

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 21 April, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind members that today is the birthday of Her Majesty the Queen. In the midst of the many other subjects that require our attention, I know that we would want to give a moment's thought to the importance of the role of the Crown, that which the Crown has played and continues to play in the Constitution of Canada and of our province. Because the monarchical system as we have developed it, has worked so well under the Canadian Constitution and Canadian conditions, we seldom give thought to the great benefits that has bestowed upon us in guaranteeing stability, continuity and legitimacy to our official institutions and to all that we do in serving the people.

Her Majesty herself exemplifies how the monarchy serves us as she carries out her largely formal duties in a quiet, serious and dignified way, both in the United Kingdom and on her frequent trips to other countries of the Commonwealth.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we are particularly pleased to learn of the engagement of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales to the Lady Diana Spencer. The affection and respect which is felt for the Queen and for the Royal Family will undoubtedly be displayed in the events marking the marriage ceremony in July.

To that end I will be proposing that this House consider a resolution of congratulations to Her Majesty, as well as to the Prince of Wales and his fiancée, to express our pleasure on the happy occasion.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members will wish to join in marking Her Majesty's birthday and in the expression of best wishes and loyalty to her on this occasion.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, on this side, we of the NDP, of course, and probably all members of this House join in recognition of the birthday of Her Majesty the Queen. There is no doubt that the monarchy being historically one of the longest constitutional monarchies in the world, that it has lasted so long and served so well. I would say since the days of the Magna Carta its strength has been that it has adapted to the evolutionary process which is part of the modern democratic ideals. As has been suggested, too often people looking at the symbol of

the monarchy overlook the fact that it is a terribly burdensome task for that person who is the monarch, and certainly Queen Elizabeth has served for a long time in a very burdensome role, being in the public eye at all time. I am sure that we would all wish her health and continued contributions in her role, which has been carried out for so long a time already.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning there was a joint release of the final report of Reed Crowther and Associates on the hazardous waste management study that was done for the western provinces and the Territories and I would table copies of the executive summary for members opposite, as well as copies of the press release that was issued in conjunction with the Federal Government at that time.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 30 students of Grade 8 standing from St. John's High School, under the direction of Mr. George Forbeg. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister reporting for Hydro and ascertain from him what stage of renewal discussions there are now with the supply of power to International Nickel, since I understand that the agreement expired on March 31st in relation to the supply of power?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think there was a question on that the other day from the Member for Fort Rouge. The member is correct in that the previous contract, or the first half of the previous contract, expired at the end of March, 1981 and for the second half of the 40-year period, the next 20-year period, there are renegotiations to be spelled out in the form of a new contract. A new contract has not yet been signed or entered into. I understand that the provisions generally are that Inco will be receiving power in the interim period, until it's signed at least, at system industrial rates, or whatever the proper category is.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement, the joint announcement with Alcan yesterday, wherein the government has recognized and given an undertaking relating to the granting to a private enterprise, the ownership of power development of Hydro sources, is the government now in its negotiations with Inco, becoming involved in the possibility of a sale to Inco, or indeed to any other private enterprise, of land sites which make it possible for these enterprises, Inco or any others, to become owners of plants on the rivers of Manitoba for the production of hydro-electric power?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the negotiations with Inco, although not entirely completed yet, call for system rate power, the same as Hudsons Bay Mining and Smelting and other large consumers on a five-year contract basis; that is, would fix it at industrial consumer rates for the next five years.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Inasmuch as the government is about to embark on negotiations involved with the granting to private enterprise the right to own power production sources of a hydro-electric nature, hydro-electric power plants in the province on the river and drawing on the resources of Manitoba, is the province prepared to discuss with the City of Winnipeg which now owns substantial hydro producing sources plants in Manitoba, to negotiate with the City of Winnipeg, the granting to the city the right to own sufficient power producing plants to take care of the needs which it now buys from Manitoba Hydro?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any request from the City of Winnipeg to Manitoba Hydro in that regard and I would be very surprised if there was one.

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

**MR. JAMES D. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro and it arises from the Letter of Intent that was tabled yesterday. I would like to ask the Minister whether the government has decided which generating station Alcan would be given a minority share in?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, it's not spelled out as generally presumed that it's the Limestone Plant but it will depend on other things that occur in the meantime such as the Western Power Grid negotiations that may enter the picture or other developments in the interim period of time between now and the final agreement being reached with Alcan.

**MR. WALDING:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the Letter of Intent includes the words in 3(b) "and if the power station is not yet constructed", could we draw the inference from that, Mr. Speaker, that the government may be

considering allowing Alcan to buy into a power station that is already constructed?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose you could read that into it, but in the event that the Limestone Plant were started prior to the signing of an agreement with Alcan those words would apply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a final supplementary.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, then can the Minister assure the House that there is no possibility of selling a partial interest in a presently constructed generating station?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I think I missed the question, if that was a question.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, the question was: Can the Minister then rule out the possibility of Alcan being allowed to purchase a portion of a generating station that is already built?

**MR. CRAIK:** No, Mr. Speaker, that can't be ruled out although it is highly unlikely.

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

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister in charge of Hydro. Are we correct in assuming that ownership of the Hydro Plant itself will revert back to the province after the either 35, or 50, or 65-year term on repayment possibly of the initial amount paid by the company less depreciation or on what terms do we get it back?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the extent to which I can indicate or answer the member's question is simply that the term has been agreed to at 35 years with renewal options of 15 year terms to follow that, and of course the spelling out between now and the time of an agreement of the exact procedures that would be followed at year 35 or at any other point in time for the renewal of that and in the case of non-renewal of it, of course spelling out the procedures that would be followed in that case as well, and I can only indicate in those general terms that those have received discussion to date but are not spelled out in detail at this point.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, just a supplementary on that to the Minister. At some point in time this agreement would come to an end, either at 35 or 50 or 65 years. Is there an understanding that at that point in time there will be a buy-sell agreement as is standard in joint venture agreements under which the majority partner can purchase the assets. Has that been discussed and on what kinds of terms would we get it back, in case Alcan didn't need it or in case we needed it more for other types of endeavours?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify. The member is referring to at 35 or any other 15-year

term after that, and if that is the case, in general the answer is yes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere, with a final supplementary.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just one further question with respect to the renewal terms. It would appear that there would be a water licence granted for 35 years, then 15 and then another 15 years. At the time of renewal, will the government and Alcan each have the right to renegotiate the formula on which the water rental is based? That is would the government be entitled to change entirely after 35 years the basis on which the calculation for water rental is made?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, without being specific, Mr. Speaker, yes, in general terms that would be the case.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not the province is going to be involved in location and environmental studies along with Alcan or separate from Alcan's activities basis their \$5 million feasibility study.

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the province will have an involvement in due course and soon, in fact, the House can expect that the Minister responsible for environmental matters will be outlining some of the procedures to be followed in this examination.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, since the province is indeed going to be involved in location and environmental studies, can the Minister assure us that it is the province that will be interfacing with local governments, wherever that may be, that is the location site that is finally chosen, so that the interests of the people of Manitoba and indeed the people in the local area are going to be protected.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the main onus of responsibility will be on Alcan to do the preliminary site selection and to do the dealings with the municipalities as the Letter of Intent has indicated. The province has undertaken and they are to be of every assistance possible in providing them with the background regulations and other things that have to be followed. I would trust we don't get into the position of having to get into acting as a conciliator in their discussions with the municipalities. I think from what I have been told by Alcan that any discussions they have had to date have been very good and very encouraging but this does not rule out the possibility that there may have to be at some point in time some legislative action taken to bring about a special distribution in an area so that municipalities other than the one single municipality can receive benefits from such an undertaking.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm that the site selection indeed is going to be

decided between Alcan and some local government in Manitoba rather than between Alcan and the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, principally, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility at this point in time certainly is between Alcan and the municipalities.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Telephone System reports. I would like to enquire as to whether there has been any information that can now be made available relative to the explosion which took place in a phone booth the other day and that was reported in the newspapers.

