answer we used to get always surprised me. They had never thought of that and they didn't consider it their business to do so; and that's why, I guess, I found it a real challenge to try to take the analysis and the ideas of the business sector when they come to government, weigh them over against the needs and the interests of the other groups in society and see how they've put together, because if we don't have a co-operative view of how all the people can share and have the same goals and go somewhat in the same direction, then our prospects for real economic development, not only in Manitoba but indeed in Canada and worldwide, are going to be fraught with social divisiveness and I guess, at the most extreme, revolution and warfare, an alternative that none of us on this side can contemplate with any equanimity; so we have to find another way to create consensus, to take dispirit interest groups and help them, through dialogue, through problem solving and through fresh thinking, come to some common view of what can be achieved.

Again, each industry has problems, Mr. Speaker, and must be dealt with on its own terms, but its well being must be put into some broader view. We hear a lot of talk about the manufacturing sector and how investment has tailed off there and it's moving up a bit now.

What's happening in the manufacturing sector is a phenomenon right across the country and the continent. What's happening to it is a part of an international shift, partly because of new flows of money, new technologies and the emerging aspirations of developing countries. Now if we don't understand that, Mr. Speaker, and find what manufacturing we can appropriately do here - and that's I guess what we all thought that Manufacturing Technology Institute was supposed to advise us on, how to adapt the most progressive manufacturing technologies to smaller scale production that would be more appropriate to the Canadian scene - if we don't work very strategically in the manufacturing area to see what we can and should do in the future, we're going to be open to an awful lot of frustration.

The service sector - the Leader of the Opposition talked about how the service sector had low paying jobs and that they were somehow less desirable. Mr. Speaker, there's two ways to look at that. One is to recognize that the service sector is a very broad sector; it's not only the human service side, it's also the financial, architectural, engineering service side that has great export potential, great potential to export, expertise, human and financial services that can help to remedy the imbalance, the import over export imbalance that greatly aggravates the Manitoban economy and makes it less able to stand on its own feet and, in a sense, maintain a stable growth and enough jobs with good pay for all its population. We have to understand the changing service sector and,

again, seek out, as we're doing through the technology innovation projects from Industry, Trade and Technology, and build with some public sector involvement and some private, build capacity for the future.

Many of the firms that we've been used to employing most of our people are really in the sunset area of what we call economic development. They're not firms that have a great future in this part of the world. We must gradually select the ones that have opportunity and promise for the future and promote the new emerging industries. There's no reason why Manitoba can't be as much at the helm in the knowledge-based industries, which aren't as dependent on geographical location, as any other province.

I think one of the exciting things that has been developing here has been the co-operation that's been developing between education, the employment service training programs, and Industry, Trade and Technology in the technology area, working with business. I think it's a model for the type of partnership and shared economic development that is a real model for other parts of the country.

A bit about social development. Social development, as supported by our Budget, if you look at the increased support that's occurred during the life of this government, you're looking at percentages of 30 percent; 30 percent increased support over the four years that we have been in power. These programs are best thought of as fair-share programs. They're the ones that enable people with special problems, with special needs, to acquire their fair share, whether it be health care, whether it be education, whether it be training and employment services or community services.

These fair shares are not going to be secured by just maintaining what we have and being complacent. In some cases, we have to examine the way we have delivered service in the past and question whether it is the most economic and efficient way to deliver in the future.

We've had a lot of talk the last week or so about the possible closing of a school for training psychiatric nurses at Portage la Prairie. Well, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for responding to questions on that the way I did. We have three training schools for psych nurses in the province. Two of these have unused capacity. They do have different specialties. Now, it would be irresponsible of us not to re-examine the way we're training psychiatric nurses to see if some efficiencies couldn't be secured by arranging the educational program and the placement program according to a little different arrangement. If we can save some money there, turn out the same number of psych nurses with the appropriate training and have money left over to do other needed things, then I say that's the way to go.

One of the areas that is very evident to me in the community service area, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of systems, the lack of carefully planned allocation of resource. Historically, I guess, social services have been provided by volunteers in the community, by private groups, and then in time governments took over some of the funding. There has very rarely been a fully developed system where someone looks at the continuum of need, tries to determine what should be done by the private sector or the non-profit sector and



what should be done directly by government; what the clear guidelines are, the legislative guidelines; what kind of training is required, indeed, what kind of procedure should be followed for opening up access to these services.

Who should decide, and on what basis? How can there be fairness and a full continuum of services? Are we seeing that people such as the mentally retarded, or the mentally ill, or the disabled are given an opportunity to have their opinion - where they're able to express it - heard; where they're given some opportunity to be placed in the least restrictive setting; where there's some regular monitoring of their placement and their program; where there's input by the variety of experts who have something to say about their condition, as well as they themselves, before their placement is made?

There are so many changes in the social service delivery field that I know whatever we put in place today is going to require review and change tomorrow, but not to make the changes that we know about today, is remiss. We do know that mental retardation, for example, is not a sickness, it's a condition of life and although there are special health needs, there are also human needs to be included, to have variety in life and to share in the rhythm of the community life. Partly because of advances in education and in technology, we know better ways to include these people in the community. We would be remiss not to make a shift, not to gradually down play the institutional health model care and shift more to the community based care. That's the kind of initiative that is going on under this government.

We are including all the interested parties and groups in a common planning system, so that their views are heard and that they have some input into the allocation of resource and the building of the program. Instead of having them warring with one another about which is the best theoretical treatment for this group of people, we're involving the members of the community in a planning process where a lot of that gets worked out as they go and where there are careful critiques made as the system evolves to see that there's quality program and checks and balances, so that people are not irresponsibly turned loose in the community without adequate programming.

There are many other areas in the social development field. Corrections and day care are the other two areas in my particular jurisdiction. Once again, we're reviewing those programs to see whether the way we have delivered the service in the past measures up to today's best standards, or whether in corrections, by building in more community committees, more community responsibility, more alternatives to incarceration, we can't find a more effective way to deal with the offenders against the laws of society.

In day care, we have carefully built a system that's under a lot of stress because the demand is so great, but a system where parents have active input and where the government does play an active and responsible role in setting standards, in assisting people to build their qualifications, in assisting them to run effective programs that are more than custodial, that are real quality care programs for young children, and on through other areas, Mr. Speaker.

I'd just like to close perhaps with some reference to the initiatives being taken to enhance the status of

women. I did refer initially to things like affirmative action and equal pay and employment equity and day care - necessary support services. No one of these is going to improve the status of women in and of itself, but it's the combination of that and pension systems, income security for people, training opportunities - particularly for single parents and older women who wish to return to the labour force - that will, over time, assure Manitoba women of a more equal say, not only in how the society is developed, but in being able to contribute their special gifts and their special perspectives to build the kind of community that is our vision for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to support the Budget as presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, because I think it's that kind of careful thought and real commitment to basic values, a sense of vision for Manitoba, that has formed the building of that Budget and will carry through to the implementation of the programs that it funds.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my privilege at this time to participate in the Budget Debate and it's nice to follow the speaker who has just spoken and to hear her comments about the former department that she was the Minister of and occupied, Industry, Commerce and Tourism, and to hear her comments and thoughts relating to labour and to business. I wonder, having heard her comments, whether perhaps she wouldn't mind a switch back to that former portfolio from the sometimes very difficult one of Community Services.

