

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Thursday, 16 April, 1981**

**Time — 2:00 p.m.**

**BUDGET DEBATE**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** The Honourable Member for Inkster has 12 minutes.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. When we closed this morning I had indicated that the people of Manitoba as far as I have been able to ascertain, have certainly given up on a Conservative administration, that it is regarded with general hostility. Now that doesn't remove from the fact that there are some hard-core Conservatives who would support the Conservative party but then in general, the Conservatives are regarded with hostility. That hostility however has not found a base in view of the fact that the New Democratic party has put itself in a position as unable to realistically claim that it can represent all of the people of the Province of Manitoba — and I'm not going to dwell on that, Mr. Speaker because I have other things that I want to talk about — that there is accordingly a vacuum in the province and that the people of Manitoba are waiting to see whether there is a party that can fill that political vacuum. It's on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive party will be seeking the support of the population at the next provincial election.

I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the macroeconomic statistics that are generally paraded out and have been paraded out by successive governments of whatever political stripe, have really had no direct relationship to how individual families in the Province of Manitoba are able to enjoy a quality of life better than that which they previously enjoyed; and given the fact that the aim of any government is to create conditions which would enable individuals, not industries but individuals, to enjoy a better quality of life the Progressive party would, in power, use an entirely different set of indices to determine our performance.

The increase in gross national product is not necessarily that which determines whether the people of Manitoba are enjoying a better standard of life. I started, Mr. Speaker, to indicate what some of those indices are, and I'm certainly not going to be exhaustive and I'd certainly welcome somebody saying that you've left something out because if they've said that we've left it out and it makes sense, then we'll put it in.

Mr. Speaker, we would be wanting to know what the average income per family of five was and if that was going up we would recognize that we have done better, and if it was going down we would have recognized that it's going worse. We would want to know what the mean income for a family of five is. We would want to know, Mr. Speaker, what the ratio between the top 10 percent of income earners in the population are and the lower 10 percent of income earners in the population are and, Mr. Speaker, if that subjects me to the catcalls of Members of the Opposition that I'm back to Schreyer's two-and-a-half to one, I have no embarrassment whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. I have no embarrassment, Mr. Speaker,

in saying that our society would be better of if the lowest level income group and the highest level income group were closer together. And, if that is a problem, Mr. Speaker, if that is a problem for the Conservative party, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to go to the citizens. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in saying that I believe that our society would be a better one to live in if the lower income group now and the higher income group, if those two groups were closer together in income earning in the Province of Manitoba; and that will be a measurement, Mr. Speaker, I don't care. The honourable member calls it a socialist program and I gather from that, Mr. Speaker, that he means that the lower income groups should get less, the higher income group should get more and that would be a better society and that's a Conservative program, Mr. Speaker; that's the Conservative program]

Mr. Speaker, another index that the Progressive Party would look at to see whether conditions were improving in our society would be the percentage of income, Mr. Speaker, which was required for basic accommodations. If that went up we would say we are doing worse and if it went down we would say we are doing better. Because if you require 35 percent of your income for your accommodations as against 25 and have less disposable income, Mr. Speaker, than you are less free, not more free. That would be an index that we would look at. We would look, Mr. Speaker, at the percentage of family income that was required for basic food and clothing and if that went up, Mr. Speaker, we'd feel that the society was getting worse and if it went down, we'd feel that society was getting better. We would look, Mr. Speaker, at the number of families without automobiles. If that was reduced, Mr. Speaker, we would say that we have governed better. If it went up, Mr. Speaker, we'd say that it would be getting worse. We would look, Mr. Speaker, at the number —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks me if I would reduce ownership and land? I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive Party, if elected to power, would provide Manitobans with an additional freedom, an additional freedom. Not a single person would be required to sell land; not a single person would be required to rent land, but there would be, Mr. Speaker, available to our rural people in this province an opportunity which they do not have now. There would be available the opportunity to live a little richer and die a little poorer, only, Mr. Speaker, if —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Members, order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources will have a chance to take part in debate.  
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** A comment is made that a person has a right, which the honourable member availed

himself of. The honourable member was a farmer and availed himself of the right to rent land from the state, and he says, Mr. Speaker, that is communism, that is communism. Mr. Speaker, I say to you without any doubt whatsoever that the Progressive Party would certainly favour more freedom on the behalf of the rural people in our province rather than less freedom and if they have an additional option, that will be more freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we would look at the number of people leaving school and see at what age they are leaving and if that goes up, Mr. Speaker, we will have done worse; if it goes down, we will have done better, and all of these statistics, Mr. Speaker, will be read in a Budget Speech Address — our Minister of Finance will read the figure last year, read the figure this year, and show the improvement, or if it turns out that way, the lack of improvement and we will have to accept responsibility for it; not the gross national product, Mr. Speaker, but how that gross national product is used for the happiness of the people in the Province of Manitoba. We will look, Mr. Speaker, at the number of people engaged in post-secondary, vocational, academic or professional education and if that goes up, Mr. Speaker, we will say that we are doing better, and if it goes down we will say that we are doing worse. We will look at the income groups, Mr. Speaker, of the people who are availing themselves of post-secondary education, and if that goes up, we will say that we are doing better, if it goes down we will say that we are doing worse. We will look, Mr. Speaker, and it will be contained in the Budget Address. I give my undertaking now to the people of the Province of Manitoba and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that even amongst my former colleagues that anyone will say that when I said I would do something, I would do it.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there will be action, because once you assess yourself, Mr. Speaker, once you are prepared to measure your performance by a standard, there will be action. We will look, Mr. Speaker, there will be a statistic in the Budget Address as to the number of people who are receiving dental care, and we will see to it, Mr. Speaker, that our performance is judged on the basis of whether it goes up or down.

Now it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, we have had a Budget Address. Not one of these things is known to the Minister of Finance and yet he is very satisfied that he has a happy Budget. None of these things are known because the government doesn't measure its performance on that account. We will have as an index, Mr. Speaker, the number of rooms per family household to see whether people are living in lesser accommodations or better accommodations.

We will have an index which the honourable member doesn't give a damn about. Mr. Speaker, we'll have an index as to the number. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue my remarks and I'm not being permitted to do so and I want the record to show that because the Progressive Conservatives can't stand what they are hearing. I indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I am not now doing what they did, ripping down their performance. I am saying what will be the standard of performance of a Progressive government, and that's what they can't stand, Mr. Speaker.

We do think that it is important for us generally to know, for me to know, for the Member for Lakeside

to know, how many children in the Province of Manitoba are unable to have a summer vacation experience; I want to know how many. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if I reduce that by means of having a more just society, that I will not feel that I am a Marxist, Mr. Speaker. I feel that I will have done a service for the people of the Province of Manitoba.

We would look, Mr. Speaker, we would have as an index, the number of people who are employed. We would have an index as to the number of single parent families who are unable to avail themselves of child care facilities. Mr. Speaker, I undertake that we will have each one of those and we will have more. We will have more because I haven't exhausted the list of those things which make life a little easier to live. We are here, Mr. Speaker, to say that there is a better way of judging government performance than the dismal display that we got on Tuesday night.

Mr. Speaker, who would have ever thought that the Winnipeg Free Press could be more vituperative about the Conservative Party than I have. I said that Mr. Ransom — excuse me, the Minister of Finance, has held up a Frankenstein mask beside his head to try to make him look good beside the mask. The Free Press has got him running around like a babbling idiot. That's what they have done, Mr. Speaker, and that doesn't come from me, that comes from them.

We want, Mr. Speaker, to offer a Progressive alternative, and therefore, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following:

"And this House declares its want of confidence in the present government for the following reasons:

"1. The government has failed to facilitate the betterment of the human condition by making post-secondary vocational academic and professional education available at social rather than individual expense;

"2. The government has failed to maintain an option for the public of Manitoba to participate to the extent of at least 50 percent in the exploration and development of the mineral resources belonging to the people of the Province of Manitoba;

"3. The government has failed to exercise fiscal responsibility by seeing to it that its revenues keep pace with its expenditures;

"4. The government has failed to obtain a fair share of the revenues generated by the mineral wealth owned by the public;

"5. The government has failed to implement policies which would permit Manitobans to achieve self-realization through participation in productive employment."

Thank you.

#### **MOTION presented on the amendment.**

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

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with great interest to the speakers this morning and to the Leader of the Opposition last night and it seemed to me that the Member for Pembina kind of threw the Member for Inkster a little off track this morning. I believe he had lead him

down the garden path a wee bit and by the time he got organized and got fired up and presented his — I guess you'd have to call it his maiden political speech as the leader of the party — and I guess you would have to acknowledge that it would be tied into a formula or, I guess you would have to call it the gross national product happiness formula, and under it I'm sure that everyone will be smiling and everyone will be being looked after by the state and the big hand of socialism will again be at the throttle.

But again, Mr. Speaker, the arguments through all of the Throne speeches on the Budget Addresses, basically boil down to a philosophy. We feel our method is best, they feel their method is best and I don't believe that there's a great deal of difference between the NDP and the New Progressives except that, as I say, the formula that was unveiled here today probably will have a little bit of bearing on their tactics.

I'd like to take this opportunity of congratulating the new Minister of Finance and —(Interjection)— he was dubbed this morning Handsome Ransom and, of course, we on this side are quite happy to go along with that judgment, or whatever, of our Minister. We haven't run a popularity contest on him, but I do feel that he is not a blithering idiot as the former speaker seems to see the press representing him as.

It's interesting to watch the operation across the way also. We have a Party without a Leader, and a Leader without a Party. We don't have to have that particular thing on this side of the fence, we do have a very strong capable leader; at the present time he is acquitting himself well in Ottawa and as the Member for Lakeside said, those who saw him on TV this morning would appreciate what we do have as a Leader.