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

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** No, I don't have any additional information at this point in time, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, I would like to ask the Minister whether what occurred has required any caution on his part with regard to phone booths generally or can we be assured that the incident was isolated and has nothing to do with either something in the phone booths or a pattern in phone booths?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to provide that kind of an assurance but I think along with the Member for Inkster we would hope that would be certainly an isolated incident.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether he would concede that the failure of the Premiers to reach agreement on a Charter or Rights has left federal leader Joe Clark out on a limb, or perhaps a more accurate metaphor would be like the giant in Jack and the Beanstock, the First Minister has chopped down the beanstock and injured his federal leader in the process.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the Accord that was arrived at by the eight First Ministers of the provinces last Thursday was an Accord that I think is of historic importance and in the national interest. I am not aware of it having left anyone on a beanstalk or in other analogies that seem to attract themselves to my honourable friend's level of intelligence. I merely say that the Accord speaks for itself. It's a positive document; it's a document of conciliation. I hope that for the sake of the unity of Canada, it will be accepted.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the Honourable Joe Clark, who expressed his disappointment at the outcome of the meeting and I

quote; he said, "I had hoped that there would have been some reference to the Charter of Rights," has the First Minister been in touch with his federal leader or vice versa?

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can understand my honourable friend's preoccupation with what leaders of national parties say because the leader of his national party has been thoroughly embarrassing all western Canadians, to say nothing of all socialists, for some considerable length of time.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that was a statement or a question, but I would like to also ask the First Minister, in view of news reports that have come out of Ottawa today that, "Conservative Leader Joe Clark told reporters that his party now believes that," and as he said, "once rights are established, they should apply equally across the country," in view of that statement by the Federal Progressive Conservative Party Leader, would the Premier not admit that the rift between him and his federal leader has now widened?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend will recall, if he has any powers of recall, I have said in this House on a number of occasions that there is no similarity between the position that this government takes with respect to a Charter of Rights and the position that is taken by our national party; I make no apology for that at all. If my honourable friend wishes to make some private socialist capital out of it that's his business and I suggest he is only doing it as a red herring to draw attention away from the fact that his party is fundamentally split on this point because the Premier of Saskatchewan has taken a fundamentally different position, and may I say a correct position with respect to a Charter of Rights throughout the piece on this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe it's in order for me to ask another question. No one else is standing.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Our rules are quite distinct that a member has a question and two supplementaries.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a new question.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like to know if the question period time has elapsed. If it hasn't, I believe members are entitled to ask questions and the ones who are standing, I believe, should be recognized.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the First Minister this. If he thinks that there is a

fundamental rift in the New Democratic Party because of an apparent or otherwise position of the provincial and federal parties and the Saskatchewan Premier, does he not also recognize that his views and his federal leaders and the views of Premiers Davis and Hatfield would also constitute a fundamental rift, only in the Conservative Party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Member for Transcona

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the First Minister. Is the Conservative Government's formal and quite intensive opposition to a Charter of Rights the position of the Conservative Cabinet of Manitoba or is it the position of the Leader of the Conservative Government of Manitoba which he is imposing upon his caucus and the Cabinet?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern and the lack of understanding that my honourable friend would have about how a democratic caucus works because he doesn't belong to one, but I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the position of the First Minister or of the government of this province was not sustained by the caucus of this government, it would not be expressed as the position of the government.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary to the First Minister. In light of his statements, will the Premier explain why a member of the Conservative Cabinet of Manitoba has sent out a statement to his local newspaper taking a position which publicly completely contradicts the position of the Premier? I quote a statement in the Swan River paper, dated March 19, 1981, headlined, "Gourlay Defends Individuals' Rights," whereby he says, "The P.C. Party believes that the Constitution should be brought back to Canada with an acceptable amending formula, then the provinces and federal government could agree on a Charter of Rights. We want the Charter of Rights to protect Canadians' rights to own property."

In the light of that statement, which completely contradicts the cherished longstanding notion of collective responsibility in a Cabinet parliamentary system, would the Minister then ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to resign?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, then, in light of the flowery statement of the Minister just now, can he explain why it is that one of his Cabinet will publicly send out statements directly contradicting the position of the Government of Manitoba and the Premier of Manitoba with respect to a Charter of Rights. Is he doing so as a spokesman on behalf of the government or is he merely doing so, Mr. Speaker, in order to protect his plank in a seat which he has great possibility of losing in the next provincial election?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** I would like to address a question to the Minister responsible for MDC, the Minister of Energy and Mines. It relates to the ManFor company in The Pas. There is a recent Canadian Press story out of Vancouver quoting a Mr. Adam Zimmerman of Noranda Mines to the effect, and I am quoting, "Woods Gordon and Company, management consultants of Toronto, was commissioned by the government to "peddle the assets."

My question to the Minister: Is the Government of Manitoba, through this Minister, in the process of peddling the assets of ManFor to Noranda Mines?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I would never be found guilty of anything like that.

**MR. EVANS:** I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether the government is currently in negotiations with various private companies to sell or otherwise dispose of ManFor and particularly, or namely, MacMillan Bloedel, the Forestry Division of Noranda Mines, to possibly Repap Enterprises of Montreal.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I was questioned on that two or three days ago in the House at the time that the article appeared and answered that question, I believe. I indicated at that time that negotiations — I wasn't able to discount the story except to say that there has been contact made with quite a number of firms over a period of time. I can't indicate whether we are currently in contact with some that he has quoted here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

**MR. EVANS:** Could the Minister indicate to the House whether there is some deadline or proposed time objectives decided upon by the government for some decision to be made in this matter with regard to whether to expand ManFor through the public purse more or less; through public investment or whether to sell it to some private enterprise that may be interested in becoming a partner with the government or perhaps may be interested in purchasing it outright?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, we had some discussions of this during the Committee stage when ManFor appeared before the Committee, and I indicated at that time that it was the Government's desire to have done whatever was going to be undertaken by sometime mid-1981. The principal reason for that is that there are some modifications to the existing plant which should be undertaken in 1981 if the large expansion that we would like to see take place somehow does not occur and for that reason, and the fact that you don't like keeping personnel caught in mid-air, not that they really have anything to be concerned about but anytime there is a proposal for change, personnel do get concerned and we don't want to prolong that period any longer than about mid-1981.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether he has had an opportunity to review the matter that I brought to his attention dealing with the Crown lands issue and whether he's made a decision on that?

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, the member maybe could clarify a little bit more precise the issue that he's referring to. I'm not aware of a letter. If it's the issue on the appeal mechanism, to this point I'm not aware of receiving a communique from him, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, it looks like I'll have to give a copy of the letter to the Minister I sent to him about a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter, can the Minister indicate whether he's prepared to allow an appeal that I requested of the Minister eight months ago and wrote him three further letters asking for a response, that I haven't received a response to that yet?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will review the issue. I know there has been some correspondence from the honourable member and will, further to checking on it, report back to him, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

**MR. URUSKI:** Can the Minister indicate whether he's intending to bring in a procedure dealing with changes in the issuing of Crown land leases to advise the prospective or former lease holders by registered mail when a change is contemplated rather than having the negative impacts that have occurred by changes without farmers being notified of losing their haying rights in their leases, Mr. Speaker?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any changes in the allocation or the procedure within the Crown Lands Branch since we've come into office, but I'm not fully aware of the negative impact approach that the member is referring to. If a person, Mr. Speaker, does not require the land or for some reason the land is taken away from him, then there is a re-allocation takes place through the normal point system.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment and

follows upon the tabling of the report on the Reed Crowther Study by the Minister earlier before today's Question Period.