Mr. Speaker, the other evening when the First Minister was concluding his remarks on the Throne Speech, he said that all he hears from the opposition is doom and gloom and he asked the Leader of the Opposition how many jobs that he had created for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Leader of the Opposition, in his days in the engineering field and his days of operating an educational component or a secretarial school, has likely employed more people in his day than all the Ministers in the current government combined have ever employed; and that he has likely contributed more to the business community of this province than all of their front bench combined; and that the Leader of the Opposition, in his engineering days, did employ people and certainly has through his business of a secretarial school, so he is used to dealing with labour-management problems and dealing with taxation and dealing with what it takes to create jobs in Manitoba.

So the First Minister's remarks as to what has the Leader of the Opposition done in creating jobs in Manitoba, I think, if members opposite were to take a hard look at his past jobs record and where he's been employed and who he's employed, they would see that he's employed many many more than they ever have.

The First Minister was mentioning the other day in his doom and gloom remarks about that all he hears from the opposition is straight doom and gloom. I remember the days when they were on this side of the



House and we used to hear about the two strips of bacon. We used to hear, when the MacGregor spill took place some years ago, the Member for Churchill just got up every day and whined and cried about what the government wasn't doing and if there was ever a clear cut example of doom and gloom, those members opposite were a great example for us to try and follow then when it comes to doom and gloom.

Mr. Speaker, we're on the Budget Debate. I asked the Minister of Natural Resources before, he's been a member of this Chamber for some 19 years, how much has the Budget increased in the Province of Manitoba and he said about tenfold. I can recall Budgets back in the late '60s being in the \$350 million range and here today our deficit is 50 percent this year more than what a total Budget in those days was.

We're now up to a four-year deficit created by this government, Mr. Speaker, of nearly \$2 billion. The other day I couldn't help but think, when the galleries on Friday morning were almost filled with young students from elementary schools, etc., that it will be those young people and their children that are going to be paying off this great deficit that Manitobans are facing today and have faced for the last number of years and particularly during the last three years of this administration.

As the Member for Lakeside mentioned earlier, yes, they have increased taxes; they did put a payroll tax on; they did increase the sales tax; they have created a lot of user fees, but they haven't been creating wealth into this province and therefore the tax base in the province has been shrinking in comparison to their willingness and desire to spend. Naturally the areas that they're spending is so often in the areas of social services which, I'm sure all members would agree, are necessary, but one of the reasons why the tax base is so much lower today is the welfare rates are three times higher than they were four years ago. So we've lost a number of people that were taxpayers that are now collecting welfare and there's less people that are paying the freight today than there were three years ago, Mr. Speaker, and this is the drawback that this government faces.

In the area of urban taxation — (Interjection) — the Member for Wolseley says, what would we do about it. One thing I think that should be done and it has been enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition that the first thing he will do when he is Premier of this province, which will take place anywhere between the next six to eighteen months, is to do away with that disadvantage tax called the payroll tax, which discourages business people from hiring and expanding their businesses. There isn't a more ridiculous tax on the books as compared to that tax, Mr. Speaker. That is one thing. You've got to get the private sector having some confidence back in Manitoba, increase the tax base within the province and hold the lid on spending. That's what has to be done, so if that's a brief and an accurate enough answer for the Member for Wolseley, I hope and trust that she will accept it.

An area that she should be interested in, being an urban member, and particularly from the inner city, is the taxation that the citizens of Winnipeg are going to face on their property tax bills.

Winnipeg has the highest property taxes in Canada and on a home assessed at \$7,000, in 1979, the taxes

during the PC Government days, were \$804.77 on such a home. They decreased in 1980 to \$799 and then in 1981 there was a further decrease to \$764.34. 1982, under the NDP, boy did they rise, right up to \$944.48, and then in 1983 they were up again over \$1,000 to \$1,002.00. Then in '84 they were up again slightly and we're going to have another property tax increase again this year in urban Winnipeg.

I know that members of this particular Legislative Chamber haven't any control over the city fathers as to how they spend their money, but I can't help but relate to an incident that occurred a week ago when the City Council reduced 24 firemen and I know that these fireman, because I've had experience, as drivers for district chiefs are not just chauffeurs. They actually accompany the district chief who is on site at a major fire and is the person that is in total control of that fire, and in many cases, if it's a large enough fire, that so-called chauffeur or assistant to the district chief accompanies the chief right inside the burning building and is his first lieutenant while he is controlling and organizing the firefighting of such a fire.

So the city fathers reduced the fire department by 24 positions and yet they reinstate back into the budget the cutting of boulevards. Now, I know it's been a practice in the inner city area, and my seat is within the inner city area, it's nice to have your boulevard cut, but cutting my boulevard versus having a satisfactory fire department, I hardly think that's a good comparison. I think that perhaps it's time that the city wrestled with the problem of the cutting of boulevards right now when they use such a ridiculous comparison of 24 firemen's position to mowing of the boulevards of Winnipeg. I think it's time maybe that the services throughout the whole area of Winnipeg were standardized and maybe that residents and owners of property in the inner city area perhaps saw to it that they cut the boulevards in front of their home. The city would do the flankage property, which they've always said they would, and maybe we could have these firemen back on the payrolls and doing the job of protecting our homes and pieces of property as they should be.

Also, in the area of urban Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, we've had for a number of years the Downtown Plan, the Core Area Plan and what bothers me is that you don't see a lot of progress with these plans. They were started prior to the current government being in office and have been continued on under them and we've had a change in the Federal Government, but what really bothers me and a lot of other taxpayers is that we are not seeing anything that is positive in the way of progress.

You see a plan in the paper the other day, a drawing, some new buildings, giving some drawings of what buildings on the north side of Portage would look like and they say that they would revamp the downtown Central YMCA and they would have an open pool area with glassed walls and so on, so that the people, the pedestrians, going by could see those that were in the swimming pool having their daily workout. Now I can't see where the persons using the YMCA facility want to be fish in a glass bowl to start with, and what good would that do the downtown pedestrian wandering by?

The Minister of Labour - I know he has been an attendant at the Y in the past and I don't know if he's

been there the last few years or not, but it is a co-ed facility now and things have now changed considerably in the last few years over there, but I can't see such a facility being incorporated into a downtown plaza approach and so on.

Taxpayers are constantly asking myself and members of our caucus when are we going to see some concrete results in the downtown area and when are we going to see the money well spent and some rejuvenation into the downtown area? One of the biggest problems that the city has always faced is the unfair assessments that faces downtown business people, when you see places like the Westin Hotel being assessed at \$3.40 a square foot and places opposite the current downtown Eaton's store, on the north side of Portage, being assessed at \$32.96 a square foot, just about 10 times as much. No wonder we have a decaying north side of Portage Avenue. Then you see places such as the shopping centres, the five major shopping centres that surround Winnipeg; the St. Vital, Kildonan Place, Unicity and Garden City Shopping Centres are all assessed at 25 cents per square foot, yet Polo Park, the one that is expanding, is assessed at three times that and it's the only one of the three that's in the inner city area of the total area of the City of Winnipeg and yet it's assessed at three times that, but the owners of such a shopping centre are proceeding and are going to have a major upgrading of that shopping centre.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this government and the future government that follows them are facing a number of urban problems; one is taxation. In our day we used to give the City of Winnipeg block funding and try to stay out of the day-to-day operations of the City of Winnipeg as much as possible. This government has gone away from the block funding and gone back to funding them under the old arrangement, piece-by-piece, instead of under the block funding arrangement, which I think is a far better one. But then again, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that if we had block funding it wouldn't be my right to stand here and voice a personal opinion, the firemen versus the cutting of boulevards.