I would like to congratulate the Minister on the Budget. It's a very straightforward document. As he said in the first two or three pages, we are not out to hide anything, we're not trying to paint anything under, we're presenting the facts of the financial statement of the province as it happened and how it is.

There's one thing that we all are very happy for, of course, the fact that there are no general increases in taxation, no general increases. We'd also have to look at the fact that it's a very thick document, but it also contains the formulas and the plans and now the actions of the business community in accepting the program the Conservative Government are putting forth, accepting their platform. The business community are now showing signs of renewed strength, renewed confidence in this province, and let it be known to our honourable friends across the way, much and all as they may laugh and smirk every time that it looks as though something is going to come into the province, they just find that the old doom and gloom formula that they promote so drastically is going to go down the drain. Whether or not they like it, we may as well face the fact that in the three-and-a-half years that this government has been in power, the financial position of this province is not showing on the books as of today, but the underlying foundation is certainly there. Let it be known to them that it will not be too long, God grant that we do get a good crop in the agriculture sector this year, but without that, ManFor will provide diversification.

Some of the other major things that we have been mentioning and which have been laughed about across the way every time they are mentioned, when is it going to happen, when is it going to happen? — (Interjection)— I guess what you would say would be soon, and you may as well laugh about that one too, gentlemen, but you may have to eat your words. — (Interjection)—

I would like to thank the Member for Inkster for his . . . and I'm very sorry I did miss out one party, the Liberal party, in my opening statement, and I recall this morning when the Member for Inkster made the statement that the Liberal Party was compared to a beached whale, and it seems to me that not too many years ago, Mr. Speaker, I found myself in hot water, just about up to my eyes, for a statement that I thought was not near as unkind as what that one was. So I guess it must mean that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is mellowing or whatever goes with being in the Chamber.

But, Mr. Speaker, you would have to, and I know this has been spoken of many times in the House, but you would have to go back again to what this government has done regarding taxation. The Member for St. Johns is here this afternoon, and he of course knows that what has happened with succession duties, gift tax — it took them about two years after they were out of government to say we would have done away with it anyway. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that had the Member for St. Johns remained as Finance Minister, there would never have been any break in taxation for the farmers and the small businessmen of this country, and let that be known. That was one of the reasons that the NDP party did not pick very many votes in the rural in the last provincial election, and it one of the reasons again why they will not pick them up this time.

I won't mention The Mineral Acreage Tax Act; that was a very nuisance tax. It was introduced, it really didn't amount to very much, except, just as I say, a nuisance. I just missed the remark from the Member for St. Vital —(Interjection)— the big farmer — well, that may possibly be but I would exchange my debts for his debts any day.

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

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't object to being quoted if the quotation is accurate. What I said was, it exempted farmers.

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

**MR. FERGUSON:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where he arrived at that, we are all paying equal tax and equal base — as we earn so shall we pay, so let it be known as that. But we have brought the rampaging, built-up bureaucracy in the country under control and we don't have to go very far, Mr. Speaker, to say that, in mentioning in my first remarks that there is now again a renewed confidence in the business community of this country, and what is causing it — 30,000 jobs since 1977 to 1980, those are statistics that are well known to everyone. You don't have to truck them from the rooftops, but you also have to let it be known what is going on and what our

honourable friends across the way are saying — and statements, whether they are true or whether they are false. There is a 54 percent increase in manufacturing investment in the last year. The value of shipments is \$4.3 billion in 1980. Mineral production is a 28 percent increase of \$834 million. There's been new records set in exploration, \$31 million.

The Minister of Agriculture announced the other day for the Minister of Natural Resources that oil exploration in the southwest corner of the province was starting to move, that they are going to build 10 wells this year, and the capital expenditure there will be \$5 million, involved with that particular endeavour.

I would have to also say, Mr. Speaker, that our record in regard to meeting some of the problems that we have faced in the province over the past year — I would have to go to agriculture, number one, because I represent an agricultural constituency, and what we did during the drought program: Number one, we instigated a program whereby feed pellets were coming in from Thunder Bay. Number two, we instituted a hay program, and the other day the Member for St. George stood up and ridiculed the hay program, and I would like to read into the record what he said, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately he's not here, but he said, "Mr. Speaker, 85 cents a bale, which is roughly \$34 to \$35 a ton." Now what the Member for St. George was talking about was a very small portion of the hay program. At the beginning it was 1979 hay which meant that it was one year old. It was coming back into the province on back-hauls on cattle trucks that were going down. The truckers were very loath after a very short period of time to haul it because of the condition of the hay. The basic quality was good, but as anyone that's a farmer and has handled hay knows, it dries out and slips out of the bales, the springs break, etc. They refused to haul and besides that the quality after one year is not equal to what new hay is.

The second statement he made, Mr. Speaker, and I will read that also, "The deals that were made through the brokers amounted to \$60 a ton." Mr. Speaker, a substantial difference of at least \$25 a ton in terms of the cost of hay. That is good business. That is saving the farmers of Manitoba a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. You know when you look at it, over 40,000 tons or approximately — what are we talking about, Mr. Speaker, a million dollar rip-off, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the prices that farmers in Manitoba had to purchase the hay through the brokers in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, he had as good an opportunity as anyone else to apprise himself of the facts and let it be known: Number one, Hay was purchased in Ontario in two methods; by the Manitoba government from hay dealers in Ontario, and by farmers direct in Ontario for their own use. The Manitoba government purchased approximately 17,000 tons of Ontario hay at a total value of \$1.1 million. That involved 329 farmers. Individuals bought 14,000 tons, and of course these were direct farm purchases and involved 240 farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know where the Member for St. George arrived at a figure of a million dollar rip-off on a \$1.1 million deal? Now this is the kind of thing that our honourable friends

across the way are perpetrating on the public, irresponsible statements, which they have had ample opportunity to check out. I would like to read a little bit more into the record also, Mr. Speaker. What did the brokers do to earn that extra \$20 a ton or whatever the member is saying? Number one, located suitable hay supplies in Ontario. Number two, purchased the hay from farmers. In some cases dealers had to advance funds to suppliers and they had to borrow money at high interest rates to do this. Number three, load hay on trucks or trailers, haul the hay to railway cars and unload from trucks or trailers to rail cars in proper manner. Anyone that's loaded hay on boxcars into trucks knows what that's all about — arranged to have representative samples of hay weighed when shipments were made by CP rail, arranged with railways proper spotting of cars.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the farmers in Manitoba or the government of Manitoba could have sent someone down there to buy hay, load it, be responsible for it, the condition of it, the quality of it, and bring it back into the province for \$20 a ton. I would suggest to the Member for St. George, and I say again I'm very sorry that he's not here, that next time he checks his facts a little bit more often on this and presents them in the position that they should be.

Number three is our Greenfeed Program; 8,000 producers were involved, 700,000 acres and \$10 million outlay. This was one of the most important and one of the most far-reaching programs in the drought program that we had last year, even the farmers in Saskatchewan that you talk to would vouch for that. The dug-out filling, still in effect, because of the possible chance that we'll be going through a drought again this year, still the same deal as we had last fall, and approximately \$50 million of pay-out in crop insurance. We'd have to look about transportation. Transportation of course, to our agricultural community and to many segments of our economy is one of the most important things that we do have to face, Mr. Speaker.

The Province of Manitoba lease cars. The Wheat Board put \$90 million into buying cars. The Government of Saskatchewan and Alberta, up to a limited amount did the same thing. But my honourable friend for Ste. Rose has talked constantly this Session that he brought in a Private Members' Resolution about the Crowsnest Pass rate. So we went through the exercise the other day discussing the resolution. Where were the farmers that are supposed to be over there? They did not have one backup speaker to follow their resolution; not one. We on this side, we had no problem, speaking on their resolution. Where is this, the great farm community that are so forthright over there and always talking about what their interest in agriculture is, etc., etc., when their own member's resolution came up, there wasn't one speaker to speak on it.

So let that be known also, Mr. Speaker. Then we had, I believe it was Tuesday, this charade of the National Farmers Union coming in to talk to us about the Crowsnest Pass rate. Well, as far as I'm concerned, the National Farmers Union is a political arm of the NDP. They do not, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in my constituency or in any

platform in rural Manitoba, I can assure you of that. Lead by whom? Lead by whom? A farmer from Prince Edward Island who has about as much interest in western grain farming as a man in the moon and Dick Martin.

Now you would have to say, and the President of Manitoba Federation of Labour, you'd have to say that there would have to be cross purposes there, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if I have any hesitation, it would be that I would have far less confidence in the unions delivering the fertilizer and my grain to any points that is supposed to be at a given time, then I would in the multi-national corporations and what they're going to do to me.

We've also contributed a Hog Stabilization Program. We realize it's not going to make millionaires out of the hog producers of this province but it is a stop-gap measure. It's something that we feel should be tied in with the Province of Saskatchewan and Alberta under a Federal Stabilization Program lead by the Federal Government; Mr. Whelan. This hasn't come to pass. Alberta have a program, Saskatchewan have a program, and Manitoba now has a program, and of course the reason it's being held back by Mr. Whelan, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, is that he wants to have supply management, and that may come to pass, and if that is the will of the producers and the will of the people that this will come to pass, it will. One of the sleepers in the Budget as far as agriculture is concerned also, is the increase in capital borrowing power from \$19 million to \$33 million through Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I spoke a little earlier about some of the businesses that we do feel have shown an inclination to come to Manitoba, many of them under negotiation. I'm going to repeat them once more, they've been read into the record 100 times, but one more time isn't going to hurt, Mr. Speaker. At least when it's there, we'll be able to tell our honourable friends, well, we said so and you laughed again, but St. Lazare, the potash \$500 million in over five years and 400 jobs; Alcan — \$500 million with 700 jobs. This of course, if it comes to pass, will involve a major hydro expansion without the western power grid and we will not have to go through the exercise of probably waiting on until after an election to get through the Province of Saskatchewan.