In the press release, which is presented under the Minister's name and accompanies the summary, the Minister said that he is looking forward to receiving public reaction to this particular report, and that he's in specific looking forward to getting the reaction of individuals, corporations, municipalities and other interested groups. I would ask the Minister if he is prepared to send the whole three volume report to the Clean Environment Commission so that a series of hearings can be held throughout different geographical areas in the province, which are in fact affected by improper waste disposal at present, so that individuals, corporations and municipalities can come forward in their own locale and provide representation to a government body to the Clean Environment Commission in a structured way so as he can get the most benefit out of the public reaction to that report?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in fact that's precisely the sort of mechanism that was contemplated when I discussed it at the press conference this morning. I indicated that we hadn't yet decided whether the Clean Environment Commission would be the official body to hold the hearings or whether a special body made up of perhaps some technical staff from the government along with members from various parts of the community at large would form the hearing body, but it was our intention in fact to set up public hearings in the various areas of the province on a formalized basis of this nature.

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

**MR. COWAN:** I ask the Minister then, Mr. Speaker, to be more specific and to indicate firstly when it is he anticipates that that public body will be formed or that public body will undertake those hearings if in fact it is a Clean Environment Commission which is already in effect? Secondly, if he can indicate if that body will be travelling into rural and Northern Manitoba so as to provide equal access to all citizens of the province, so that they can make their views known to that particular body in respect to what they consider to be problems and solutions in respect to hazardous waste management in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that it'll be later this year. The logistics of time probably prevent it from occurring before the summer so it would be sometime in the latter part of the year and yes, it would be the intention that they could go into the rural and northern areas of the province to hold those hearings in those areas as well.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Finally I ask the Minister if he can respond to a statement within the press release when it's indicated that the report also recommends that a proposed waste management system be operated as a Crown corporation financed by all the participating governments?

I ask the Minister if he endorses that concept and if he does not endorse it, for what reason has he chosen not to?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, at the moment I can confirm that I neither endorse it nor reject that concept. We have not had an opportunity to evaluate it from a Manitoba prospective and that's one of the areas that certainly we'll be looking at closely from our governments prospective on behalf of all Manitobans.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not he is prepared to table the Order for Return that has been asked of him for some period of time and which has been on the Order Paper for about two years?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, when that information is available then it will be made available to the House.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that in two years time that if there's a need for information that the Minister would have had adequate time and staff capacity to bring that information forward. I ask the Minister what is the problem with respect to staff within his department that is unable to bring forth that information?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, there appeared to be some inconsistencies with the appraisals of the properties done while the member opposite was the Minister and until I'm satisfied that the proper information is available to this House, then, Mr. Speaker, when I'm satisfied it will be provided to the members.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council that we're dealing with has nothing to do with the system of appraisal prior to the term of this government. It has to do with the request for information that was made in Committee and subsequently an Order for Return was filed in order to facilitate the information being made available to this side of the House. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is not willing to provide that information because that particular information contains information relative to the purchase of properties without more than one tender or bid received, and where it involves relatives of Ministers of the Crown.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as all members of this House and I'm sure the Member for Lac du

Bonnet is quite aware, that he refers to an Order for Return, or an Order-in-Council. They're all public documents and quite available to him and as I've indicated when the information that has been requested, when I'm satisfied that the proper information is available, then it will be made available to this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a new question.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the Minister whether he does not consider it in his interest and the interest of the government that that matter be clarified since it does involve, you know, relationships of members of the front bench and it seems to me that if there's nothing to hide, then it would indeed improve the image of my friends opposite, otherwise we have to leave the question open and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. One of the fundamental rules of the Legislature is that a statement by a Minister has to be accepted as being the case unless a member has very specific information, otherwise in which case he has a matter of privilege then.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dispute your ruling. I simply want to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that this is not new information. This was properly debated some two years ago, at which time the Minister agreed to bring the information. The question of whether there's a conflict of interest was debated at that time, so it's not something that I'm injecting as being new today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the move of the Agriculture Department employees to the City of Brandon as of July. Can the Minister now advise whether a decision has been made to utilize any particular building in the City of Brandon for these offices and in particular, can he advise whether the former co-op retail store on Princess Avenue would be in that decision?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** No, Mr. Speaker, a final decision has not been made. As I indicated to my honourable friend earlier, a number of locations had been looked at and the location that will be decided upon is one that requires certain facilities in order to ensure that the location is one that is acceptable by the client department and the department are now in the process of examining the various facilities that have been suggested and as soon as the proper one has been decided upon and arrangements are made, I will advise my honourable friend.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Minister for that information. Just by way of supplementary, could he

briefly indicate what kind of facilities does he refer to? There is, I gather, certain type of arrangement of a building, certain perhaps water facilities, or traffic facilities or whatever. What criteria are you looking at in making this decision?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** As you may be aware, the Water Services Board do require warehouse space as well as fenced in outside space for some of the equipment that they use, so that's part of the complex that I was advising my honourable friend about earlier.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I thank the Minister for the information because there is a great deal of interest in the city at this time. The last answer, it would seem to me perhaps in effect, rules out a downtown Brandon location?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to suggest that any particular location is ruled out. My honourable friend can draw his own conclusions.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance and it refers to a government news release dated April 3rd of this year, indicating that the City of Winnipeg will receive \$2,050,000 as a grant to cover increased Winnipeg Hydro costs for water power rental. It indicates that this amount is as of June 1st, 1980 until the end of 1981. Can the Minister confirm that this amount will come out of this fiscal year and where will this amount appear in the Estimates?

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** The amount was paid out of the 1980-81 fiscal year, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to a January 30th news release indicating a Special Warrant issued by the government out of which \$2.1 million is indicated to be paid to Winnipeg for lost revenues to Winnipeg Hydro due to increased power rentals and hydro rate freeze. I'd like to ask the Minister whether this is a different amount, since the amount is indicated to be not the same and why is there this apparent duplication?

**MR. RANSOM:** It's the same item, Mr. Speaker, but it's an estimated amount and the final figure was slightly lower than the Supplementary Supply.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines. Last evening in his contribution to the Budget Debate, the Minister of Labour indicated that the Roper Committee which has been examining the Wright Committee Reports

on safety and health conditions in the mining industry in Manitoba, has made their report and that the government is acting, is already working on six or seven of the major recommendations of that report. As this Committee was financed by the Minister of Mines and as the responsibility for Workplace Safety and Health is still that of the Ministry of Mines, can the Minister indicate which six or seven major recommendations are being implemented as a result of the review of the Wright Committee Report by the Roper Committee?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** A matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I listened to and then reflected on the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture dealing with an Order for Return which he accepted on May 16th, 1979, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if a review is made of the comments he made today and made in response to questions I asked within the last number of days that he has no intention whatsoever to comply with the Order of the Legislature because, Mr. Speaker, he has indicated that he will not file it until he is satisfied that he has appraisals which were made some — it must be more than three-and-a-half years ago. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is an affront to the House especially since the Order has nothing whatsoever to do with appraisals made at any time as far as I know, but certainly not prior to sales made by the government.

I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion it is a matter of a privilege of the House and one which would result in a motion of censure of the Minister or at least an exhaustive review of his salary when it comes up again under the Main Supply Bill. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister ought to give a definite undertaking to file an Order be it inadequate in his opinion or not but yet a response to the Order which this House ordered and I believe unanimously.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. On the matter raised by the honourable member, I listened carefully to the points he has raised. I have heard no indication whatsoever from the Minister of Agriculture that he will not file the Order for Return, therefore the honourable member does not have a point of privilege.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ADJOURNED DEBATE — BUDGET

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment and the subamendment thereto — The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, we have, as I indicated last night, been presented with a Budget based on faulty analysis of the performance of the Manitoba economy in the past three years under this particular government. They have made a fruitless attempt, Mr.

Speaker, to try to prove that their economic policies have been effective in developing the economy of this province, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, their actions to date have resulted in a relative decline in the Manitoba economy.

Mr. Speaker the data shows, an independent appraisal of the data shows, and this is something that should worry members opposite and members on this side — it does worry members on this side — that there has been a serious structural decline take place in the economy in the past three years; a serious structural decline.