So, Mr. Speaker, another area that I would like to take some time and discuss with the people is the tourism area. In the tourism area in the Province of Manitoba I find it kind of odd that the Premier has added staff to his department and to various departments to try and build up his image, politically - 124 new staff persons - and this is from an article that appeared in the December 22nd edition of the Free Press - at an average salary of \$30,000 which works out to a total cost of \$3.7 million. In this year's Estimates that were just released the other day, the total tourism budget for the Province of Manitoba is the equivalent amount, \$3.7 million. So the image building of the current government is going to cost us just as much as this government is going to spend on lowering non-Manitobans into Manitoba during this upcoming and forthcoming tourism season.

The Minister was in attendance a week ago in Brandon at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Tourist Association of Manitoba's Convention, and I call it the Tom and Jerry Show, because Tom McMillan, the Federal Minister, was there and our own Minister of Tourism was there. The two of them were talking about signing a new tourism agreement, but it hadn't been passed by their various cabinets, so therefore they

couldn't make the announcement at that time. But some time later in this spring, perhaps in April, the Federal Minister will be back in Manitoba and at that time the two governments will sign a new tourism package. In the meantime, the two of them had to say nice things about each other and pat each other on the back. I don't think I've ever been to a meeting that wasn't organized by government that had more of a patting of one another on the back, and therefore I refer to it as the Tom and Jerry Show.

I'm afraid I'm going to have to speak to some of my federal counterparts, because even though the Prime Minister said that he was going to have a government that went out and sought and consulted with people and wanted to know what they wanted in the way of government action, I think that having his Federal Minister come out and say what a nice person Manitoba's Minister is, that he's easy to work with and he's not hard to get along with - they're both school teachers - and so on, it looks and sounds, Mr. Speaker, as if it was a carnival show and I'm not so sure that our Federal Minister should be going overboard to that extent.

Recently I was talking, Mr. Speaker, to the president of the Manitoba Restaurant Association, Mr. Doug Steven, and we were discussing the various aspects of government that affect his industry and some thoughts he had, and so on. He handed me a booklet that has his president's message in and on the back of the president's message it's got a short message from the former Minister, Mr. Uskiw, to the Restaurant Association expressing how the Department of Business Development and Tourism likes to work with the people in the restaurant industry.

I might note, Mr. Speaker, that Winnipeg has more restaurants per capita than any other city in Canada and has many persons employed in those restaurants.

Mr. Doug Steven, the president of the Restaurant Association, talks about some of the difficulties that are facing the food service industry. He says that over the years our industry has been significantly impacted by many legislative changes that have taken place. Primarily, those changes that have affected labour costs have been the most frustrating industrywide. Examples of these are the minimum wage increases, the payroll tax, unemployment insurance and workers' compensation increases. We all know that the workers' compensation premium increases have gone up dramatically in the last few years, unemployment insurance premiums for the employers have gone up dramatically.

He goes on to say that there are other specific changes such as the unwieldy price increases in the liquor area. Just on Saturday - it wasn't even in the Budget - but Saturday in the paper you'll see where liquor prices are going to be going up, but it wasn't mentioned in the Budget on Thursday night. Again, he goes on to say that Manitobans are going to have the highest liquor prices of any of the western provinces. One of the things that we've always tried in the past to do is keep our prices in line with the Provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan. Now we're ahead of both of them and greatly ahead of them.

Mr. Steven goes on to say that today \$1 in \$3 are spent dining out and this is going to increase to \$1 in \$2 or 50 percent by the end of the current decade. He

said that they're facing some major changes in the food industry and one of the changes that is occurring in the food industry is that people are going more to the takeout type of food services, because they can get it cheaper and they don't have to go into a restaurant where taxes are forcing the restaurant proprietor to force his prices way up. So the restaurant industry is going through some dramatic changes, Mr. Speaker, and wages, taxes and liquor prices, as well as food prices, are having a great bearing on the restaurant industry.

At the Brandon Conference that I made reference to a few moments ago, the Department of Tourism put on a presentation and they mentioned how they were changing the emphasis of their advertising this year, where the primary area is going to be the State of Minnesota. It's been noted by the tourism industry that the Province of Manitoba last year suffered a 14 percent decline in tourism from the State of North Dakota and that the Province of Saskatchewan went up by 10 percent. But the Province of Saskatchewan in the last three years, Mr. Speaker, has more than doubled their tourism budget and have gone out with a very aggressive program to lure North Dakotans into that province. What they have done is they have taken the tourist business that normally would come to Manitoba away from here and into the Province of Saskatchewan, but I find it rather odd, Mr. Speaker, that now Manitoba has changed its emphasis and we're going to work on the Minnesota market, and particularly the Minneapolis market.

On June 26th of this year, Mr. Speaker, in the Minneapolis area is when the race track in that area opens up for business. It will be the first time that we will have had a race track between Winnipeg and Chicago, and therefore the persons from about as far away as Crookston, Minnesota, and Fargo, North Dakota, are going to have a choice. Do they come up to Winnipeg to go the track here and enjoy a weekend of racing and hospitality in the Winnipeg area, or do they go to Minneapolis and go to the new track that's going to be established and opening up in late June of this year? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that nine out of ten of the persons that are from at least 150 to 200 miles from the City of Winnipeg are going to go to the Minneapolis track.

So I hope that this government, in its wisdom, by spending more money with a greater degree of emphasis in the Minneapolis area, know what they're doing. But at the same time, the same Minister is responsible for the Horse Racing Commission and we've gone through a winter of nothing but hell, Mr. Speaker, at the race track between the incompetent judges that are in place and judges that have come from Ontario that took positions away from Manitobans that appeared to be competent and do an adequate job, and they've come into Manitoba with one thing in mind and that is to prove to the Manitoba horsemen that they know better and they know how to run racing in Manitoba because they have some experience in the Toronto area.

Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we need Mr. Robert Topley, the supervisor of racing, and I don't think that we need Mr. Leby who is the senior judge who is at loggerheads day in and day out with the horsemen here in Winnipeg.

What has happened in the last few years is we've had 100 days of standard-bred racing over the winter at Assiniboia Downs. This didn't exist three or four years ago. It's a new-found industry. It's an expanded industry from a short summer season that took place throughout rural Manitoba. What we are doing, these two individuals in their manner of trying to deal with the Manitoba horsemen, are killing the industry.

It is a difficult industry to run. You're running horses in temperatures of 30 below and you're having attendance at the track of around 1,000 per night. You're asking the track people to heat the facility for the fans, to provide extra facilities because of the extreme weather conditions for the horsemen and, yet, you've got a few unrealistic judges who set down fines and days of suspensions to horsemen because their horses don't run in January as fast as they do in the month of June.

It's impossible for a horse or anyone to run in extreme cold weather like that and, yet, because their times are not measuring up, they're being saddled with fines and suspensions. The drawback to the suspensions is that it puts the horsemen out of business for a two, three, four, day period or even up to a two-week period where he loses all of his revenue.