The rapeseed plan in Harrowby is now well under advancement. The gasohol plant at Minnedosa is well on the stage to development and one of the things that have brought all of these discussions about and the interest that these companies are showing of course, would have to be the fact that we do have hydro power and we do have the hydro rate frozen for five years. That has got to be one of the biggest incentives to anyone establishing a business. Where in the world today can you go with a guarantee that your hydro rate would not be increased for three more years? I think that is one of the pluses that our government certainly have offered to the people of Manitoba and those outside of the province, that are interested in establishing a business here.

Sure, our Budget has gone up. It's \$2.3 billion. The Member of the Leader of the Opposition last night, said that we had cut the social programs. Well, my God, Mr. Speaker, how many more new social

programs do we need in this province? We raised the health costs \$115 million; we raised the education \$101 million; we raised the Community Services and Corrections \$37 million; we put \$70 million into the educational grants to the school divisions through the province, and we are called an uncaring government, we're cutting social programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have reached the stage that it's high time, and as I've said this in practically every speech I've stood up, that those that are capable and physically fit should be working for the state, and rather than in many cases receiving welfare and doing nothing for the state. Yes, we do have, we do have a \$219 million deficit, but the Minister of Finance last night had guts enough to stand up and say, yes, we are going to deficit finance to \$219 million. Things may improve. It may improve, probably will improve, under the good management that we have coming, Mr. Speaker, and the bright horizons that are before us, I'm sure that our budget deficit will be nowhere near that, but at least the Minister was honest enough to say, well, this is the outside line, we could be, the inside line will be arrived at later on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to in conclusion, in saying that, you know, due to the high interest rates, the high inflation rates, the high unemployment rates, the low growth rates, my Honourable Friend for Minnedosa says, no fault of the banks, we have a great amount of empathy and sympathy for the plight of the banks, but we won't get into that, but last night also, the Leader of the Opposition said that he was going to present great new ideas. Well, he's been in here longer than I have been, and I don't know whether I've ever come out with any great new ideas, but I have yet, I have yet to hear the Leader of the Opposition come out with one great new idea.

Now I don't know where that's going to come from, whether it's going to come from the Member for Brandon East, from the Member for Churchill; he probably has a whole bunch of ideas that would put the farming community out of business in this province if he was allowed to carry on with his ideas. And this great out migration of people from this province, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say, and if I am standing here next year, speaking on the same thing, I will bet anyone across the way, that a year from now the population in Manitoba will show an increase, or possibly a considerable increase to what it has now. I'm wide open for any takers that would like to put their money where their mouth is and laugh every time that a statistic comes in and it says that people are leaving the province.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister again for his Budget. I commend our Cabinet and our front row people for the thought, the effort and the staff that went with it. I'm sure that we are on the right track. I'm sure that we will have another four years following this at least, to further implement the policies that are being developed by this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. WILLIAMS JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been some time since I've spoken in the Budget Debate and since we have a new Minister of Finance this year who presented a 71-page speech to this

Assembly on Tuesday evening, and you know, Mr. Speaker, I have never, in the twelve Budgets that I have listened to in this Assembly heard the diatribe that was hurled forth by the Minister of Finance; 71 pages. He hurled invective after invective at the official Opposition, then he hurled invectives at the Federal Government. You know, Mr. Speaker, for all that was in the speech that dealt with the Budget, it could have been dealt with in less than five minutes for any substance that was in the speech. Mr. Speaker, I think the best comment that I have seen on the Budget appeared in today's Free Press in the cartoon on the Editorial Page: "Look out, Mr. Minister of Finance, they're coming for you with the butterfly net." They're coming for you with the butterfly net. Sunnydale Rest Home, I believe it is. He almost is like the pregnant elephant that struggled and struggled and brought forth what? A tiny weeny little mouse. That was the effort of the Minister of Finance in his first Budget; 71 pages, 71 pages. He could blame everybody that he could think of. I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that 42 months of office has certainly broadened the vision of the Progressive Conservative Party, because I'll tell you when they sat on this side of the House they couldn't see beyond the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border. They couldn't see beyond the Manitoba-Ontario border. They couldn't see beyond the Manitoba-Minnesota, North Dakota border and they couldn't see beyond the border with the Northwest Territories. They had envisioned. Now, Mr. Speaker, they can see all across Canada. They can see all across North America; they can see the Arab world; they can see the OCEAN. They can see everywhere.

When they were here on this side of the House, if we would mention that some of our troubles were being caused by forces outside this province, where were the comics then? Speak about Manitoba; Manitoba. We're not worried what happens anywhere else. You alone should be able to control inflation. You alone should be able to control spiraling price rises. That was what we got from the then official Opposition. That is the kind of garbage that they came out with day after day after day when they were on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. Talk about tunnel-vision. They would look inward always. Now, lo and behold they can look all over the place; blame everybody else but themselves. They have been —(Interjection)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I said, they now have broadened their vision. They now can really see the world as it is; man, three-and-a-half years has really done something to them.

We had a Minister of Finance, and I listened to his speech. I tried to listen as attentively as possible. Fifteen minutes went by, no mention of the Budget. You know, it was quarter past eight. Surely, sometime now between now and the next 15 minutes, he's going to be talking about the Budget. 8:30 came, Mr. Speaker. Budget; what was that? It came to 45 minutes, right, Mr. Speaker? What did we hear? Did we hear anything about the Budget? No. One hour; it was now 9:00. I thought surely by now, Mr. Speaker, he should be speaking about the Budget. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are times in this House when people should be called for repetition and if anybody should have been called for repetition it should have been the Minister of Finance the other night, because he went five times on the same topic before he came to the Budget; five times. One hour and fifteen minutes, nothing happened. One hour and thirty minutes. One hour and forty minutes. Ah, we got the Budget. Five minutes between 1:40 and 1:45 of speaking time, the Minister of Finance delivered that teeny-weeny little mouse; that little mouse. You know, Mr. Speaker, here we have a Minister of Finance who has, and you know, Mr. Speaker, if you ever saw anyone that looked unhappy, unhappy, worried-looking, and no wonder he was worried-looking. Look at him, Mr. Speaker. Handsome Ransom? He was gloomy. He was glum. I don't know who wrote that speech for him; I don't know who wrote that speech for him, Mr. Speaker, but whoever wrote that speech for him suffered from mental constipation. He certainly did, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection)— .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order, order. It's strictly unparliamentary to interrupt people when they're speaking.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not too worried about that guy enjoying some of the repartee that goes on in this Chamber. I think it's good that we can make our points back and forth. You know, Mr. Speaker, I felt sorry for the Minister, I really did. He's not a bad guy. But, Mr. Speaker, he inherited a very unenviable task, a very very unenviable task. You know, we'd had three budgets presented by Donald Duck and I kind of think you could say we had one presented by Daffy Duck.

**MR. ENNS:** That's bridging on the unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. I think Donald Duck has a point of order.

**A MEMBER:** Let him quack for himself.

**MR. JENKINS:** The Minister in reporting for Hydro is a great fan of the Gong Show. You know, I don't think he is, Mr. Speaker, I think he's a great fan of the Bugs Bunny Show, because that's what we've been getting.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think one person writing in the press called this Flights of Fiscal Fancy. (Interjection)—

**MR. ENNS:** Let's identify that writer. She was the one that was going to present the "Western View to Ottawa". It took her exactly two months to find out that that wasn't possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I can only allow one person to speak at a time in the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** That's all right, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of —(Interjection)— Wild Rice. Well, you know, he changes portfolios year by year because I think he's had a different portfolio every year that this government has been here.

You know, I don't know whether he's the fireman putting out fires or whether they're firing him from

one department to put him in another. But the Minister of Natural Resources, you know, he's another fellow that's not too bad. I know when I sat down there where the Clerk is sitting now that I used to have my problems with him, and I know Speakers —(Interjection)— Not with the Clerk, no, I mean with the honourable member. He was prone to make noises, sometimes bark like dogs, he used to make all kinds of funny noises.

**A MEMBER:** Capitalist dogs.

**MR. JENKINS:** No, no, I don't know what kind of dogs they were but he used to make all sorts of funny little noises which sometimes annoyed me, depending on which side of the bed I had got out of that day, but in the main I enjoyed him. I enjoyed him and I still enjoy him. He's a great story teller, he's a great actor. I've often said, you know, when they hand out the Oscars every year in Hollywood that it is a shame that the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources is not in consideration, because I think he should be. He's the biggest ham that I've seen for a long time.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge says, he's not a whale. He might be a whale of a ham, I don't know.

We were described, I believe by the First Minister, two years ago, as being fiscal arsonists, let rampage on the public purse or the public purse.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Budget No. 1 presented by the then Minister of Finance was a deficit. Budget No. 2, well, we thought, you know, maybe Budget No. 1 they couldn't quite make it, Budget No. 2, well surely they'll be able to have a balanced budget this time, no. Budget No. 3, did we get a balanced budget last year? No. In fact, I think the present Minister of Finance says that we're somewhere in the ballpark figure of \$100 million, but you know \$15 million of that, Mr. Speaker, has to be counted as part of that anomaly. That anomaly that disappeared out of last year's Estimates, that \$15 million. That anomaly that the Member for St. Matthews said well, it was a crazy idea, a crazy idea, that \$15 million is also part and parcel of that, because if that had been in, the Budget deficit would not have been \$100 million, it would have been \$115 million. Fifteen million went out of the Budget last year.