Members opposite and particularly the Minister of Finance made glowing statements about turning the economy around and about how progress has been made and of course they for ever and ever point to the employment growth record. They point to the record of job creation. Mr. Speaker, job creation under this government has been no better, in fact worse than it was under the New Democratic Party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. There are a great number of private conversations going on. I find it very difficult to hear the remarks of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we look at the statistics on job creation in Manitoba and relate our situation here to what has been going on in the national economy as the Minister of Finance is inclined to do usually, the facts are, the figures show that the job creation performance of this government in relative terms, in relation to what's going on in Canada, is no better than what happened under the NDP, in fact it is slightly poorer than what happened under the New Democratic administration.

Take a look at the facts. In 1980 Manitoba had the worst job creation record of any of the ten provinces; in 1980 it was the worst. In 1979 we had the worst job creation performance of any of the 10 provinces, and in 1978, we weren't the worst, we were the third worst, we were the third poorest.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to brag about in terms of job creation in this province. My colleague the Member for Churchill will be going into this matter in more detail so I don't propose to discuss this particular matter any further, but I just point out that the Minister of Finance and others opposite are always inclined to hang their hat about economic development on this one particular statistic, which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last night is really a function of the value of the Canadian dollar. The fact that the Canadian dollar has been devalued and began to be devalued very seriously in 1977 has indeed created jobs across the country.

The problem we have of course, Mr. Speaker, because job creation has increased across Canada whereas economic growth has not kept pace, what has happened is that productivity per worker has been declining across the nation and this is something all Canadians should be concerned with.

The Minister refers to manufacturing, forever talking in current dollar terms, forever talking in the value of shipments, never wishing to look at value added, never wishing to look at constant dollar terms which most economists look at in terms of what is actually happening to a particular industry. The facts are that if you look at the real growth in Manitoba's



manufacturing industry in the years 1978 to 1980, the rate of growth is 1.2 percent, Mr. Speaker, which compares rather poorly with what happened under the NDP years. At that time the average rate of growth was 5.4 percent, just about almost five to one. But again we should relate it to what happened in the Canadian context because I don't think it is fair to just look and see what we're doing in Manitoba in isolation.

If you look at the NDP years in government you will see that the real output in manufacturing grew at about one-and-a-half times the rate in Canada as a whole. Under the present government the rate of growth of real output in manufacturing has been only one-half of the national average. So in terms of manufacturing, Mr. Speaker, our performance has been worse.

If we look in mining, if you look at the real output in the mining industry, again, it's quite clear that we have done more poorly the past three years, 1978, 1979, 1980, than we did in the years when the New Democratic Party was in office. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, any year, you could look at any of the years in which we happened to be in office and you will see that in no year did the mining output fall below \$100 million using constant dollars based on 1971. In no year did it fall below \$100 million. Since 1977 we have been constantly under \$100 million; 1978 the real output in mining was \$88 million; 1979 it was \$83 million; in 1980 it was \$93 million. In effect, if you combine what has happened under the past few years of Conservative government with what happened during the NDP years, there has been an overall decline of 25 percent in real output. If you don't believe those figures, you can look at what has happened in terms of mining employment, what happened in terms of employing people, and the average man hours worked in the past couple of years has declined also from the period of time in which we were in office.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on and talk about other aspects of the economy and, in effect, demonstrate very easily that the economic analysis in this Budget Address simply will not hold water.

Let me speak for a moment about the problem of population growth or population decline in the province. It's interesting that the Budget document generally tries to gloss over the problem, generally tries to make the problem less than it really is. As a matter of fact, I notice on Page 10 of Appendix B, wherein the Minister reviews the Manitoba economy, he lumps foreign immigration in with interprovincial migration and talks about migration in total. I suppose you can do that, Mr. Speaker, you can lump them together because foreign immigration is a factor, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, you gloss over the problem that way because foreign immigration, as the Minister knows, is not a function today of the economic situation in the province. It tends to be more a function of federal government policy and the last two years or so have been primarily government policy with regard to refugees and there is no question that there has been an increase in foreign immigration into this province and that is what has helped to sustain the population in the year 1980, the large increase in foreign immigration into this province.

But by lumping it in with interprovincial migration, as the Minister has done in his report, you cannot

see what has been happening to the flow of Canadians into and out of Manitoba. I say it is important to look at that in isolation because it is a function of the extent to which the level of economic activity in Manitoba is either above or below levels of economic activity in other provinces. Surely the outflow, the net outflow, or if you want, the net inflow of people, if that should ever occur again, the net flow of people is surely a function of the relationship between the economic performance of Manitoba versus the economic performance in other provinces.

You know, the Minister goes on, on Page 23 of his Budget Address, to imply that the population loss that we have experienced in great numbers in the past couple of years has somehow arisen in the past few years because of what has happened in Alberta and I quote one sentence on Page 23: "What is new is the impact of the rapid expansion of Alberta's economy on migration patterns throughout the country."

In other words, the suggestion is that Alberta started to grow only during the past three years. Well, the Minister knows or should know that the very rapid rate of growth in Alberta has been with us for many years. When we were in government, the average rate of growth in Alberta was 7.95 per year. The past three years, it has been 7.23.

(Interjection)— The real domestic product rate of growth, according to the latest figures that we have from the Conference Board, and I can quote the numbers: In 1969 it was 6.685 million; in 1977 it was 10.939 million. That figures out at an average rate of growth of 7.95 percent per year. Since 1977, the Alberta rate of growth has been 7.23. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had this phenomenon of rapid growth of the Alberta economy for many years, so the Minister can't hide behind that as the reason for the Manitoba exodus.

(Interjection)— I didn't hear the Minister. What should we know? What should I know? What I know and what the Minister wants to pretend he doesn't know, and that is that Alberta has for many years been a magnet attracting people out of this province. To the extent to which we can provide job opportunities here, attractive opportunities, we can help maintain our population basis, but the fact is that we have failed in the past few years and therefore this increased exodus from the province.

I would only close, Mr. Speaker, because I believe I only have one or two minutes left, three minutes left. I would only close by pointing out to the members opposite that in no year of our government did the population of the province drop. Every year that we were in government, the province's population expanded year-by-year.

The only other time that I can see any significant decline was during World War II and the years 1942 and 1943, when men and women left the province, were sent out of the province to fight World War II. The other time was 1966, when there was a drop of 1,900 in the total level of population during the Roblin administration. There was no decline of this magnitude in the Seventies when we were in office. It occurred in the past couple of years and we can see it mainly because of the rapid increase in interprovincial loss. It skyrocketed; it just about doubled in 1978 over 1977. We lost 5,685 people in the year 1977 and this jumped to 10,493 in 1978; it

jumped again in 1979 to 15,457; and in 1980 it was still relatively high, 13,533 people.

Mr. Speaker, the government is perpetrating a myth that it has begun the process of recovery and rebuilding the Province of Manitoba. On Page 16, there are references to restoring a healthy economy and that step has been taken and elsewhere he says, "We have encouraged private expansion and we have made progress . . ." and so forth and so on. Mr. Speaker, if this is progress, God help us if the Minister says we have had stagnation. If this is progress, when there has been less private capital investment under the Tories than under the NDP; when last year in 1980, when the figures come out next week we'll have more than 2 percent decline last year; if that is progress, God help us if we are ever presented with the statement by the Minister that the economy is stagnant.

Thank you.

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, it is once again a pleasure to rise to speak to this particular document, which I consider most positive and significant.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the new Minister of Finance, my colleague, on acquitting himself so well in this first Budget. I take some confidence and pleasure in knowing that a man of his abilities and talents has now assumed this position. I think it bodes well for the responsibilities of the Finance portfolio. I know that he will carry on that tradition that has been set by his predecessor and carry it on admirably well.

Mr. Speaker, we've had four Budgets and I would suggest that not one of those Budgets has contained an increase in personal or sales taxes. The most significant particular aspect, Mr. Speaker, of all of these Budgets, no more taxes on the people of Manitoba of a personal or sales tax nature, and, Mr. Speaker, if there is no other point that comes out of these Budgets, no other point than that one, I have to suggest that it is significant.