The fines haven't been all that great. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the horsemen are not sitting back and taking this idly. They have gone and sought out legal counsel. Mr. Lawrence Greenberg or Mr. Mark O'Neill and these people have gone to court on three occasions on behalf of the horsemen and have had the courts overrule decisions that the Horse Racing Commission has come down with in the past.

Mr. Greenberg, in representing the horsemen, knows that these people are not wealthy people, that many of them are just scratching out a living, that many of them farm in the summertime and supplement their farm incomes by being in the horse racing business, and it's the love of the horse racing business that keeps them in it. It's not because of the dollars that they're earning.

Mr. Greenberg had a meeting with the Minister regarding the Racing Commission and when he had the meeting, he asked the Minister if he could come and talk to the Minister in a frank and open way and discuss the handling of racing by this current Racing Commission.

So what does the Minister responsible for Horse Racing do? He invites the commission to sit in on the meeting. So, right away, Mr. Greenberg is handicapped and can't have a frank and open discussion with the Minister as to why he thinks and what he thinks is going wrong with the Racing Commission because the Minister won't meet him one to one. He has to have his support staff there and, yet, the person is coming to discuss the support staff and, and yet the Minister won't meet him.

Anyway, on Friday last, Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question of mine, the Minister said that he would meet the new president of the Standard Bred Horsemen's Association and he would meet that person without staff. We are starting to make some progress.

The next thing that we're going to have to do, Mr. Speaker, is have a long hard look at why this government, in its wisdom, has had three different Ministers in three years that have been responsible for

the Horse Racing Commission. We have had three different chairmen of the Horse Racing Commission in three years. We've had a lot of personnel changes.

There were people who are well educated and competent who reside in Manitoba that could be acting in the roles of judge or as the racing supervisor, but no, in the wisdom of this Horse Racing Commission they felt that they had to go outside the province and get somebody. When they couldn't get the person from the United States they wanted because of immigration problems, they went down to Eastern Canada and got two, what I consider, incompetent persons, brought them out here and the tracks in Eastern Canada just waved goodbye to them and loved seeing them leave. They were a thorn in the side when they were down in Eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of comments about business development and I would say that in listening to the previous speaker, the Minister of Community Service in talking about business development in Manitoba and how persons representing the same industries would come to her office and, yet, ask for completely different things in the way of assistance from government.

I think if this government is interested in seeing technology in Manitoba advance, seeing business advance in Manitoba, in broadening the tax base in Manitoba, they've got to look at the area of taxation and the taxes that they have in place in Manitoba, and as has been said almost every speaker from this side of the House, that one tax that they have got to eliminate if they really want to instill confidence in the businessman and the proprietors of business and have them enhance their business opportunities and enhance the numbers of persons that they employ, that is do away with that disastrous tax called the payroll tax - the wage tax as I call it. I think that if they did nothing but that, it would be a step in the right direction for gaining some confidence with that sector of Manitoba.

I know, Mr. Speaker, they will never do that because the businessman has never been their friend. They might as well penalize them. One thing that is on the record and has been said by many persons, but most distinctly by our Leader, the Leader of the Opposition, is that when we form the next government, we are doing away with the payroll tax. I say that will be the most progressive tax move that has been seen in ages.

Mr. Speaker, if we can do something like they did in Ontario today; the Premier of Ontario today called a general election. Maybe the Premier opposite will muster up enough courage in the near future, Mr. Speaker, and call a general election, the Conservatives will form the next government and we will do away with that bad payroll tax.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have an opportunity to say a few words in respect to the Budget that my colleague, the Minister of Finance presented to the House. I regret the fact that I wasn't in the Chamber to applaud his presentation. I was home with a cold. I had an opportunity to read the speech and I was impressed with the thoroughness of the

examination of the problems that face Manitoba from a fiscal point of view. The very forthright presentation of this government's concerns in respect to fairness, in respect to taxation, and it is in that area that I wish to address a few remarks, Mr. Speaker.

I know members opposite are concerned to criticize and that is their role. When they criticize a particular tax, I assume that they do so concerned that perhaps some alternative tax should be pursued. Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, I don't hear that from members opposite. I have indicated on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, that it is incumbent on an opposition that intends to govern at some time, to indicate its course of action in respect to fiscal policies and tax policies. Where it condemns the tax that the government has, it should be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to offer constructive advice as to where the government should be taxing.

Mr. Speaker, you'll recall and members will recall that we've heard nothing from the opposition in any way suggesting areas where the government should be taxing and isn't taxing. They imply, Mr. Speaker, and there is some division opposite, that if they were in government, they would do things differently. They would tax differently, but they haven't said where they're going to tax differently. Some members over there may support an increased sales tax, but they don't say that, Mr. Speaker. They have their hidden agenda and they will not offer to the people of Manitoba the benefit of their wisdom as to where Manitoba Government should tax today. They criticize the health and education levy, and yet they offer no alternative. Yet, they know that in sister provinces, large companies are already paying that kind of a levy to ensure that their employees have health and medical benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in this province, we eliminated premium taxes. That was a major shift of the imposition of tax in this province. Conservatives in this province were very unhappy about that. Mr. Speaker, Conservatives elsewhere in Canada support premium taxes and I would certainly like, during the course of this Budget Debate, to hear members opposite say that they disagree with Alberta and they disagree with Ontario, that have premium taxes. They're not based on any principle of ability to pay. That fixed levy goes on the back of taxpayers whether they earn \$12,000 or \$100,000 a year and that isn't equitable, Mr. Speaker, and I don't hear any Conservative spokesperson in this province being critical of that kind of fiscal, that kind of tax policy in other Tory provinces. It's high time that Conservative spokesmen in this province stand up and be counted on tax measures, not just continue to hide and fudge and say, oh if we were in government we'd do things differently. They don't say how they're going to do things differently.

Perhaps they followed the logic of the former Federal Minister of Finance, who is now the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, who said, "Look, we're not going to tell the people what we're going to do because it would frighten them. We've got to have that hidden agenda. They wouldn't vote for us." And we have people in Ottawa who, quite frankly, recognize that they can't be open and tell all of their plans because they're going to frighten people. But we don't have any encumbrance upon this opposition. They're free to make all sorts of statements. They're not in government. Why aren't they open and constructive about their advice to

government? Why don't they demonstrate to the people of Manitoba that they're ready, willing and able and fit to govern, should they be given the nod come the next provincial election. Tell the people of Manitoba where you stand in respect to fiscal policy.

No, Mr. Speaker, they don't do that. They kind of pay lip service to the demand we had with Ottawa for fair sharing of tax credits. I admit that they have joined in representation, but they were put on the spot, Mr. Speaker, and only when they were put on the spot did they come forward and co-operate, and even now when we put the \$72 million in our Budget, because it is due to this province, they criticize it. I have heard speeches in this House critical of the fact that we put the \$72 million as anticipated revenue from the Federal Government in our Budget. Why shouldn't we, Mr. Speaker? The Honourable member from Turtle Mountain who made representation, admitted that that money was due to Manitoba. As a matter of fact, he said there was more due to Manitoba. Well, why the carping criticism about putting the \$72 million in the Budget and saying we have a hidden game here? What kind of a game are they playing, Mr. Speaker? Are they with us or against us? Are they with the people of Manitoba or against them? The people of Manitoba would like to know.