You know, it was pointed out, I forget what Minister brought that bill in, statute taxation, I guess it would have been the Minister of Finance last year, it was pointed out very clearly, I think by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that what happened this spring would happen. Oh, no, no, that isn't going to happen. These are the great fiscal managers, the great fiscal managers. You would have had a Budget deficit if the proper formula that you got caught and hoisted on your own petard with this year. You know, you monitored — and you're the greatest monitors I've ever seen — monitor this, monitor that, study. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, they may have got a few letters earlier on, but the bulk of the income taxes are being filled in right now, because that's when the bulk of the income taxes come in. You have got the old age pensioners before, but now you have the people. (Interjection)— The payees that are filing now. Oh. (Interjection)— Ah. Now the Minister of Finance — I

always thought, Mr. Speaker, that the filing of an income tax was the most sacred thing. The Minister now says that he seems to know, he intimates from his seat that he knows it's just the payees that are filing now.

Surely the Minister is not going to intimate to this House that he has secret access to tax return files. If he does — tax files that are filed with Ottawa? Is he collecting the taxes for Ottawa? I wasn't aware, Mr. Speaker, that when I filled out my tax form that it went by Royal Mail via the Legislative Building and the Department of Finance before it went to the Taxation Data Centre on 59. (Interjection)— If the Minister is telling me that he's intercepting mail, then I think he might find himself in violation of the Postal Act of this country.

Then we come to this year and this Minister of Finance. This nice fellow, you know of all the years to get to be Finance Minister. I don't know, I've heard it rumoured, Mr. Speaker, I've heard it rumoured that we're possibly looking at the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Sterling fixed that, didn't he?

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, you know, if the present Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party is looking at a way to cut out the feet from the Minister of Finance or the present Minister of Finance, he couldn't have picked a better way to do it.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** And he wrote the speech for him, made him give it.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, the Member for Rossmere says that the First Minister wrote that speech and practically forced him to give that speech. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I watched the honourable gentleman the other night, when I watched that honourable gentleman, he actually looked pained. He looked pained when he was delivering that speech. After all, to have to deliver in this book, here we go in this — I'll say one thing, it's a nice cover on the book, good quality paper, but we go to page 11, — (Interjection)— and we get . . .

**MR. ENNS:** The pages have a nice texture to them, soft, gentle. Gentle government.

**MR. JENKINS:** . . . up to Page 71. You know when that honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, sat down, you could see a huge sigh of relief. He was so relieved that he could sit down and didn't have to talk about this thing anymore. So relieved was that honourable gentleman that he could sit down and get out of the morass that they have put themselves in; \$219 million, the largest projected deficit. You know, Mr. Speaker, the largest projected deficit ever in the history of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we look in this booklet here, I believe it was the Minister of Transportation this morning who was saying that they had reduced taxes, they weren't sneaky on taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you they've got a dilly, they've got a dilly that they passed a couple of years ago, the gasoline tax. Ah. That is a beautiful one. That almost reminds me of a poker game where the house takes a percentage of the take, the bigger the pot, the bigger the take. Boy, what a deal! And we wonder why the present

government is so enamored with the philosophy of the Premier of Alberta to have those prices rise, and no one is — I, for one — it is, as I say to the honourable members and to the Member for St. Boniface, it is like the banker at a poker game, the more that the price rises, the bigger that the pot is, the bigger cut you get. That's above the board taxation? Oh yes.

We go to the back page of this five-page document, Expenditures, and we look at the equalization that the Minister has estimated. I've checked with other years and I find that, and even with other parts of the budget, that a \$98 million increase in equalization, I find is a little — given our economy — it's a little high. When we look, Mr. Speaker, at last year's and the individual income tax, an approximate \$50 million increase. I would say perhaps the Minister is a little hot. I hope he's not, but you know, Mr. Speaker, you cannot on one hand, as the First Minister and this government is wont to do, to criticize the government in Ottawa for fiscal irresponsibility, and when they do start to tighten the purse strings, expect that you're going to get as much as you had before.

You have a classic example of that now. The Attorney-General. He has his problems now in signing a police agreement for the RCMP. Who was the gentleman when that ill-fated Crosbie budget was introduced into the House, said, it wasn't a hard enough budget, it wasn't a tough enough budget? The First Minister of this province.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, if Joe Clark can be faulted for one thing, it's for bad arithmetic. Bad arithmetic. He couldn't somehow or other, and his compatriots in the House, couldn't somehow or other figure that 136 couldn't beat 141, or figures close to that. Talk about managers, they couldn't even manage the affairs in their House. They allowed members to leave the country, without even attempting to get pairs. You know, if you — (Interjection)— well I thought that your sights had been raised. (Interjection)— Ah, never mind, we'll get to that point. (Interjection)—

**MR. DOERN:** To know him is to love him.

**MR. JENKINS:** I don't have to talk about my Leader, because I have no worries about my Leader.

You know, I think one thing that was brought out this morning, and I think the Member for Inkster brought it out very well, and I'll say this, that if you think that by ridicule and trying to belittle a person in this House, any member in this House, that you are going to score Brownie points, then you are sadly mistaken. You are sadly mistaken. I think that the — (Interjection)— I said it was an accurate description of the Budget, I didn't say it was an accurate description of the Minister.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, there was no better example that could have been brought to this House than that that the Member for Inkster brought this morning. In the 1945 General Election in Britain, Winston Churchill — and I happened to be there at the time, I happened to be attending some political meetings, and I can tell you that if you were to gauge what the results of that election would have been on the crowds that were being drawn to one Winston Churchill as to what were being drawn by Clem Attlee, you would have said that he would have

wiped the Labour Party off the map. But you know, Mr. Speaker, it was the other way around.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Ingratitude.

**MR. JENKINS:** It wasn't ingratitude. You know, Mr. Speaker, I believe at that time they were having the Potsdam Conference, and Mr. Churchill was so sure of himself, he got a commitment from Clem Attlee that he would go with him to Potsdam, win or lose, and Clem Attlee says, the same applies for you, sir, and so they came to an agreement. But you know, it was a beautiful cartoon, because when it came for the Potsdam Conference, Churchill wasn't there. Clem Attlee had to go. Winnie Churchill was at home or in the south of France suffering from labour pains. He was painting, but the cartoon showed him at home or in the south of France suffering from labour pains. He was a sore loser, but if you think that by attacking our Leader that you're going to score Brownie points, well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, you are sadly wrong.

You know, it has been said that this government doesn't raise taxes. They have raised so many little itsy-bitsy things, sneaky gasoline tax increase, and they criticize the Feds, they criticize everybody else, but you know, everytime the gas price goes up, they get their cut. One that I think, Mr. Speaker, was really despicable, a real despicable one, prior to October 1980, Certificates of Death were issued by municipal authorities, by the City of Winnipeg at a fee of \$2.00 — \$2.00. We got an increase, Mr. Speaker, 50 percent, 100 percent. No, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 150 percent, that same certificate today is \$5.00 — a death tax.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I could go chapter and verse on all these sneaky little taxes that they have done over the years. There are many more, many more that they have, picayune little things, real picayune little things that make life a little bit more uncomfortable here for us in the Province of Manitoba.

Much has been made of the job creation. Look, I wish we were creating not 3,000, 30,000, I wish we could create 300,000 jobs. I would like to see all our young people employed, not having to leave this province, but you know, Mr. Speaker, while they vote on one hand, 30,000 jobs and you know, I think that's great. I think that the more jobs that we create to keep our young people here, the better, but at the same time we have lost jobs. We have lost a major newspaper, really no great attempt made by this government to try and keep it here; we have lost a major flour producer; we have lost a major meat producer, meat packing house. You know, on one hand we're talking about mega projects and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I hope that those mega projects do come onstream, but I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, they're going to come onstream too late for this government, too late.

The First Minister can tell my Leader to go to blazes, but you know before those mega projects come onstream, he's going to have to go to the people of Manitoba, and the people of Manitoba, unfortunately for you people over there, are going to tell you where to go. They're going to tell you where to go.

You know, this is probably the last Budget Speech that I'll ever participate in. I reasonably expect that

this bunch over there, Sir, will screw up their courage and call an election. I think they will, I think they will.

I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because things are not improving for them, they're getting worse. Their options are becoming less and less. If I was in their shoes, I would get out to the public and to the people as fast — I'd leave the province if I was them, yes, the Member for St. Johns says, yes I would leave the province. There will be an exodus, yes. There was a great book written by one Leon Uris, is that correct, called Exodus. There has been another book written, Exodus II, written by S. R. Lyon, because we've had an exodus, an exodus of young people, of skilled people, people we can ill afford to lose.

The Minister of Labour, the Minister of Education, other Ministers, they're all telling us that we're short of an experienced workforce. We are short of those people.

You have driven them out of this province. You have driven them out of this province. We have had exodus, Exodus II. You know, as I said before, if I was you, I would go to the people as fast as I could, before you get yourselves into more hot water than you are already. I don't know if you've been listening to the people on the streets, but you are not a very nice word out there. I don't hear you referred to with very complimentary phrases. That is what your problem is. Your problem is that you are hoist, as I said before, on your own petard. You were going to have balanced budgets; you were going to lick inflation; you were going to do this; you were going to do that; you had that in-vision, you were looking in here all the time, but now that you're in here, you have to look outside and you have been an absolute failure. You have been a failure to the very principles that you have espoused. Do know what — is this going to be your election document? Is this going to be your election document? Are you going to try and fight the 1981 election on what transpired in 1977, 1976, or even prior to 1969. Look I'll tell you something, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Manitoba are not concerned about what happened back there, they want to know what's going to happen now. What is their future going to be? Their future with you people in charge is certainly not a bright one for the people of Manitoba.

So I would say that if you want to save your bacon you better call that election while you still have some votes left out there. There are going to be people who will not be here next time that a new Legislature is elected to this Assembly, I happen to be one of them.

**MR. DOERN:** Albert is another one.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for St. Johns and the Member for Seven Oaks — no, that's not the Member for Seven Oaks because if it is he's put on a lot of weight since I last saw him in the caucus room.