Now, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and his comments on the Budget and I found it was the same old tired diatribe of rather pallid insipid stuff that preach doom and gloom and offered no hope for the province, condemned everything that we have done, in fact couldn't see anything that we had done, Mr. Speaker, and that of course, can only suggest a lack of perception. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition said there's no election coming, because no one would go to the people on the basis of a Budget like that.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have allotted to me, I would like to touch on some of those very positive things that are contained in that Budget and are contained in the services in the programs, that that Budget provides for, for the coming year.

Now the Leader of the Progressive Socialist Party had some things to say about the Budget, but I was really more interested in what he had to say about the Progressive Socialist policies, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time we've had an opportunity to really hear what those policies were and all I can gather from listening to his remarks was

that the Progressive Socialist Party is the NDP Party in a hurry. In other words, he believes in the same things, state control, the socialist state, but he would move to them a little more quickly than our friends in the NDP Party would. So we have that contrast between the doom and gloom party and the PS party who will move very quickly to the socialist state and that is the choice that the people of Manitoba will have, Mr. Speaker, in that regard.

I thought I would try something a little different this year, Mr. Speaker, because there's a real danger in this Chamber that we are so close to the forest that we don't see the trees, so I took this Budget document and I gave it to a couple of my constituents, who I consider reasonably objective people, asked them to read through it and tell me what they thought was of greatest significance, and I was amazed. One of them was a businessperson, the other one is a professional person, and they came back and they said, pages 58 and 59 are the two pages that to us are most significant, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to turn to them for a minute because they are part of that overview that the Minister of Finance provided for us in his remarks, and that overview, Mr. Speaker, I think is highly significant and significant to the people of this province. I was interested, Mr. Speaker, that two reasonably neutral, non-political people would look at this document and suggest that pages 58 and 59 were perhaps two of the most significant pages in the Budget.

What do they contain, Mr. Speaker? Well they refer first of all to the fact that as soon as we took office, that we reduced the general personal income tax rate from 56 to 54 percent and we phased out that temporary surtax on personal income on schedule, at the end of 1978. Mr. Speaker, this was one of the things that they thought was most significant.

The abolishment of the succession duties and the gift taxes was another that they felt was most significant. A third was the reduction in the corporate income tax for small business in this province, from 13 percent to 11 percent, Mr. Speaker, and isn't it interesting that our friends on the other side as they get closer to an election, all of a sudden have been transformed into great friends of small business. They had eight years to prove that friendship, and small businessmen during those eight years didn't seem to sense any warmth at all, any friendship, any support from their government, and I'll tell you they'll have a hard time convincing small business people in this province that the leopard has changed its spots, that they're prepared to go out and help small business in this province, because they had their chance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was three of the particular items that my friends pointed out, that they thought were significant. The fourth, of course, was the corporation capital tax exemption for small business, from \$100,000 — \$100,000 that's where it was under gentlemen opposite — to \$500,000 in 1978 and \$750,000 in 1980. We have to remember of course, that it was \$100,000 at the time we came into government, Mr. Speaker. Of course there are a number of others: the reforms in the Manitoba mining tax structure that took place in 1979, another very positive move that this government took and, of course, what have the effects been, and we're seeing the effects in this province.

A number of other nuisance taxes, Mr. Speaker, that we abolished including the mineral acreage tax and the mining royalty and The Tax Act levies for quarry operators, and we're seeing the benefits of that increased, mineral exploration in this country, in this province particularly. Those are the effects, if the honourable gentlemen opposite want to see the effects of those things and, of course, we also provided new and extended sales tax exemptions for childrens' clothing, restaurant meals, safety equipment and so on, and, of course, The Gasoline Tax incentives for the production and distribution of gasohol have resulted, I would suggest, in the establishment of a plant in Minnedosa that will be utilizing some of the agricultural production of this province.

Interesting points, Mr. Speaker, and I think significant in that two people, who are not political, who are not involved in this process, would look at this Budget and say, those two pages in the Budget that show all the tax cuts that were undertaken by the Progressive Conservative Government are two of the most significant pages in the whole Budget. Mr. Speaker, I thought I should touch on that because I found it rather interesting.

We can expect certain slants, certain directions from people in this particular House, but it is interesting to get the reaction of people outside the House to some of these things.

Now the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard a great deal about in the last two or three years is the fact that this Progressive Conservative Government is only interested in big business. Not interested in people, you know we went through that, what I think was a disgraceful situation, where we talked about the bedsheets and two slices of bacon and so on, and the Minister of Health was besieged by these tremendous stories from members opposite and they kept this particular charade up, Mr. Speaker, to the point that it became absolutely ridiculous and the people out there were laughing at them. Then what happened? We had a study by Justice Hall that looked at Health in this province and, of course, destroyed that myth that they were trying to perpetrate in this province, saying that this is one of the finest health systems that we have in Canada. And you know, we haven't heard too much about bed sheets from the gentlemen opposite since then, they've more or less had to back off from that particular myth because they can't sell it anymore. Mr. Speaker, they can't sell any of those myths that they are trying to perpetrate about us not being a government concerned about the people of this province.

Look at the increase in this particular Budget, some \$303.9 million, and 83 percent of it, Mr. Speaker, is made up of budgets in Health, Education, and Community Services. Where is the emphasis there, Mr. Speaker, if it isn't on people? Right in the area where it counts most, in services that are going directly to people; Health, Education, and Community Services.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to touch on an area that is very close to me of course in Education, because I know that my colleague the Minister of Health will have his opportunity to talk about what new programs and supports have been provided by this Budget to the Health Department. I would like to

spend some time on looking at just what this particular Budget will do for the Department of Education and the services that we provide across this province.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that I mention the most outstanding initiative that has been taken in educational financing in this province for many years, certainly not taken during the eight years that gentlemen opposite were in government, the new Educational Support Program where this government, after two-and-a-half years of careful study and input from individuals and organizations in this province, has come forth with an education support program where the government and this Budget place \$70 million in the financing of public school education in this province; \$70 million, Mr. Speaker, that will not come from property taxation. In fact the total amount of money out of this Budget that comes out of provincial coffers that goes towards the financing of the schools of this province in 1981 will be some \$288.1 million in direct grants to the schools of this province. That's \$288.1 in direct grants, Mr. Speaker, that does not account for the \$146 million in indirect grants through property tax rebates. If we add those two figures together we find that in total the government in 1981-82 will be supporting education costs through direct and indirect grants at an 81 percent level. That was a promise that we made to the people in 1977 that we would approach that level of educational funding, and, Mr. Speaker, we have done it.

I take some satisfaction in that fact and of course what did the program contain? Not only that particular relief for the vast majority of property taxpayers in this province, but let's look at the educational side of it, Mr. Speaker. It increased incentives for vocational education and programs for children with special needs, and I will expand on that later, Mr. Speaker. It brought in a three-year plan for the first time in Canada, Mr. Speaker, where there's an educational financing program in place in one of the provinces that allows school boards to plan ahead for three years. Never before have we had that situation and it certainly has been well received by school boards in Manitoba. We have retained local autonomy. We believe that those locally elected officials, elected by the people in their own school divisions should have responsibility and should have some say in how their schools are run and operated, and this retention of local autonomy through the raising of a percentage of the school taxes through local levy has been retained. We realize of course, Mr. Speaker, that when you retain local autonomy you must accept that local autonomy may manifest itself in spending beyond guidelines that the province would like in some instances, but we accept that that is a part of local autonomy.

We have seen a significant shift, Mr. Speaker, from the real property taxation to the general revenues of the province, long overdue I would suggest, and of course we have had to take into consideration that this year there will be a \$54 million increase in the cost of operating the schools of this province which is about 11 percent. So the \$70 million, Mr. Speaker, is an amount of money that not only took into consideration that \$54 million increase in the costs of operation for 1981-82, but also has enabled most school divisions to hold their mill rates at a level the

same as last year or less than last year, Mr. Speaker. In fact I have here the latest information on that. We now find that in the 60 to 70 mill range in those school divisions that have mill rates in that particular range, this year will be 32 in total, and in 1980 before the new Education Support Program came into being it was some 18, Mr. Speaker. We can see one of the very positive effects of the new plan right there. A 60 to 70 mill rate, Mr. Speaker, if we compute that on a \$6,000 assessment certainly doesn't leave the property taxpayer with much to pay after their particular rebate. And of course perhaps a more global figure as to the effect of the program to this date, Mr. Speaker, some 46 school divisions have had less than a one mill increase in their school property tax. Forty-six school divisions have had less than a one mill increase, most of them with a decrease, Mr. Speaker, but certainly 46 with one mill or less out of some 54, Mr. Speaker.