They seem to speak on two sides of every issue, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that honourable members are not talking about is fairness in taxation. They say that the education and health levy is an unfair tax because it somehow hurts the employers. Well, I haven't heard that ground swell from employers, but I admit the Chamber of Commerce is saying things about that and we have to listen to that concern, but major modifications were made in respect to the health and education levy, so the bulk of small business isn't affected by that levy, only the large employers; large employers who, in Ontario, are paying for health and educational levy because they have to ensure that their employees have that coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't hear members opposite saying, look, if we're concerned about the deficit, we want to continue the program, we would see another point or two on the sales tax. No, we don't hear anything like that, and I haven't heard thus far demands that we cut further programs, cut the fat, because they know the fat isn't there. There isn't any fat, Mr. Speaker.

So where are the members coming from? Well, where are they going? Do they know? You know, there was a time when there were Conservatives in Canada who had some concern about equity in taxation, but that was yesteryear. And my colleague, the Minister of Finance, alluded to those, I would say, reasonably "Progressive" Conservatives of yesteryear, when the Right Honourable John George Diefenbaker appointed Kenneth Carter, who headed a Commission and they studied tax in Canada and they made representations. But then the boys in Bay Street told John that he couldn't do it and the great Conservative Party knuckled under again to vested interests in Canada and no change was made in the tax system in this country.

Then we had another government, a Liberal Government. What did they do about taxation? They sure didn't help, Mr. Speaker. They increased the loopholes, the dodges and the diversions, such that there's been a dramatic shift in taxation in this country.

Someone will say, Al, you're overdramatizing when you say a "dramatic shift." You're putting it on too heavy, Al, but that is not so.

In 1954 the Federal Government of the Day collected \$1.17 billion in income tax from individuals compared to \$1.05 billion it had collected from corporations, almost 50-50, Mr. Speaker. Now, 30 years later, the gap has widened dramatically to the corporations' advantage. In 1982 Ottawa collected \$26 billion in income tax from individuals - and hold your breath, Mr. Speaker - only \$8 billion from corporations. This means that individuals were shouldering 76 percent of the tax burden compared to the corporations' 24 percent. Remember, it was about 50-50 in 1954, that was under successive years of Conservative and Liberal Governments in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, those parties in office in Ottawa were responding to the demands of Bay Street, a Bay Street that John George Diefenbaker couldn't control because his party wouldn't let him control Bay Street; a party, a so-called Progressive Conservative Party, whose spokespersons in Bay Street made sure that John George Diefenbaker had a short rein. He was a hope for reform in the west, reform of a political party in the west, and a lot of people followed John believing that with his kind of inspiration they would see dramatic change in taxation in Canada. It didn't happen because that so-called "progressive" party ensured that John George Diefenbaker couldn't pursue equity in taxation across this country. And so the Kenneth Carter Commission did a very effective job of looking at taxation in Canada, and that report sits on a shelf gathering dust, Mr. Speaker, and it's shame - shame on the Progressive Conservative Party, shame on the so-called Liberal party of Canada for the inequity in taxation that exists in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in the last federal election the Honourable Edward Broadbent, that effective, eloquent Leader of our party nationally, exposed the leaders of both the Liberal and Conservative parties on this issue to the point where they finally admitted, both of them, that they would ensure that there was a base of taxation in this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will wait and see whether we're going to get a fairer taxation policy in this country, or are Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mulroney going to be frightened off again by the people who call the tune for the Conservative Party in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, I'm given to understand, in mentioning the equalization formula that I talked about earlier, that the Honourable Member for Lakeside had said that they had agreed to the 1982 Liberal equalization formula of 83-87, that is that we had agreed to that; and he knows, Mr. Speaker, that we opposed it all the way. Last December, the Leader of the Opposition had to withdraw statements that it was a bilateral agreement. That's the kind of doublespeak they follow across the way. That's the kind of doublespeak they follow.

Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of doublespeak that is destructive of fairness and equity in this country. I alluded to the shift in taxation in this country, a shift in taxation which, rather than having been rectified in any way in recent years, has been worsened. Earlier in this House I took time to elaborate on the tremendous amount of money that has been allowed by Liberal and Conservative Governments to be left owing to the people of Canada, left owing. In account receivable,



perhaps - deferred taxes they call them - no intention on the part of the companies to ever pay those taxes, but what's worse, they don't even pay interest on them, Mr. Speaker.

I have referred members in this House to my speech on this subject matter earlier and how in heaven's name, how in the sense of justice or equity, how can we expect that farmers, small businessmen, workers in this country can approach the question of income tax feeling proud to be associated and giving of what they have earned, because they are sharing responsibilities for government in Canada, when there is this vast deferral of tax by corporations, completely unfair; no payment of interest, billions and billions of dollars.

The Auditor-General talked about the loopholes - \$35 billion I think he said, \$50 billion annually. Mr. Speaker, how can honourable members not be concerned? I haven't heard them speak about that. Are they afraid to offend their friends in the large corporations? A lot of their constituents, Mr. Speaker, are farmers, small businessmen who, when they make a dollar, have to pay tax. You know, the great Conservative Party sent out a group to hear the problems of businessmen and farmers in this country before the election. They did a good job of that, a lot of window dressing and they heard the complaints of the small businessmen who are being hounded by the tax man, but what have we heard to provide relief for small businessmen and farmers? They continue to support the financial policies of Wall Street and Bay Street for higher interest, and open markets for agricultural goods. Their depth of sincerity and respect to the cares of the farmer and the small businessmen are very very scant, Mr. Speaker.

They heard at that task force that the Federal Conservatives sent out - it was very skilfully done before the last election - they heard those problems, but what have we heard coming from the Federal Government or from Conservatives opposite about what they're going to do about the scandalous ripoff of tax by large corporations in this country? I haven't heard a word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, these kind of dollars that are being taken away from the public is not merely misfeasance, in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, that is a crime, a crime against society, that people should be allowed to withdraw from the public purse that kind of money because that's what they're doing; and when the little man, desperate for something, and it's happened many times, has been so desperate that he's tried to take from his neighbour, when he or she does that, we justifiably say, that's wrong. That is against the public will to take someone else's property and when that happens they're challenged, quite properly, by enforcement officers and they're brought before courts of justice and they have to face the penalty; but when large corporations drain off billions of dollars from the public, don't pay any interest on it, don't care, members opposite don't breathe a word of criticism.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you there's something wrong when you have a society that imprisons the small person for petty theft, but to the large corporations who drain off vast billions of dollars, they say nothing. Their silence speaks volumes, Mr. Speaker, of old line parties that have lost their will to see justice and equity.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** No, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether the Minister would permit a question at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted at any time to answer the member's questions. I know the honourable member likes often to divert anyone who is speaking, he often rises on points of order, makes a small speech and returns to his seat. I know the honourable member's techniques and I'm most happy to accommodate him at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, obviously, members opposite are becoming quite uncomfortable, and so they should be because they speak out and defend a system that is beyond defence. They should be turning blue and be just full of annoyance and irritation that they represent, and have represented in government in Ottawa, parties that had the power to effect real equity in taxation, but their party didn't do it.

**A MEMBER:** You will never have that opportunity.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Rather, they destroyed a leader who sought to do things like that.