But I want to pay tribute to the years of service that these people have given and contributed to this House. I also understand that the Member for Morris, the Minister of Government Services has also announced that he will not be running. While we

have had our differences in the past, I have always thought of him as an honourable gentleman and an honourable member in this Assembly, and I wish him well, and I want to thank him, and acknowledge that he has made a contribution in public life. We all have had our ins and outs on various things and I think that anyone who stands for public office — it's a noble profession. Many people out there think that we are something that we aren't. I also understand that the Member for Brandon West is not running again, and to him also — and I think that the people of Manitoba owe a debt of gratitude for their service to this Assembly and to the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, this will probably be the last Budget speech that I take part in.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You wish that were the case.

**MR. DOERN:** Maybe next year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** . . . next spring.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well if I'm back next spring, I'll have to be, but if I was to have any advice for that government over there, I would get to the people as fast as I could because the longer you wait, the worse it's going to be for you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the Budget debate here today. I have been listening to the various comments that have been made up to this time. I found it very interesting to listen to the Leader of the Progressives, who I believe was trying to state his party policy here today, and all I can say to him is that if that is his party policy, what he was dictating here today, then he's going to have a heck of a time selling that to the public. Any time you start talking two-and-a-half or three-and-a-half times one, the public isn't going to buy that kind of a concept. Besides, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think that was one of his best contributions to this House to date.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other thing, — if I had my druthers, I would like to follow a member that is speaking that is representing a rural area. The Member from Logan with all due respect, I think is very super representative for his area, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our interests are as far apart as day is from night. He is representative of a labour community. I am representative of a rural area and a farm community and it's very hard . . .

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I represent all the people in my constituency whether they be labour people, business people, retired people, I represent . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Logan might try and give that impression but his

leanings have been shown within his party exactly where his strength is and which way he leans, and I would like to cover a portion of that a little later on — the socialistic aspect of it, the labour aspect of it within their party, but I would like to deal with that later on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my intention today to not speak in terms of figures specifically, I would like to talk in generalities, and in that regard I would like to start off and maybe do a little bit of history. I would like to back off let's say 55 years when my grandparents emigrated to this country, emigrated to Canada with my parents at that time, who were teenagers at that time from the country of Russia. My grandparents and my forefathers in Russia had built up a dynamic kind of farming community out there. They were very rich at that time. They had built up assets like you wouldn't believe. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they had built their own schools. They had their own colleges, they had their own physicians at that time. They had a good rapport. It was very affluent society at that time that my ethnic background, the Mennonites had in Russia at that time. What happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that a revolution took place. There was a very affluent people, there was those less fortunate and a revolution took place. Consequently to that my grandparents, together with my father and my mother, who were teenagers at that time, fled when the Communistic take-over took place — fled Russia; were very fortunate to be accepted into this country, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is why I am going to be speaking on why I am proud to be Canadian, why I am proud to be a Manitoban — because my parents when they came here had nothing. All they wanted was a chance to be able to make a living with certain freedoms. There were no government controls at that time. They were eternally grateful, in fact till the last one or two decades ago, they were so grateful to the Liberal Federal Government at that time, that they always voted Liberal. Finally they have seen the light. It has changed like it has changed in western Canada for a good reason, and the lone Liberal member here must realize what has happened.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when my parents arrived in Manitoba they had nothing, virtually nothing. At that time the Hudson's Bay Company, the big giant, which our people opposite are always fighting, the Hudson's Bay Company owned most of the land. Certain trust companies owned a lot of the land, and they gave people like my parents the opportunity to start off. They leased them land with arrangements where they could pay off. They gave them a start to the point where they could buy a certain amount of cattle and start off, and they started off from the basic grassroots. And they had the right to follow their religious backgrounds, their religious beliefs, and I am talking of the Mennonites, but this applied to other people as well of ethnic backgrounds; Ukrainian, French. All the liberties were there.

I would like to take it from there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a certain time just passed, the Dirty Thirties came and along came myself, raised in hard times. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had the privilege of learning the work ethic from my parents — if you wanted something you worked for it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, at that time in the rural areas if somebody was in

trouble, if there were people who were less fortunate, who looked after them? — the various church organizations that were in power at that time. They looked after those people. They helped them, people worked together — no government involvement. This is 30 years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

At that time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was driving a team of horses, loading stooks, sheaves, driving them through the threshing machine — just 30 years ago. What has happened in the last 30 years? It's not that long ago, 30 years is a short time in terms of history compared to our country which is a 113 years old, in Confederation, versus the Russian history which is hundreds and hundreds of years. What happened in the last 30 years? We have developed. The work ethic applied. People did not stand there with hands out for a hand-out from government. They worked. That's all they asked for — the privilege to work and produce. And what has happened, technology came along. We have in this country — and we are one of the most fortunate countries in the world, we have developed medical advancements to where our life expectancy in this country is the highest in the world. It is the highest in the world. We have developed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all kinds of things in modern technology, modern science. We have developed insecticides where we can control all kinds of — you know, the grasshopper, many things that happen. We have developed herbicides where we can control weeds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, why we have done this is because the cost of the product that we sell right now is not that much higher than it was even 30 years ago, but the cost squeeze, production squeeze, has done something in this country that everybody is envious of. We have produced, we have the most efficient production in our farms, I think, bar none in the world, because every time the cost goes up, farmers get more efficient, with all kinds of technology, like I say with herbicides, fertilizers, insecticides. We get better all the time. We put an awful lot of pressure on the farmers, but they have always risen to the challenge.

What bothers me though a little bit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that we have a member there that has got a real hang-up about chemicals and all these kinds of things. I am talking about the Member for Churchill, and I am going to be very frank with it. In fact, in my opinion, and for the farmers, he's a bit of a fear-monger. Pardon the expression, maybe it's a little rough, but he claims that every chemical devised is dangerous to somebody. Well it is this kind of thing that has made our farmers the best producers in the world. It is this kind of technology that has raised the life expectancy among our people to the highest in the world, and it is scare tactics that he uses.

A chemical spill, we have debates in this House for two weeks, you know, concerns. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been transporting chemicals in this country for the last 30 years, and it is these chemicals that have made us productive, second to none. A third of the world is starving.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one thing that concerns me, we still believe in the cheap food policy here — we do, when we spend 18 cents of each earned dollar on food. Eighteen cents of each earned dollar gets spent for food, and the balance of it gets spent —

even if we say 25 cents gets spent on lodging, where does the rest get spent? The cost-price squeeze that we put on the farmers — the day will come, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All we have to do is look at Europe, what they have to pay for their food. They pay 50, 60, as high as 70 cents of the earned dollar for food, but we're still operating at 18 cents. And the day is coming where the people in this city and in this province and in this country are going to have to pay their fair share for food. —(Interjection)— Well check it out, check it out.

The normal approach from the other side is to hide your head in the sand and say not true, I don't buy that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have never had it so good as we have it right now, never.

And I would like to talk about senior citizens, the squalling that goes on — we're depriving senior citizens. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have parents that are in their 70s. I have in-laws that are in their 70s. They tell me they've never had it so good, and senior citizens all have it very good.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we provide personal care home service. We provide elderly citizens housing. We provide free Medicare. We provide all kinds of benefits for our senior citizens. The people say, oh, they have it so bad. Compare yourself to the rest of the world and quit belly-aching. We have health programs that doesn't cost our senior citizens any money or anybody for health programs, does it?

Let's talk about the education costs. This country was built by people who had very little education. They had guts, they went out and worked, and I will tell you something right now, we are spending so much money on education as compared to the people that built this country, and you know what I'm concerned about is that we probably will be destroying what our parents and forefathers built. What we have established is a society that gives security from cradle to grave. Show me one person that is suffering in terms of — that goes hungry — (Interjection)— That's malarkey. You're always talking that way. Everybody gets looked after in this country, you know that yourself. But they're always talking doom and gloom. In fact, Doom and Gloom Howard is what they refer to as the Leader of the Opposition in our area.

What it basically amounts to is a difference in philosophy. I'm coming — we're getting down to the point that — I'll touch on that a little later. Okay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the province has weathered their little economic problems in the last few years, basically because of high interest. —(Interjection)— Oh, the Leader of the Opposition laughs. You know what, I would like to refer to interest rates, I would like to refer to our neighbours to the south, I'd like to refer to Canada as a whole, he would like to contribute the whole thing to the Province of Manitoba. What a fallacy. And that is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the weakness of the Leader of the Opposition. Everything he tries to relate in terms of politics to this province, what has happened has happened generally across Canada, and North America.

I think we're at the point where we have made the turnaround. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have dealt with flood, we have dealt with drought, we have dealt with high interest rates, and in spite of that we have made the turn. We made the turn. And they would like to

have an election right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know why? Because in this next year many things are going to happen very positively. Hydro. And they would like to see that things stall, in fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have reservations that they have probably tried to stall this western grid thing, you know, because they've never complimented or supported any of these programs to date, including Alcan, what do they do? They talk pessimistically. Potash, what do they do? They talk pessimistically. And there's the biggest pessimist of all, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mining generally has taken off. If you read the articles, if you want to read, mining in this country is just taking off, ever since we changed policies in terms of our participation in that.

I would like to talk —(Interjection)— I will touch on Saskatchewan. Let's talk, for example, housing. A very interesting point. I've just been handed a note here, millions for minerals. I would like to read this whole thing into here, but you know, just hang on here, Mr. Speaker, I have here a little note here that says, the Statistics Canada showing the dollar value of building permits issued for January 1981 in Manitoba. In January 1981, building permits of \$11 million were issued in Manitoba, an increase of 26 percent. In January. Just relax a little bit. Now, cutely enough, at 26 percent. In this period Canada showed a decrease of 11 percent over the same period in 1980. And the only province that showed higher than Manitoba was Quebec. They showed an 87 percent increase. But, what happened in Saskatchewan? Minus 50 percent. Minus 50 percent. Manitoba had the highest increase in the western provinces.