While I mentioned that part of this new program, and I don't want to emphasize the fact that it is just a program that provides taxpayers with relief. Let's look at some of the positive aspects from an educational point of view. Back in 1977, Mr. Speaker, when we came into government, gentlemen opposite were very quick to criticize that Minister of Education, myself, and they said you've only got three-quarters of a million dollars in this budget for Special Needs. You are not doing any better than we did, because we had that amount of money in our Budget. Well that was some four years ago, Mr. Speaker, and let's look at what the picture is today, what we have developed in this area of Special Needs over four years, what has evolved, what kind of programming and what kind of supports are now in place in this province. Remember it was four years ago when they were criticizing me for the fact that I hadn't increased the three-quarter million dollars that they had in place for some Special Needs program.

Let's look at what it is this year and what it was last year and see the comparison. Last year the province provided some \$13.9 million out of a total Special Needs funding in the province of \$27.3 million. In other words the province last year, Mr. Speaker, was providing about 51 percent of the total Special Needs support in the province. This year under the new Education Support Program the province will be funding \$29.1 million of a total expenditure for Special Needs of \$34.7 million. This year, Mr. Speaker, the province will be funding 84 percent of the costs of Special Needs education in this province in our schools.

I take some pride in that, Mr. Speaker, I consider it a progressive step and one that gives me some satisfaction. In other words, an increase over 1980 in Special Needs funding of some \$15.1 million. Rather significant, Mr. Speaker, when we think back four years to when gentlemen opposite were quibbling about three-quarters of a million dollars, and why we hadn't increased it by \$100,000 or so. And you know, Mr. Speaker, in this \$15 million, in this increase this year is contained some \$6 million dollars for educational supports, for low incidence one and low incidence two handicaps. Those are children with the severest handicaps in our system. Some \$6 million, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you in the past, under their government, it was a matter of a few thousand. In four years, Mr. Speaker, and they

say that there is nothing positive in this Budget, that we haven't done anything with those dollars, that we aren't concerned about people, that we aren't putting programs in place to help people? Well, that's a little bit ironical, Mr. Speaker, when you look at facts such as those that I have just placed before this House in the area of Special Needs.

In 1977-78, when we came into this government, a previous government had provided some consultants for the hearing impaired in this province. They had a grand total of two. This year, Mr. Speaker, we will have eight consultants for the hearing impaired in this province. We have increased rather drastically over the last four years. And of course we have heard a great deal of rhetoric about what they would do and what they were going to do about Special Needs children and screening, but, Mr. Speaker, it was all rhetoric; there was no action. We saw nothing in place. We have put in place a screening pilot program, this fall it will be starting, that will identify children in the very earliest stages of their schooling who have learning disabilities, Mr. Speaker. This will be the first time that there will be a provincial program in place in the province and from that pilot we will develop a screening program that will apply to all of the province and identify children who have special needs much much earlier in their career. To this point, Mr. Speaker, too often they've been allowed to drift through the system and not be identified, not be treated until much later in the school lives. Well, we are setting a program in place that will identify them and help them out at a much earlier stage in their development.

And of course we have also initiated programming for multi-sensory handicap students who are both deaf and blind, Mr. Speaker, and we now have consultants and intervenors and teachers in place to help those particular students. Perhaps most important of all, Mr. Speaker, as part of this Special Needs funding and support, we have put in place, and it will become operative this fall, a diagnostic support centre that will be operational at the School for the Deaf that will take those students from our schools who have not responded to the programming that they have, who have learning disabilities of such an extent, such extreme learning disabilities that they need special remediation, special diagnostic services, and this centre, Mr. Speaker, will be staffed by people well trained with a great deal of expertise in dealing with children who have these problems and we will certainly be able to identify and help that type of student who has that particular problem. It is something that has not been in place in this province. Other provinces have established centres such as this. I am very pleased to be able to announce that we will have a diagnostic support centre in this province. Another program, Mr. Speaker, geared to people, aimed at helping those in our society who have problems and who need that type of support. And certainly it will cost dollars, Mr. Speaker, certainly it will take dollars out of this Budget but, Mr. Speaker, we feel they are dollars well spent. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we might suggest that the dollars going to this area are what are causing the deficit but that would be unfair because, Mr. Speaker, these are dollars that any government should be spending.

I wanted to spend some time on that particular area, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is most

significant and certainly an important part of this present Budget that we have under consideration.

I also wanted to look at another area that falls within my department and of course accounts for some of the money that this Budget covers and that is the area of universities and colleges. As you know we have provided some 13.8 percent increase in funding for the operating expenditures of our universities this year, an increase, Mr. Speaker, that will be one of the highest in Canada. I believe B.C. has come in at 13.9, so they may exceed us by point one-tenth of a percent but certainly an increase that has been heralded by the universities across Canada as rather outstanding. Our capital and operating grants if you include those with the operating funding that we've provided, we would then have an increase of some 17.3 percent, Mr. Speaker, rather significant, a positive aspect, and part of this Budget. Of course, I don't have to say that we feel this is money well spent, well invested. The people who graduate from our universities make a great contribution to our economy, our way of life, and I don't have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are proud of the fact that the University of Manitoba is one of the foremost research universities in Western Canada and we are anxious to see it maintain that status and not only, of course, do they receive the usual research moneys from the Federal Government and other agencies, but the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Economic Development make a very worthwhile contribution to the research activities at the University of Manitoba.

The Leader of the Progressive Socialist group said in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, that a Budget should tell what is happening to student enrolment. Do we have more or do we have less and why? He wanted to know just what was happening there. Well, I can tell him that at the universities, our enrolments are up; they have increased. The enrolments at the universities in Manitoba have increased and this is contrary to what was expected across the country; it's contrary to what was expected. Everyone had predicted a rather drastic drop because the number of people coming through the school system has declined as birth rates decline, so that great reservoir of people from whence the universities and other post-secondary institutions draw their enrolment is becoming smaller. But, Mr. Speaker, this year we saw an increase in our university enrolment and what was most encouraging, we saw an increase in the participation rate of high school students. In other words, the continuing students, those who go from Grade 12 on to university, that percentage increased this year. I am pleased to see that the Leader of the Progressive Socialist group applauds that because I think that we all applaud that particular fact. Some 35,913 enrolments, part-time and full-time at our universities in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

The community college enrolments have shown the same particular trend and we have had the highest enrolment for several years in 1980, Mr. Speaker, some 32,652; again, full-time and part-time enrolments. In fact, in the fall of 1980, there were more students on course at Red River Community College than at any previous time in its history, a rather dominant and significant —(Interjection)— Certainly, well, we predict that next year there will be

another increase, Mr. Speaker, and we see that increase continuing and I think it is one of the most heartening and increasing signs that we have in the educational community because it means not that we have more students in total, but we have more students going on into post-secondary training.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to touch on another aspect of the whole educational scene and the post-secondary educational scene because members opposite have often try to imply, or some have, that the problem of finding a job in Manitoba after graduation is indeed a difficult problem. It is part of the doom-and-gloom syndrome that they expound and keep expounding. Well, the facts put the lie to that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in comparison with other provinces, we are not doing badly at all. There are a couple of surveys that I can refer to that honourable members might be interested in; one, of course, carried out by the Department of Manpower and Labour of this government with community college graduates in 1979, showing a participation rate of 95 percent among those graduates. Of course, that doesn't surprise me, Mr. Speaker. If we have 30,000 more jobs in Manitoba over the last three years, then I am not surprised that our community college graduates are finding jobs. The reports we are getting from employers is that they are well-trained and that they are very pleased to employ this type of person.