**A MEMBER:** You did; you guys brought down the government so you could put your buddy, Trudeau, back in.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the record of what the Conservative Party did with John George Diefenbaker is in the history books and what they want to say about it - I'm interested to hear what they want to say about it - but the West thought they had a champion in John George Diefenbaker, but the Ontario boys won out and I'm going to be very watchful about what happens with this champion for the West in the present Prime Minister. There's a good smile, it comes across very well, but the hope for the West was that he was really going to be able to respond for the West, but then people in Quebec and Ontario thought, hey, you know there's change coming here and we better be with it. Now we're going to be very very watchful in the West as to how fair this government in Ottawa is going to be in respect to our concerns.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns I have, as a participant in government in Manitoba, is this whole fascination on the part of the new right with deregulation, free markets, all sorts of liberal ideas in respect to the economy, very liberal ideas. Let the old laws of supply and demand look after things. I know that honourable members opposite like those concepts. They like the idea, for example, that large syndicates of private money speculate on currency, I think that's a great business; people can - you know it's private enterprise - people can make fortunes overnight. They

can speculate on the Deutsche Mark; they speculate on the pound; they speculate on the dollar. They have a dramatic effect, these vast pools of money on the value of currency. Mr. Speaker, that's a wonderful arrangement. That's private enterprise; that's free market. There's no rationality to our fiscal arrangements internationally, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is no rationality in this system. We never hear concerns opposite, Mr. Speaker, that there should be rationality; there should be some regulation; there should be some basic worth of a country's currency. Canada's currency shouldn't be the fractional value of the American dollar now. We represent, from a resource base, much much greater security to our dollar than the American dollar. But these flights of capital are allowed unchecked. Honourable members say that's the way it should be. I say no, Mr. Speaker, there is a place for regulation. A place for regulation to make sure that our system is operated in a fair and reasonable manner. Honourable members are opposed to regulation.

Mr. Speaker, that is the new line from down south. Kick out the regulations. Let the market forces prevail. Let it be survival of the fittest. Mr. Speaker, that's what we had in the 19th Century. That's a return to the 19th Century. If that kind of logic prevails, then you do the same thing in respect to health care, don't you? So, let the healthy survive. Oh no, if a person is really sick, why, we will give them a little charity. We will dole out a little bit of medicine for them. We will see that not too many go too early to the grave. We will be charitable. The democratic socialist thrust, the development of the welfare state has been developed on the concept that we are our brothers' and sisters' keepers. There is a way in which we can assure a reasonable standard of living for everyone. It's all there, Mr. Speaker, but all the members want to continually go back to the law of the jungle where there is no regulation.

I appeal to members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to reflect that Conservatives should be full regulation, reasonable regulation. They are opposed to that now, Mr. Speaker. That concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because if that kind of philosophy continues to be the prevailing philosophy within the Conservative Party, and that is typical of the Conservative Party across the country, we're in for a very rough ride. Because everyone of the hard-fought, undergirding social programs that we have in this country will be placed in jeopardy. I would like to hear members opposite saying that is never the road they're going to take. We seem to have this prevailing sense throughout the country, you know Canada has resources, we're open for business - that's what the Premier of Saskatchewan said. We scrapped FIRA. We're not worried about the American companies coming in and taking over. We're up for sale. The Federal Government said no, there are some areas, Mr. Speaker, that we won't sell, we won't give them up.

One of those areas, Mr. Speaker, is the fabric that holds this nation together, that's our culture. They said no. The Progressive Conservative Party in Canada said no, through the Federal Government, no, we're not going to give that up. But where are the first cuts to come? Where is the first slashing to take place? - CBC, the arts.

Mr. Speaker, a very telling statement was made by one of the performing arts groups that attended at the

mass appeal - I was privileged to attend that appeal - at the Manitoba Theatre Centre. He said, and I wish the Honourable Member for Pembina, in particular, would listen . . .

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** . . . he said, Mr. Speaker, "How many in this audience remember the name of the Finance Minister when Beethoven was composing his music?" That's a very telling statement, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Pembina says "It didn't tell him a thing." Mr. Speaker, that is the depth of understanding of the honourable member in respect to the value of the arts, the value of our culture. — (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Pembina from his chair is calling me a fool. He can call me any names he wishes, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — but I believe that question that was asked is of very great meaning.

If in this country, Mr. Speaker, we are going to take an attitude toward our culture and our arts where we don't care, we're not prepared to ensure the protection of our arts and our culture, we're prepared to take the cheap route and see the people of this province and the people of this country engulfed with the culture of our great neighbour to the south, we won't have any independence, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, these are the words and these are the actions of a Conservative Party in Canada that frighten me.

Mr. Speaker, derisive comments from members opposite presently when I am trying to indicate to the House my concern for the fabric of this province and this country, our social fabric, the differences that we prize, because we are a different country than the United States. We love our neighbours both. We have no reason to quarrel with our neighbours to the north or to the south. We have the two longest undefended borders of any country in the world, both to the north and to the south. We have no reason to pick quarrels with either of our neighbours. We want to continue to enjoy that free flow of exchange between our neighbours, but Mr. Speaker, we want to protect the beautiful differences that exist between us and our neighbours. Our greater measure of freedom as against our neighbours to the north. In respect to our neighbours to the south, the kind of undergirding of human and social values which we have crafted in this country over the course of decades under prodding of social democrats in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we want to protect what we have. We don't want to see that eroded by doctrinaire, political concepts of a party that appears to be prepared to turn back into the 19th Century.

I challenge the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the remainder of this debate to disassociate themselves from Conservative analysts and Conservative spokesmen who say that we have to deregulate, that we have to cut the arts, that we have to cut the CBC. Mr. Speaker, I want to hear members opposite stand up and say it is time that we had fair taxation in Canada; taxation that is based on ability to pay, not on the basis of how good your tax lawyer is or your tax accountant is or how many loopholes you can take advantage of in the present system.



Because Mr. Speaker, the system as it is now maintained is a travesty, is not mere injustice to the people of Manitoba and Canada, from my sense of perspective, it is a crime.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other concerns I have that I do want to lay on the record fairly early, is my concern for the attitude of the present Federal Government in Ottawa in respect to matters dealing with defence and the arms industry.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled and ashamed when the former Minister of Defence bad-mouthed a group of people who are concerned to demonstrate for peace in this country. He characterized them as foolish and at the time that these demonstrators for peace were expressing their concern, they were expressing their concern about the urgings, the solicitations of American armaments manufacturers and buyers that Canada ought to get more involved in bidding on arms purchases. Mr. Speaker, that frightened me.

We know the power of the arms industry in the United States and the Soviet Union and other parts of the world. We know the power of the arms industry and how important it is in France and Israel and other countries and how devastating is the tremendous wastage of billions of dollars — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye thinks this is a silly speech from his derisive comments that are being made from his seat. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of money that's being spent in the world for arms to destroy people is not silly. It's a travesty for companies to be coming to Manitoba and other parts of Canada saying, get involved; get involved in this business of creating arms, manufacturing arms, because it's a great business. No, it just keeps growing and growing because President Reagan continues to inflate the cost of the Pentagon's spending on arms.