And I'd like to verify that with a statement that, I have a lot of people in my area, young fellows that are working in the construction industry. Last year was a tough year for them. There was very little — sit down. There was little activity going on in construction last year.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere on a point of order.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I would like to ask the member a question if he has a minute, about Saskatchewan, possibly he could tell us what the dollar value was of . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member . . .

**MR. DRIEDGER:** I'm not accepting a question yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll accept them at the tail end if he wants.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** All right.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're trying to break my train of thought. In my community I have a whole bunch of young people that are working in the construction industry, young fellows, last year they had a rough time, especially in the plastering. This year they have been working already for two weeks. And you know what they've indicated to me, they have so much work they won't be able to handle it for this coming year. They're talking of

working nine hours a day, six days a week, and they still won't be able to catch up. And we've made the turn. But they won't admit that. We've made the turn on many things. That's why they're clamouring for an election right now. I'll tell you something, we'll call it when we're ready. And it's going to be a good time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, why am I here, as a politician, why am I here. I'm a little country boy, farmer, what have you, a few years ago when the NDP made their move, when they fortunately managed to buffalo the people in Manitoba to some degree with their philosophy, figuring they were going to make it that much better, what bothered me so much was the fact, at that time a person came around promoting the NDP philosophy to me. I was just a farmer, struggling like many of them do, and he says, you know what, our philosophy is everybody's equal. Everybody is born equal, black, white, red, it doesn't make any difference, they're all equal, and they should all have the same chance. —(Interjection)— Even Mennonites. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's what bothered me. He says, they should all be able to start up equal. When they get to be a certain age, we'll each give them so and so much, and everybody should have the same start, irregardless if my parents have worked hard and sacrificed much of their life, lived poorly. And they start off, they say, no, when you are through, the state takes it, and we will redivide it. And that is basically the socialistic philosophy.

They talk of taking over companies, they talk of taking over farmlands, they talk of taking over everything. And Mr. Speaker, what bothers me is, that is what happened in Russia, where my parents came from, and that is why that country is in that kind of state it is right now. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I am perturbed, and they keep hiding behind — when do you hear the NDP talk of socialism? They don't want to talk of it because there's too many people in this province that would not accept that kind of philosophy. They hide behind, say, we'll make things better. But they talk of taking over everything. And even — I'm getting ahead of myself here.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is when we were debating the dairy bill last year, and the leader of the Progressives, who is trying to play a middle of the road type of thing, I'll tell you something, he must be having callouses trying to stay on both sides. Because he's got a heck of a time staying on that fence. But I want to remind him of statements that he made in this House when he said, if the dairy farms are too expensive, the province should buy them and we'll lease them back to them. When they're through with them we'll lease them to somebody else. And you know what? And no matter what kind of brush he uses at this stage of the game, he is still a socialist, actually he is bordering on communism.

Many of the members opposite have to accept that same fact. In fact the member is not here right now, but on Provincial Affairs just last week-end, we had one of the members of the NDP on a program and he was putting on a little mirage and having a little bit of fun, smoking his cigar and blowing a smoke screen, he says that's what the Conservatives are doing, then he takes out a red can of paint with a brush and he paints it red and now he says now

they're branding us communistic. I'll tell you something, you know what, they make fun of it because they can't deny it, because the road that they're on — Mr. Speaker, we've talked of creeping socialism, we have galloping socialism and we have creeping communism. And let us beware, the only time that kind of thing can happen is if you have a strong country. That's when the have-nots start picking at the haves. And the philosophy that they have in that respect is what bothers me very much. Mr. Speaker, that is why I'm going to be here as long as I can and I will fight their philosophy as long as I can.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we could pursue along these lines, like I say I could start battling around the figures and there are many speakers that are going to be speaking and what it boils down to is that I believe that this country is young enough, it is strong enough at this stage of the game, that we can resist that kind of philosophy, and we have to. We only have one province in this country right now that has a socialistic government, Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you something, the Premier of Saskatchewan is swinging right as far as he can.

Doom and gloom is what comes from opposite, you know. And I'm not going to be kind to the Leader of the Opposition. I will not be kind to him in the next election, because he's been grasping at straws, he's been doing that in the editions that he sends out into my areas, and he feels confident that he is going to win the Emerson seat for his party. Beware, you've got a real fight on your hands.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, he has been so desperate in the last days in the House, we've seen a demonstration that, you know, I can't believe the kind of leadership that has come from there. He's flubbed every effort in terms of getting this hydro thing into committee, he says. They were in committee and walked out, looking badly, and then they try and come back. They walked out of the committee. Now they want to get it back into committee. —(Interjection)— Oh, Mr. Speaker, he's talking of a Stonewall job. If there's ever been anybody that's got egg on their face, they have it with Hydro, and I'll tell you something, they're going to have a lot more if they keep on flogging that issue.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I feel very positive and optimistic about Manitoba. I feel we have, and will continue to give responsible government. We will give responsible government as we have.

I want to totally support the Minister of Finance in his Budget. What did you expect in the Budget? What did you expect? Under the circumstances, we have done the right thing.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am proud, No. 1 to be a Canadian, which is something that something seems to be lacking on the other side; I am proud to be a Manitoban, which also they lack from time to time, many of them; and Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a Conservative on the side of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very thankful that I've had the opportunity to get up and speak my opinions here, because we get so clogged up with all these legal beagles out here, from time to time they want to split hairs, and it's surprising. The thing that I forgot to mention before, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the

members opposite have all made their living off the capitalistic program. I have yet to see one of the legal lawyers on the other side say, I will work for half price because somebody hasn't got the money. They believe in taking the full benefit, and then turn around and preach socialism in this House. — (Interjection)— And the member that's speaking from his chair — you know, I have a problem with the Member for St. Johns. I think he's a very shrewd, smart individual, but the moment one of us chirps from our chair, he is always the one, when he is speaking says, you know, he's chirping from his chair again. And he is the one that does it most of all on their side. So the rules are never the same in their opinion.

But I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, I am proud to be where I am right now, I will fight the socialistic system in this country as long as I can, and I'm looking forward to the opportunity, within the next period of time, to take him on in the next election because your ranks are going to be depleted.

Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER, Harry E. Graham:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the Member for Inkster referred to my party as a beached whale, I didn't expect you to beach me completely, Mr. Speaker, but I've been trying a long time to get a chance to speak to this Budget. I was, in fact, on my feet before the Member for Inkster this morning.

Using the same analogy, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson on a point of order.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** I happen to have been in the Chair this morning when the honourable member makes reference to being on her feet before the Honourable Member for Inkster. I think it's the prerogative of whoever is sitting in the Chair to acknowledge and speak to and allow that person in their turn to speak, and I think that to be criticized for not allowing her to speak before the Honourable Member for Inkster is unjust.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I was not criticizing that, needless to say, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** On that same point of order if that's what the member is speaking on. The Member for Inkster stood up yesterday in his place in order to get the floor, so, I think there was some preference there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** Don't take it off my time, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would like to hear the comments of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I really wanted to continue on this whale bit because continuing the analogy, fishy analogy; I wanted to thank the Honourable Member for Inkster for his excellent imitation of Jaws, today. My only concern, though, is that my friends and others who are joining his school thinking that they're going to be sharks, too, will just end up being poor fish.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing this Budget, I, too, want to protest this piece of propoganda which is being circulated to the people of Manitoba. People in Fort Rouge are phoning my office and saying: "What a nerve." What a nerve, Mr. Speaker, to charge the taxpayer not only for the printing and the preparation but also for the postage. As it happens, and quite by chance in the same week, I have distributed my own brochure and I've seen some of the government members reading it in the House as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. I want to say for record that that was printed at my own expense and circulated under my franking privilege, Mr. Speaker, not as this was, at the expense of the taxpayers.

I called it propaganda, and Bertrand Russell asked why propoganda is so much more successful when it stirs up hatred, than when it stirs up friendly feeling. The First Minister of Manitoba knows this well, Mr. Speaker. He uses it constantly. He replaces policy and programs with propoganda. He governs through intimidation and hatred; he has lectured and hectorred the Speaker of this House on at least two occasions that I'm aware of, and he has filled this Chamber with his contempt for the people who don't agree with him.

I think it was in the Summer of 1978 that Roger Newman writing in the Toronto Globe and Mail referred to the Manitoba Legislature as the "politics of hate." And, what a terrible indictment that is of this House.

I want to speak for a moment on the current controversy surrounding the Minister responsible for Energy. Mr. Speaker, I'm at a loss to understand why the Minister and his Leader refuse to refer this challenge, which is a challenge to the Minister's honour, why they refused to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It has been said: "A man who allows his honour to be taken, allows his life to be taken." I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order, please. There has been a ruling in this Chamber and the member is challenging that ruling.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'd like to say I think that probably you misunderstood the person that's speaking. All she said is that she was concerned with the Minister and his Leader and she felt that they should accept the challenge to bring this in the open. She didn't refer anything to your decision or the Chair at all, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** No, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that this has nothing to do with the matter that you have under consideration or you had under consideration. I'm concerned with the honour of a member of the Treasury Bench, and the honour of another member of this House, Mr. Speaker; in fact of us all as I said yesterday.