But if we are going to talk about the job opportunities for university people, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is significant, then I refer to this Job Market Reality for Post-Secondary Graduate Survey that was carried out by the Department of Statistics, Statistics Can., and released a few months ago, because I think it's significant. Here is what it had to say. Talking about our Manitoba university graduates compared to Canada as a whole, comparing them to other university graduates across this country, it said they were doing as well in the labour force as graduates from other provinces in terms of participation rate and employment rate; it said they were more likely to have jobs related to their field of study — these are Manitoba graduates — that they were less likely to be under-employed; that they were as satisfied with their jobs as other graduates in Canada; that they were earning salaries comparable to graduates in Canada as a whole; and that they were less likely to regret their choice of field of study — comparing Manitoba university graduates, Mr. Speaker, with graduates across Canada.

If we look at the community college graduates, this is what the survey had to say about them. They were doing much better in the labour market than other community college graduates across Canada, took less time to find a job. This is not my department saying this, Mr. Speaker, this is Statistics Canada that said this in their report. They took less time to find a job; they were more likely to be employed in jobs related to their training; less likely to be under-employed; less likely to be dissatisfied with their job; less likely to regret their field of study choice. Mr. Speaker, here is the interesting thing, the final comment in this particular survey said, and I think this is the most significant comment of all, graduates in Manitoba did better than average in every way. Graduates in Manitoba did better than average in every way, and they had one more sentence in that

comment — the percentage with full-time jobs topped the list. The percentage with full-time jobs topped the list.

But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of those very positive comments, there was an article in the Free Press on March 25th that said, and here was the headline: "University Graduates Quit Province." That was the headline. Now, Mr. Speaker, whoever picked that particular headline hadn't read the survey, I would suggest, because the survey did not support the type of slant that article received. It is not supported by the facts in the survey. Certainly we have a number of graduates who leave Manitoba and I think, Mr. Speaker, the President of the University of Manitoba in speaking to this particular article said certainly we have a number of graduates who leave, mainly because of the excellence of many of our faculties in that we attract students from other provinces who return to their home province upon graduation.

The article said, "Manitoba loses a greater percentage of its university graduates than any other province in English Canada except Nova Scotia." Well, Mr. Speaker, the survey disputes that and gives the lie to that statement because it shows that Manitoba is right in the middle in that regard. Ontario, Newfoundland, British Columbia and Alberta retain more of their graduates — perhaps they don't have as many coming to their province from other provinces. Manitoba is right in fifth place and below Manitoba, those that lose more, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. But that isn't what the article said. However, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was interesting and rather pertinent and really does refute some of the gloom and doom that gentlemen opposite would sometimes like to spread about the opportunities for the young people graduating from our secondary institutions.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that we hear quite often in connection with university funding and particularly, again, funding by this government. We have heard, well, there were cutbacks at the universities, real cutbacks at the universities and, Mr. Speaker, quality has suffered. I don't know gentlemen opposite measure quality and I don't know how they measure cutbacks but, Mr. Speaker, let's compare the year 1976-77 with 1979-80 and see what these cutbacks were. There was one cutback — there were less students attending in 1979-80, some 2,700 less than there were attending in 1976-77 and that's been the pattern across this country. A cutback in students, yes, but let's look at the academic staff because after all that is funded in large part by the grants that are provided by this government.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Order please. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

**MR. COSENS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The academic staff in 1976-77 numbered 1,493. Now, let's take a look at the cutbacks because this is where they will be, won't it, there will be severe cutbacks here. In 1979-80, with 2,700 students less enrolled, the teaching or instructional staff in our universities totalled 1,561, Mr. Speaker, or 68 more. Well, where is the cutback, Mr. Speaker? Where has the quality been affected? Not in a cutback in teaching staff. We see that there are 68 more now

than when honourable gentlemen opposite were in government and when there were more students there — I am talking about academic staff at this point.

Mr. Speaker, just one more point. In 1976-77, there were 344 full professors in our universities in Manitoba, 344, and honourable members opposite know that there are full professors, associate, assistant, and lecturers, and the full professor, of course, being at the highest level in the academic ladder. That was in 1976-77, some 344. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the cutback that has affected quality — in 1979-80, 431, 87 more full professors in the universities of this province, and that's a cutback? That has affected quality, Mr. Speaker? That has affected quality? If we are going to judge quality by the status of the people who are teaching in our universities and the qualifications of our teaching staff, I would suggest this is an indicator that the status of the teaching staff, the quality of that staff, has increased over the last four years.

Of course, if we are talking about quality, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other areas where we can look as well. Certainly students in many of our faculties that compete in national exams are showing that they are rating right at the very top. I draw your attention to students in Pharmacy from the University of Manitoba, who have almost annually for the last two or three years, to my knowledge, placed in the top groupings in the national exams in Pharmacy and I think that the universities and that particular faculty can certainly take some pride in that fact.

Of course, we have heard this other point, Mr. Speaker, from gentlemen opposite, that at the universities, because of the Conservatives' funding, that professors are leaving; they are leaving in great droves. Well, look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. In 1975-76, 68 professors resigned from the universities of our province. In 1976-77, 58 resigned; in 1980-81, Mr. Speaker, some 35, the lowest number that we have had for a great number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to touch on a number of other topics as well but there was just one other that I would like to mention and that is the area of student aid because, again, I think that there is some misunderstanding among a number of people about what this government has done in that particular area. I point out to yourself, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members opposite that in 1976-77, the Budget that was provided for bursaries and support to the young people in our post-secondary education was some \$4 million. This year, in this Budget, we are providing some \$6 million, Mr. Speaker. Where is the cutback? Where is this tremendous acute, protracted restraint that is affecting students, Mr. Speaker? I have trouble seeing it; I have trouble basing it on these statistics that I have just given to you.

Of course, I found, Mr. Speaker, when I came into government that those fellows opposite had seen fit to provide a bursary level that was \$400 below the loan level and we immediately addressed that in 1978 and increased it to the same level as the loan level and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that this year, in summary, we are increasing those maximums and we are providing for those students who have needs beyond the required maximum. Mr. Speaker, I have

no problem supporting a Budget that provides programs and initiatives that will benefit the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, in order to fully appreciate the real significance of this year's Budget or, I think, it would be more accurate to say at this point this year's mini-Budget because that is in fact what it was. It is necessary to look beyond the torture performance of the Minister of Finance, a humble if not a humiliated Minister of Finance of the other evening and to look beyond the tortured contributions of members of the government in respect to attempting to support what is in fact a Budget which is not worthy of their support. For more is learned about the budgetary policies of the Government of Manitoba by what this document doesn't say than rather by what it does say. What we know is that the Tories are on the ropes. The Budget points that out very clearly. They are tired; they are bedraggled; they are intellectually bankrupt and they have been able to produce in this year's Budget little more than a series of apologizes for their fiscal failings of the last three years. In fact, this is a loser's Budget. One could see the losers' looks on their faces, the other evening when the Budget was first presented. A tired group of people who had given their best, who have tried, who had anticipated doing better, but who in fact had failed. A loser's Budget. After three long years of suffering, after three long years of unfulfilled expectations and after three long years of puffery by a government, unable to escape its partisan history and its dogmatic ideology and consequently unable to deal with many of the complex problems of a modern day industrial society. We and the people of Manitoba are treated to this, a loser's Budget. The Government had gambled it all. We heard them when they first came to power. It was the private sector that was going to fuel the economy. That was the engine of the economy, so they gambled it all on the private sector. They put their blind faith in the private sector alone. They placed their bets with the private sector and they lost. So after three years of Tory mismanagement of the economy, we're given a Budget of no significance. In fact, it is a bended knee Budget, Mr. Speaker. It is a bended knee Budget by a government driven to its knees by their own blind, stubborn dependency on the transnational, on the multinational and on big business.

There is nothing in this Budget, nothing at all to provide the catalyst for needed job creation in the province. We will address that issue because in fact job creation is needed desperately in this province, but before doing that it's important to note that there is very little in this Budget to protect Manitobans from the worse ravages of spiralling inflation and a spiralling cost of living that accompanies it and the result of course is a reduced standard of living for Manitobans. At best, the Government offers a series of apologies for their inability to cope with this serious erosion of every working Manitoban's future.