Where is the end to this, Mr. Speaker? There is no end to the arms manufacturing, but members opposite think that it's silly that I would be concerned about that kind of initiative. They want to get more Canadian firms involved in building tanks and technological equipment for arms, so that we're more entrapped and more enslaved in that whole arms industry. And it wasn't a flaming patriot for socialism who indicated concern about this growing, terrific power of the arms industry in the United States. You know who it was, Mr. Speaker? It was Dwight Eisenhower. When he left the presidency, he made a speech and I'd like honourable members to read that speech, showing the gravest concern for the development of the power and influence of the arms industry and the military in the United States, pleading that legislators in the United States take recognition of that growing threat to the independence of economic initiative and political policy on the part of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of thing now, apparently, that the Prime Minister of this country is saying to Canada. He's saying in that joking way - he tried to trap I suppose or make the Honourable Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry uncomfortable - how about 10,000 jobs in the arms industry in Winnipeg-Fort Garry? He thinks that's funny. Mr. Speaker, I think that's obscene. It's obscene that he should suggest that we are prepared to get involved in the arms industry, and that we don't care. We do care in this province. What we do in this province is try and develop jobs for people,

to develop useful goods, to develop a better way of life for the people of Manitoba and Canada and throughout the world. We don't want to put our money, our investments, in the development of guns.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned to see the initiatives in Manitoba and Canada, such that they work to the good of not only Manitobans and Canadians, but all mankind. We are involved in a ridiculous spending spree throughout the world on arms; money that is being wasted; money that otherwise could produce homes, health, clothing, food for the millions of people in the world.

But no, we're involved in this reckless arms spending spree and we have people in this country who are saying, get involved. Get involved, Mr. Speaker, because that's the thing to do. It's time that honourable members said surely there is another way. There's another way to produce jobs. I plead with honourable members, face up to the realities of today; face up to the fact that we are wasting our resources in this world. We have an unjust society. We have a society where the rich don't pay taxes, where the poor and the farmers have to pay taxes, and they go broke; they're turfed out by the banks or anyone else if they don't pay their fees.

But who is speaking up for the farmers? Who is speaking up for the small business? Who is speaking up for the small people who want to stop the arms race? Well, members of the Conservative Party aren't speaking up for peace. They deride those who stand for peace. They applaud those who want to make money on arms and they criticize the farmers as the fat cats in this country, Mr. Speaker. It's time that we started hearing from opposite, some constructive, useful suggestions in respect to how we should develop alternative forms of justice and fairness and equity in taxation in this province and in this country.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to speak on and support my leader's amendment with respect to the Budget of 1985.

Mr. Speaker, when one attempts to assess, firstly, the Budget and, secondly, this person who just spoke, one attempts to put a caption as to what we just heard and what was described in the Budget. I suppose I'm reminded of that song and I believe it was Jane Morgan - I'm sure the Member for Lakeside would recall that song, "Is That All There Is"? Do you remember that song?

**MR. H. ENNS:** That's an old favourite. "Is That All There Is"?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Remember how the song went with that very steamy and sensuous low voice of - I believe it was Jane Morgan? Mr. Speaker, if you remember the words to that song there was some reference to it, "Let's have a ball if that's all." You read this Budget and there's nothing to have a good time in respect to the Budget of 1985.

Mr. Speaker, I was totally prepared to write down every meaningful announcement the night the Minister

of Finance brought forward the Budget and this is how much I found of interest.

**A MEMBER:** Why did you save it?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, I thought I should save it to show the Member for River East. I thought he might like it - or the Member for Thompson who likes to do research, Mr. Speaker.

As I review all the Budgets over the last four years, something struck me and it's the constant use of the word "emerge" or "emerging" - we seem to be pulling out of this - or the word "recovery." Mr. Speaker, I don't have the time that I had hoped to go through and quote from all the Budgets, but you find interesting comments where the government, for instance, in 1982 in the Address said, "We are facing a . . ."

**A MEMBER:** An incompetent government.

**MR. C. MANNES:** That's right. They say it's only time, probably only time before the recovery comes now that we're back into power.

Go to '83, Mr. Speaker. On Page 8, it says, "Despite problems in numbers of sectors, the impact of the recession on Manitoba was among the least severe on any province in Canada last year. The latest Conference Board Estimates suggest that along with Saskatchewan, we experienced the second lowest decline." On Page 10, "In its latest forecast, the Conference Board has predicted that Manitoba's economy will grow at close to the national average in '83."

If one wants to look at the Budget of '84, you have these comments. It says on Page 11, "Now that we appear to be emerging from the recession . . ." and it says on Page 6, Mr. Speaker, that it is evident our province is at a take-off point for a number of meaningful, economic developments. This was in 1984.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Good times are here again.

**MR. C. MANNES:** So, Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the Budget of 1985 and I hear the word again "emerging", and I hear the word "recovery", I wonder what has happened in four years. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously nothing. Again, I suppose, one could pose the question, is this recovery around the corner and is Manitoba the best off during these impoverished times?

I suppose my reaction is best captured with a little story I heard the other day. It happened in a foreign country where Ivan pushed out of the Strohorsky (phonetic) Communal Manufacturing every evening a wheelbarrow full of straw. The police knew that he was stealing; they knew he was stealing something and they put all their scientists to work and they meticulously looked at all the straw and they microscopically looked at all the straw. They asked the highest and the most learned scientists in the land to look at the straw, Mr. Speaker, and of course they found nothing; they found absolutely nothing. They could not indict Ivan, but they knew he was taking something. They went through this a number of times and finally they were prepared to grant him immunity and move him to the council in the community, the political council that ran the affairs of

the community, if he would only tell them what it was he was stealing. Then he told them, well, what I'm stealing is wheelbarrows.

Mr. Speaker, as I assess the Budget of 1985, I depict a grand larceny of sorts and it's not in the area of the straw, with respect to the transfer from one department of monies to the other - although that is meaningful and that's significant - but, Mr. Speaker, the wheelbarrow is being stolen, \$1.8 billion worth of wheelbarrows over the last four years, the grand larceny of stealing from the future generations for years to come. Let's put into perspective quickly what it is that this NDP Government has done for the last four years, when you look at a \$300 million deficit in 1982 and three consecutive deficits in the area of \$500 million. Mr. Speaker, it's grand larceny of the highest form.

The areas of straw, as I've said before, are identifiable. Of course, we have had many of our members speak to the fact that Jobs Fund money has been taken out of various departments and brought to that highly imaged area of government, sold under the guise of a green sign and a lot of noise. We've talked about the massive increase in Executive Council support and of course the support for hired NDP hacks; and of course the support for NDP constituencies, which we haven't been able to document in a fullest form yet, Mr. Speaker, but in time we will. We will uncover, I'm sure, some major horror stories of how this government has directed the funds of the province to support their own geographical and their own electoral divisions.

Mr. Speaker, the straw that has been carried away has been part financed through levies on jobs and of course on properties in support of education and yet we never hear any indication, any direction given to it.

We have the Minister of Municipal Affairs whose only initiative in that whole area of re-assessment was a new pamphlet, another pamphlet.

So this is the straw to very many, maybe not indictable, yet to the multitudes, although we will do our best, I can tell you, to make every Manitoban aware of the financial atrocities that this government has placed upon the backs of Manitobans today and Manitobans in the future.

I can hardly believe most of the reactions I have heard to this Budget. There seems to be a total lack of reference with respect to the deficit, other than what we are mounting as a political party. There seems to be a total disregard for the massive \$500 million deficit; there seems to be no mention whatsoever of the grand theft of a party from generations to come. Mr. Speaker, Ivan stole wheelbarrows under the nose of the police; the NDP today are stealing from succeeding generations at a most alarming rate.