This is a grubby series of incidents. You know, it's a grubby thing to have challenges to the honour of members, and I feel that by refusing to go to the Committee, the Minister or the Government or his Leader, whoever is making the decision, is allowing the Minister's honour to be taken. Unfortunately, the dishonour is being spread throughout the House, Mr. Speaker. It has already touched the reputation of the Member for St. Vital, who is being accused of perpetrating a fraud on this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge that in order that the integrity of the two members, the Minister for Energy and Hydro, and the Member for St. Vital, in order that their integrity maybe restored, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the Minister to allow this matter to go to the Committee when it next comes to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to address the Budget itself. The Minister of Highways and Transportation, this morning, talked of motherhood. He said it's not a motherhood Budget. Well, I have to agree with that, Mr. Speaker, this is not a Budget of motherhood, this is a Budget of the deserting father. I'm tempted to describe the Budget as a non-event and leave it at that, but I can't. This Assembly has never heard less at such lengths from a Minister of Finance. Never has there been offered such a superficial analysis of Manitoba's economic condition. Never has so much credit been claimed for so little, and certainly never has \$220 million deficit been described as a step toward a balanced Budget. I'll be coming back to the deficit, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister wisely kept the reference to the balanced Budget to the end of his speech. I suspect on the assumption that we'd all be so bored that we would miss it, and he was nearly right.

Mr. Speaker, the first hour, I think it was, of the Budget Speech was as much anti-NDP as it was pro-Conservative. It was the 1977 election over again, it was incredible. After four years in power, their strength is still in criticizing the NDP instead of introducing their own programs. Manitobans know about the NDP's faults. They responded to those in 1977. They can't take much comfort in this government patting themselves on the back for merely making different mistakes.

I want to object to the repetitiveness of the Minister's address. Five times at least he took occasion to refer to the failures of the previous government, the difficulties that his administration had as a consequence of those failures and the claim that the "Golden Age" is just around the corner. Well, it's a big, long corner because that "Golden Age" has been around for three years under a different Minister.

I'm anxious about the Minister's claims of careful financial administration. If this year is an example, we have reason to be anxious. Projected deficit of \$139 million became \$191 million and then the Minister told us the other night that it's now \$100 million. That's not just unusual cost control, that's

just not efficiency, Mr. Speaker, that is service promised that is not been given. That represents approved staff positions that have not been filled; promises made and not kept. What's going to happen in the coming year? Are we going to have the same deceptions?

The Minister's assumptions about Manitoba's revenue in 1981-82 are disturbing. He expects, he says, an increase of between 10 and 14 percent depending on the base figure. He carefully avoided any direct statement on Manitoba's economic performance in the next fiscal year. With projected revenue increases of between \$250 million and \$300 million and only \$8 million in new tax revenue in the face of a negative growth rate of .5 percent projected by the Economic Council of Canada, the Minister is counting on inflation, on double digit inflation, to boost revenues, Mr. Speaker, yet there is not a single measure in the Budget to protect the people of Manitoba from the impact of that inflation on which the Minister is counting to save his neck fiscally. This is just as hypocritical as the alcohol tax. You warn people of the dangers of excessive alcohol use and then count on them to drink a lot to fill the government coffers.

Mr. Speaker, fundamentally, the question to ask about the Budget is what are the people of Manitoba getting for their money? My Party would be ready to support a deficit, even this deficit if it could be demonstrated that essential human services were being maintained; that small business was being supported as promised in the 1977 election campaign by this government; that new initiatives were being taken to expand economic activity; that the government has suddenly taken the North seriously, not just as an area to be pillaged by international corporations but to be developed for the benefit of the people who live there. If it could be demonstrated that the enormous potential of Manitoba agriculture was perceived and real measures to develop the value-added potential of our basic industry were initiated. That there was a beginning to adjust a legal land base for our native people, or that there was a commitment to develop the enormous agricultural potential of Northwestern Manitoba with protection for the animal and fish stock of the area.

We have none of these things, Mr. Speaker. What we have is the following: We have an expensive change in educational financing that gives benefits to some Manitobans at the expense of others. Not the great reform which the Minister promised, but a kind of shell game which still leaves 56 percent of the educational cost on property taxpayers.

Secondly, we have a minor adjustment to correct their own errors in the property tax rebate system, when in fact the whole system is rotten and needs a whole general overhaul.

Thirdly, we have major cost increases in health care, which had an accumulated effect of three years of neglect, rather than improvements in the system. We have the grudging maintenance of the air ambulance service from the north, but a decline in the standard of local health care centres, in almost every northern community; we have no commitment to the expansion of home care or extended care for our senior citizens; we have a short term cash short commitment and an income averaging program for

Manitoba hog producers, unanimously condemned by the farmers, as too little, too late; we have a long overdue adjustment to day care allowances, but no commitment to day care standards or a day care act; and we have a lot of rhetoric about the private sector, but no relief for the backbone of the private sector, small business enterprise in the face of alarming failure and bankruptcy statistics.

We have an Economic Development Department, which is under-funded, under-staffed, has no ideas and its presided over by a Minister who is under-competent.

We hear the former government castigated for political interference in Manitoba Hydro, but we have the process continuing with flagrantly political senior appointments. We have a half-promise to renew Hydro development in the north, but no commitment to clean up the mess and to compensate the people who are still suffering from the last time around.

We have a promise of mega project development, but a stonewalling against legitimate questions being raised in this House, from members including myself, regarding details of the Western Hydro Grid or the Alcan smelter proposal. We want to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals are not a sell-out of precious Hydro resources, just to prop up a government which is sinking under its own incompetence.

I want to examine some of these failure in a little more detail. Elderly care: still no financial commitment to home care, still no positive measure to shift the emphasis from bricks and mortar to maintenance and preventative programs to keep the elderly in their homes. Everytime the subject is raised, the Minister for Health assures and avers and claims, angrily at times, that that is his emphasis. In a speech to the Annual Meeting of the Manitoba Health Organizations in 1980, in late 1980, he stated that that was his intention, but still nothing ever happens, it's all just talk, Mr. Speaker.

The department is terribly short of senior staff, people in acting positions throughout the Department of Health. It's no wonder that the movement is not occurring, it's no wonder that we're still constructing more buildings instead of developing preventative and caring programs for the elderly or the housebound.

I was shocked to hear the complacency with which the Member for Emerson referred to the elderly. What about those elderly people who have no children? What about those elderly people whose spouses were under a pension scheme which made no provision for the early death of the working, of the employed, of the wage earning spouse. There are a lot of very lonely elderly people in this world, in this profit-oriented world, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing against profit, it's legitimate, but it's our responsibility to look after those who are less fortunate, and we cannot be smug as the Member for Emerson was smug in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in this city there is no organization available at the present time to help any elderly person even with their shopping, even to pick up their groceries, and I think every other year there has been such an organization. I can't find one. I phoned everyone I can think of, because I have people who are going to have to go into personal care if they can't get a little help with buying their groceries and

doing their banking. Continuing care won't do it and there just aren't any other organizations that have the funding to do it.

Now what more basic need is there, Mr. Speaker, then the need to pick up your groceries, your food and your other grocery supplies. The Minister talks of enabling the elderly to stay in their homes, and yet this very most basic need is not being filled in this city.

You want to talk about employment. Manitoba doesn't have the highest unemployment rate in the country at the present time, but that's not much comfort for the hundreds and hundreds of people who are unemployed and have been unable to find jobs all winter or for their dependents. The government hasn't done anything positive about the thousands of working poor. People who are underemployed, locked into dead-end jobs with low wages. These people know, many of them, that they're capable of handling better jobs, Mr. Speaker, but they lack the opportunity for upward mobility, because of the critically slow economic growth of the province.

The construction industry hasn't benefitted from the jump on the season that should have been caused by the early spring, because the work just hasn't been there. Many of the best senior tradesmen have left the province, leaving apprentices with a shortage of masters from whom to learn, and then in his Estimates the Minister of Education told us that people couldn't be found to take Level III of the Tool and Die Trades Training, of which there's a critical shortage in this province, of tradesmen, but why do they not pursue with vigour capable people who desire to improve their competence and their lot in life, Mr. Speaker, to take this and similar training. There's no evidence to show that the Minister is doing this.

In education generally the Budget is remarkable, more for what it did not cover than for what it did. There are many problems in education which are being ignored. There is the problem of financing education. Essentially, who pays? Historically and from this Budget Speech, which looked backward over the 1970's for most of its span, it's very clear that the government has a very keen interest in history at least as far back as 1977. Historically, education has been paid for by property taxes, Mr. Speaker, and everyone including this government recognizes this as regressive taxation. Everyone agrees that education needs a more progressive tax base, such as income tax, and I applaud the government for at least considering or agreeing to consider doing something about it. They're faced in the right direction and they just need, it seems, a good shove or a swift kick to get them going.

It's not how much comes out of provincial coffers, Mr. Speaker, but how much comes directly or indirectly from property taxes. It's not enough that the province pays 80 percent of education, if part of that 80 percent comes from property taxes as it does. We need a base of no more than 20 percent of education costs on property and to make sure that the rest of the cost comes from more progressive tax bases.

At present over 50 percent of education costs are based on property taxes, and that is much too high a percentage, but we applaud the government for at

least facing in the right direction. We'd be happier if they moved in that direction by giving us a better plan and showing us how, over the next short time, the goal of 20 percent property base to education taxes will be reached. They're still too busy fighting the 1977 election, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it's because not looking to the future, perhaps they dread the future.

There are many other problems in education. One is reflected in the core area of the City of Winnipeg. There's a crucial human problem there, and on this again, this Budget and this government is silent. The only way it seems to interest this government in paying any attention to the problems of the core area, is to show them how they can save a lot of money in the future by spending a little money now, but they don't seem to be interested in that investment type of spending, where the results are going to come later, perhaps as I said, they're afraid of the future.

Special needs children, the budget was silent again, again. Not covered also was any encouragement to school boards to use some of their empty classrooms, of which we have some in the Inner City, for desperately needed day care. Quite a small incentive, cash incentive would result in unused space being utilized for this community benefit, Mr. Speaker. We have at the present time, such a ridiculous spectacle as the Winnipeg School Division charging the YMCA rent for use of a school room for a child care program. The government could have been helpful on this, but they are not, and that's not surprising for a government that won't even fund kindergarten.