What is so upsetting is they flaunt that theft before all of us and all Manitobans and societies. I suppose what is disturbing is our society, to some degree, sits back and watches. They do not indict and are prepared to grant immunity.

Mr. Speaker, it's a telling tale. If you listen to the conference, some of the comments that came out of the Prime Minister Mulroney's economic summit last week, you heard references by church leaders to the fact that we shouldn't talk in too much detail with reference to the Budget. I suppose an article that bothered me the most was an editorial offered within Maclean's about five or six weeks ago where the

editorial writer challenged all politicians to come up with a little bit more imaginative approach to the whole system of fiscal responsibility. In other words, they were saying, we've had enough talk about this word "deficit"; we've had enough problems with this problem of dealing. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what took the member so long to come out with their hackneyed phrases of, "tell us where," but moving back to the point I was trying to make, I see a society today that seems to be totally backing away from even discussing the whole area of deficits.

We had a professor from the University of Manitoba, Bellan, who says, don't worry about debt; it's the government's money or the government can print money or it's the Canadians' money, so therefore you don't have to pay it back. We even had a member within our party federally, Mr. Pocklington, who has come up with a method of doing away with all of debt.

Then you listen to our Minister of Finance here and he told us two years ago that we were emerging, that we had found a way, that recovery was around the corner. He led us to believe that it was only the next day that we'd be able to reduce the deficit of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, four years, \$1.8 billion of combined debt, and yet this Minister and this government just continues to move along the same path.

Mr. Speaker, I've done some assessment on this whole area - at least in my own mind - and of course my views are well known. I'm one who believes that we have to pay as we go. It doesn't come as any surprise. I'm not opposed to debt; I have my share of debt.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to accept the constant argument that comes from the people opposite that all this debt is being directed towards very worthy institutions. It is, Mr. Speaker. They figure that they can deflect all the criticism if we continue to say that all the debt has been going into the institutions of hospitals and fire halls and schools, as if some day there will never be a need for new hospitals, a need for new schools, a need for new fire halls.

Mr. Speaker, I've never heard the members opposite once indicate when in the next 20 years there'll be an opportunity, whether there'll be a 10-year span where we won't need money for those institutional necessities. Never, Mr. Speaker, it never happens because we know that it won't happen. We know that there will always be a requirement for those types of institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we see the members opposite in support, not of meaningless institutional requirements for our society, but using that as the argument that they can get away with the massive, massive debt. They steal the wheelbarrow.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that it's a very serious problem. — (Interjection) — Well, isn't it interesting that we have a comment from the Minister of Labour who on many occasions has risen to charge a large number of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members opposite if it's important that this whole area of debt be ever considered. I can't remember one of the first questions I posed to the First Minister. I asked him if there would ever be a day, if there'd ever be a time, when he could see where there would be some balance between expenditures and deficits, some opportunity where some of the debt could be reduced. The First Minister was very candid. He quite honestly said at that time,

no, he didn't expect there would ever be a time when they would ever be brought into balance, or certainly, that there would ever be a surplus of revenues over expenditures.

So, Mr. Speaker, from where is going to come? Where is it? Where are the bright spots? Well, they're certainly not within agriculture, if the members opposite realize that China no longer will sign a long-term agreement with us in the area of wheat exports. Of course, within the area of the Soviet Union, there's new leadership, and don't be surprised if incentives become the way of the farm community. We all know that incentives spur farmers on to produce.

What about the other resource areas, Mr. Speaker? What about the areas of lumber and minerals? Is there something there that will be our salvation? And manufacturing, Mr. Speaker. Some specific areas, yes. Of course, Mr. Speaker, in the large employment fields, the textiles and the manufacturing, there's nothing significant in the future as far as increasing employment and revenues.

So, where is it, Mr. Speaker? Where is all the exciting new area of economic thrust within this province, indeed, within this nation, that's going to pay back this deficit? I sense that members opposite and people who think like the members opposite are living on dreams and hope. To hope is to live, but to be unrealistic is to die and to die suddenly. I think that's where the members opposite, the people who are now in charge of government, are leading all of us.

Mr. Speaker, when are the deficits going to end? Well, I don't think it's going to happen obviously. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members opposite would laugh so hard if I had the time to quote Laxer. Mr. Speaker, who was this James Laxer, this person who left, who was the economic brainchild, the person who developed economic theory for the NDP federally? Who was this person who said these things?

"I have attempted to make a contribution to the evolution of the party's economic policies. In this process I have included the party's economic analysis and programs suffer from very real inadequacies. This is not a conclusion drawn lightly. It's one that I share very widely in the party and in the caucus."

He goes on. He says, "The problem as I see it is this. The NDP's analysis of economic and social evolution remains locked in the Fifties and the Sixties where it has its origins. It is now so seriously out of keeping with the reality of the 1980s that it has become a serious impediment, a barrier to appropriate action and a guide to it."

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, and he says, "The NDP's basic analysis of the economy bears a striking resemblance to the social democratic thought of the Fifties and Sixties. Although the particular issues are different, the fundamental approach has not changed. Tactical responses to specific situations have a tendency to become doctrine, blessed as the years go by."

Mr. Speaker, he says, "An endless succession of tactical adaptations to the social democratic thought of the past has left the NDP with an economic analysis of little value, an economic program that is a hodgepodge of contradictions and dead-end solutions."

He says, "The central idea of current NDP economic thought is that the Canadian economy suffers from a severe case of insufficient economic demand."

Of course, Mr. Speaker, that's the NDP - demand - the belief that you have jobs and all the problems are gone. The problem is, of course, they assume that you can guarantee full employment. They assume that if you borrow enough money and put people to work, you can prime that pump.

Mr. Speaker, the theory doesn't work. Why doesn't it work, Mr. Speaker? Well, Laxer goes on to say the reason is that Keynesian economics, of course, was meant for a different period of time. Mr. Speaker, in their essence, the Keynesian economic notions were these: Governments could solve the problem of unemployment and underutilization of industrial capacities. The government could itself create demand by spending money or by increasing purchasing power through tax cuts. Of course, such deficit financing would result in the consumption of goods and services and would thereby promote increased production.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the theory. As one James Laxer goes on to say, the theory has failed. Yet why do the members opposite, why do they not realize that you just can't continue to borrow and borrow and borrow forever without someday having the banker come and say, sorry it's all gone?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has had an opportunity, I'm sure, over the last three years to listen to many testimonials from individuals who were living on borrowed money, who were living on operating loans, and all of a sudden one day had a banker call them in and tell them that their operating loans had been cancelled. They were denied for the next year. Mr. Speaker, no doubt he has had them tell him the feeling of devastation that has come over them.

Sir, I have some of those same fears for Manitobans in the future, for those to come within, I say, as soon

as 10 years. When are the members opposite going to say to them when our bankers call us up and say there is no more; you are pushed off "the land"; you're finished. What will they say then? Mr. Speaker, they won't. Of course, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. C. MANNES:** . . . they will divert - that's right - they'll divert all the criticism to the banks and they'll divert it to those who have saved and have some means of coping and that's who they'll divert, all the . . . people.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, in my view a grand larceny in a fiscal sense has been committed with the laying down of this Budget. I feel this government cannot be granted any immunity by the people of this province and our party will do the best within its power over the next year, or however long it takes the members opposite to screw up their courage and call an election, we'll do our best to convince all Manitobans that no immunity should be shown this government.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the honourable member concluded his remarks?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 o'clock.