Student aid, even though STEP salaries and the Student Aid Program is slowly responding to inflation, the Budget doesn't address the main problem, which is the insensitivity shown by the government to the needs and aspirations of young Manitobans. These rigid mid-term audits, which have been described as witch hunts, have had a devastating and demoralizing effect on students. The government's mistrustful suspicious attitude is discouraging proud young people, who are unwilling to subject themselves to the potential of a mid-term notification that their whole year's education has been blown by having anticipated student aid whipped out from under them.

I want to talk about the north. The Finance Minister's reference to the northern part of the province was so fleeting, that if you weren't listening closely you might have missed it, but he did say that his government was planning to pursue a renewed development of natural resources for the benefit of Northern Manitoba. Well, judging by this government's past performance in the north, Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine anyone up there clapping their hands in glee over that comment. If one of the resources the Minister was talking about is Hydro power, we've already seen some of the effects and they aren't pretty. We've seen the fruits of power projects at various locations in the north, and as far as further Hydro development is concerned, you can understand the people of those communities saying, why doesn't the government clean up one mess, before starting another? And of course, the mess I'm referring to is no secret to this government, but I'll run —(Interjection)— — All right, I'm glad you

asked, I'll run down a few of the consequences of the Conservatives' policy of benefiting the north, the so-called benefits to northern communities of the Churchill-Nelson Diversion Project, which was carried on at the South Indian Lake Project initiated by the NDP and perpetuated under the PCs, destruction of trap-lines; pollution of lakes and streams; loss of spawning grounds and water fowl refuges; serious soil erosion; quantities of debris in waterways which interfere with navigation and fishing. With a record like this the government has the effrontery to promise more benefits, more benefits. With a friend like this, the north doesn't need enemies, Mr. Speaker. Not only remote or native communities are affected by the Conservatives' insensitivity to the north.

In the Speech from the Throne last December, the government stated that it was committed to the maintenance and expansion of employment at ManFor and is working actively to ensure the future of that important industrial operation at the park. Later the Conservatives came out with glowing predictions of expansion and job creation. Most predictions had little acquaintance with reality, Mr. Speaker. This Budget makes no allowance for such expansion and today we see ManFor up for sale to the highest bidder with no thought for the North or its people.

Mr. Speaker, in the rather tedious speech the other night, the Minister mentioned the creation of 30,000 new jobs in the private sector. He doesn't say what happened to the old ones in both the private and public sectors. He doesn't say whether this figure is a net increase in jobs or is just another number juggling act. But while the Minister omitted facts in trying to put the face on his governments rather inadequate record, he is guilty of an even more serious omission, Mr. Speaker, and that is one that touches on the welfare of every working person in the province. I am speaking about the failure to allocate sufficient finances to ensure that occupational health and safety in Manitoba is more than a myth churned out by the expensive propagandist mill that the Conservatives have hired.

The Minister boasted of the quality of life enjoyed by Manitobans and pats himself on the back for it and his government, but what about the workers in the factories, on the construction sites and in the mines. How is their quality of life been improved by this government, if indeed they are still working? What safeguards has the Minister offered, or the government offered, or implemented to insure that ingesting cadmium, asbestos dust, brought up by the Member for Churchill from time to time, and sulphur dioxide, are not some of the fringe benefits of working in our province.

Mr. Speaker we heard about the government concern for creating a healthy climate for private investments, that they are willing not only to forego tax revenues to attract infusion of capital, as they said, but willing to forego something a lot more important to keep their corporate backers contented. They are willing to forego the health and safety of workers by failing to provide for a sufficient number of inspectors to monitor worksites and for personnel and equipment to monitor the air that workers are breathing in smelters, mines, and factories, air which is too often filled with poisons which kill and disable.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in failing to include these expenditures in his Budget, the Minister is being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Providing for health and safety of workers, we can avoid paying huge sums in compensation tomorrow or next year, but that's the future again. The Budget wasn't interested in the future. By protecting workers against unsafe work environments, we can see to it that they remain productive, contributing to the economic well-being of the province.

Manitoba workers have always been prepared to give their sweat for their families in order to provide for their families, even for the government through their taxes, but surely they shouldn't also be required to give their blood and their tears, Mr. Speaker.

The Property Tax Credit Modification — but first I wanted to speak for a minute about the increase in social services which the government likes to refer to. We shouldn't even talk about it as an increase, Mr. Speaker. They haven't nearly caught up with the cutbacks of the first years. We should look at social services over four years, not just over what has happened in the current year with an Election coming up. We have to look at the total, Mr. Speaker. But still the hardest people hit are those requiring personal contact, as I've already explained with the elderly, to a small extent I've explained it, and the direct services type of activity and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Minister has acknowledged the error in the Cost of Living Tax Credits, to correct what the Member for St. Matthews described on television as a terrible mess, which the Minister's department had created. I suppose this was the first blow in the St. James nomination contest, but it seems as though at last the Member for St. Matthews is getting some help from his front bench in correcting, in fact confirming that his description of the terrible mess was correct.

Mr. Speaker, in too many instances any increase in dollars in the pockets of renters referred to so boastfully in describing the Property Tax Credit Modification is just going to be picked up by the landlords, Mr. Speaker. It's deplorable that so little is said about housing in this Budget. In view of the extensive election promises in the area of housing, Mr. Speaker, promises which are the subject of a resolution before the House, it's shocking that there's no significant mention of housing. Those were specific, you might say concrete policy promises in the election. Somebody said a promise is binding in the inverse ratio of the numbers to whom it is made — Thomas de Quincey said that, and I guess when you make to a million people that makes it not very binding unfortunately. The tenants are being hammered with cruel rent increases, Mr. Speaker, and what does a gesture like this adjustment in Property Tax Credit do to help them. The lease renewals for this year are going out now for next June, and these papers I hold in my hand describe some of the increases in just two apartment blocks. The increases are from between 22 and 63 percent, Mr. Speaker. (Interjection)— The Minister for Highways says statistics. These are people — these are real people paying their hard-earned money to live decent lives in the city, and having their opportunities taken away from them by an uncaring unfeeling government. These are not statistics, these

are people who have come to my office to talk to me, because I'm their MLA, Mr. Speaker. These are not statistics, these are real living breathing people and their blood flows just as red as the blood of the government members on those benches.

These rents that I'm referring to in these just two apartment blocks I decided to bring to this debate, which were previously varied from \$254 a month to \$571 a month. Now the same apartments vary from \$311 a month to \$935 a month. These are not the wealthiest apartments, these are good apartments, they're nice apartment blocks for people who have earned a decent living for themselves. How many people, Mr. Speaker, would some of these mouthy people here say could pay \$900 a month for rent.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would table that information in the House, so that I could have it investigated by my department.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry it's not signed — it's dated, but it's not signed. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris, a very pompous man I might say, says I have no right to read something into the record. I didn't read this into the record, I described it. Do you want me to read it word for word, my notes on my visits from my constituents? How absurd, Mr. Speaker]

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on a point of order.

**MR. FILMON:** The member is required to table it, if asked for it, if she's reading it into the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Everybody, don't be silly. Okay?

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. These have all been protested to the Rentalsman, Mr. Speaker. (Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member has been asked to identify what she was quoting. Is the honourable member prepared to identify?

**MS. WESTBURY:** I was referring to two apartment blocks in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I have to table my notes, then I take it that means I have the right to ask everyone who speaks in this House to table their notes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I did not read from my notes, I described my notes. It doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker, I presume even this government would like to hear some truth.

Mr. Speaker, there were reports of a seven-city survey by the Ontario Housing Ministry, which the

report shows that typical rent increases in Ontario, in seven communities, I think it is, seven cities, range from 4.2 percent in Thunder Bay to 6 percent in Metro Toronto last year. This survey by the Ontario Housing Ministry, Mr. Speaker, found that typical rent increases were and they document 6 percent in Toronto was the highest, and 4.2 percent in Thunder Bay; 5.9 percent in Hamilton; 5.6 percent in London and so on. But they also found that in the survey that more than 65 percent of the people who responded to this survey reported few problems with breakdowns of maintenance and those that did occur were fixed within three days.

Mr. Speaker, they still have rent controls, which allow for 6 percent increase in Ontario, but have we heard that construction companies have stopped operating in Ontario? I don't think we've heard that, Mr. Speaker. Why are there so few breakdowns in the maintenance system, when here, the exact opposite has been true in apartment blocks?

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The breakdowns in apartment blocks in Winnipeg are constant, continual, continuous and repetitive even, Mr. Speaker, and while I'm still on the subject of housing, the Minister announced \$200,000 for a new program of incentives for super energy efficient housing. That was on page 55 of the Budget and I'll read it and I'm prepared to table it, Mr. Speaker. This program will involve grants of \$1,600 and will apply to 100 units in the first year. The purpose of this initiative is to support and stimulate the application of energy-saving technology to housing in Manitoba. Further details on the new program will be made available by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Mr. Speaker, how much of this \$200,000 is going to come from the Federal Government? The Federal Government has two programs for housing, for energy efficient housing. One is called Ultimate Energy Program, which is a comprehensive program I understand, and then they have a smaller program called PUSH and I'm sorry I don't know what the initials stand for, but which of these, if either, is the Minister drawing on, and I wonder why the Budget wouldn't have explained that some of this money was coming from the Federal Government? I presume they know about the programs.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I did refer earlier to the Minister of Finance, and now I want to — the previous Minister of Finance — and now I want to refer to last year's Budget speech. Mr. Speaker, he called it the "Blue Skies Budget", do you remember last year, and we laughed on this side, because it was "Blue Drought Skies" as it happened and we thought we were amusing because we made some little jokes about the "Blue Skies Budget" over here.

But I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that if that was the Budget of blue skies, this Budget is the winter of our discontent.

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

**MR. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m., April 20th (Monday).**