It must as well be said that there is nothing in this Budget designed to provide the programs and the

policies which are necessary to get Northern Manitoba moving again. It is obvious that a more realistic approach to the north of this province must await the election of a more realistic government, a government with a proven history of caring, concern and commitment to the northern parts of this province. Of course, we're talking about a New Democratic government.

My colleague, the critic for the Department of Northern Affairs, I'm certain will provide more details and more insights into the Tory government's complete and total failure to deal in any sort of a systematic and positive way with the serious structural problems that confront northerners living in Northern Manitoba.

However, as labour critic, I would like to use this opportunity to address some of the concerns if working people in the province. To begin with, it is necessary to examine just what has been happening over the past three-and-one-half years of Progressive Conservative government. As well, later on in my contribution to the Budget Debate, I believe the time has come to begin to talk about some of the ways in which a good government would respond to the challenges of the 1980s, some of the ways in which a good government would meet the growing demands for safer and healthier workplaces, some of the ways in which a good government would deal with the mounting pressures for greater job security in the face of plant closures and production shut-downs. In this respect, from the perspective of the working person of this province, this Budget was not only extremely disappointing, it was a total disaster, for it did nothing at all for the working person in the Province of Manitoba.

Now even a Tory government has to admit or at least should admit that any government has a certain responsibility to attempt to build the type of economic climate which will in fact provide employment opportunities for its citizens. There can be no denial of that very basic simple truism, but if one is to listen to the Minister of Finance and at the same time to ignore all the facts and figures which have been laid on the table during the course of this Debate, one would have to believe that nothing is right anywhere else in the world but in Manitoba everything is right because of his government's budgetary policies. He says that as if there weren't tens of thousands of unemployed Manitobans listening to his very words. What did he say in the Budget Speech? I quote the Minister of Finance: "By comparison with most other parts of Canada, our unemployment situation is enviable and our record of job creation should be a source of pride for all Manitobans." As if by the very voicing of those words alone, history would reverse itself and the past three-and-one-half years would be but a bitter memory for the tens of thousands of unemployed Manitobans, and, for the tens and thousands of Manitobans who have had to leave their homes and their families in search of employment; in search of a basic job. The sad fact is that during the last number of years under a Tory Government the job creation record in this province, mostly as a result of government policies, is worthy more of shame than of pride. And, it is a shame that the government has to bear, it's not the shame of the people who want nothing more than a job, who want nothing more

than to work. They have proven consistently, the people of the province have proven consistently that they do desire work and all they ask for is a productive and a fulfilling job and when work is not available to them here, they in fact are forced to travel outside the province in order to find that work. They are forced to tear up their roots, to leave behind their family and friends in search of the simple basic necessity of life. A job by which one can earn a day's wage and by which one can raise a family.

So, such is the Tory's shame. The massive population loss. We have been suffering; the people of this province have been suffering during their term in government is solemn testimony to their inability, their complete and utter inability to create an economic environment which provides the needed job opportunities for all Manitobans. And it must be remembered that we are the only province out of all ten over that period of time which has in a number years suffered a decline in population. It's not a Canadian phenomena. They would like to blame the Canadian economy for their problems. It's not a world-wide phenomena. They would like to blame world-wide pressures for their problems, but it is a purely Manitoba phenomena brought about in large part by the policies of the present Conservative Government.

That out migration is a serious concern and there are some very substantial reasons for the forced migration of thousands of Manitobans. Plain and simple, as we said, there are not enough jobs to go around, because people will stay a long time in one place if they anticipate being able to get a job. Beyond the fact that there are no jobs, there is very little anticipation that there will be jobs; there's very little hope left. Through their budgetary policies, through their government policies of three years not only have they stripped people of their jobs but they have stripped people of their hope and they are forced in desperation to leave looking for other work. So notwithstanding the optimistic words of the Minister of Finance, I would suggest to you that there is very little cause for pride in either their record or their budgetary policies. And the Minister says you have to compare our record against the Canadian record. That's what we've been saying all along. They don't want to do that when they participate in the Debate. They want to compare the Conservative Government's first three years in office record against not the first three years of the New Democratic Party government but against the last three years of the New Democratic Party government. A period time when even they will admit there were pressures outside of the local economy which were having strong influence on what happened in the provincial economy. So let's make the comparisons that we have said all along consistently should be made. Let's make the comparisons that they appear to have come to the realization must be made. Let's compare what is happening in the Province of Manitoba, not with what happened 10 years ago, or 20 years ago, or three or two years ago. Let's compare it with what's happening over the past three-and-one-half years with what's been happening outside the province and the rest of the Canadian experience over the past three-and-one-half years.

Manitoba has had the third lowest percentage increase in new jobs over that period of time. That is a fact. We are at the bottom of the pack. Their job creation record is a percentage and that's a fair way to analyze it, has not been able to keep pace with the national average. Matter of fact, I think, if you take the full three-and-one-half years into consideration, it's been running at somewhere around 55 to 60 percent of the increases on a national average. And the situation is worsening; it's not getting better. Last year's job creation record, if you take the year-end average for the Province of Manitoba, was the worst of all the provinces. We had the worst job creation record. What is there to be proud about in that sort of a record? And in fact, last year it grew at less than one-half of the Canadian national average. So we have slipped behind for three-and-one-half years and we are slipping further behind. If job creation suffers such as it has under that government's budgetary policies, then unemployment is bound to increase. Exactly what has happened. Today, if you take the latest figures, only two provinces in Canada have a higher unemployment rate than they did of October 1977, and October, 1977, of course, is the month in which they took power. Only two provinces have a higher percentage unemployment rate today than at that time; Prince Edward Island and Manitoba. During that period of time if you compare it, and you can't make a straight line comparison, you have to compare now and then, but if you compare that, you will find that Manitoba's unemployment rate has increased by several tenths of a percentage point while the national unemployment rate has decreased by nearly one full percentage point, so the difference is substantial.

I can tell the Minister of Finance that the 35,000 unemployed Manitobans find very little envy or very little to envy in the Tory's Government job creation record. And it must be noted that never in eight years of New Democratic Party government were there 35,000 workers on the unemployment roles.

The Minister of Labour the other day, last night I believe, made much ado about the fact that we have more workers in July of last year; we had more workers in the province than we'd ever had before, that the labour force was at its highest peak than it had ever been. One would imagine that to happen. That's not a situation that is hard to imagine. The labour force grows as new people come into the labour force and barring certain circumstances it's going to continue to grow. But the fact is that he neglected to mention that last month we'd had one of the highest levels of unemployment in this province in decades. And neither can one ignore the other warnings that were contained in the most recent unemployment statistics. Since January of this year, 6,000 Manitobans have entered the labour force, comparing March figures as against January figures. How many of them were able to find work? Well, if we listen to them, we ignore the facts. We would expect that jobs went begging for all of them. But the fact is only 2,000 of those 6,000 were able to find productive and fulfilling employment. Two-thirds were forced into unemployment or out of the province. As well, for the first time in years, Manitoba's unemployment rate increased from the second lowest and that was for the month previous



to the fourth lowest in the country. And it has to be noted, in all fairness, that it normally and during an NDP term ran about third lowest; it is now the fourth lowest. So we see a deterioration of the situation in Manitoba in respect to the other provinces. And all of this has taken place under a Tory government and the Minister of Finance tells us that we should be proud of his government's record. Why, that would either have to be foolish pride or false pride, and the Member for Point Douglas has told me many many times that one should not fall prey to either foolish pride or false pride.

However, the number of jobs is only part of the equation. It is necessary as well to look at the quality as well as the quantity of jobs. It's no secret that wages have failed to keep pace with spiralling inflation in the Province of Manitoba and throughout Canada during the Tory years. Almost any worker witnesses firsthand, their own personal erosion, in their own personal earning power, every time they take out a pay envelope and have to put it to the bills. Every time they have to take their pay cheque and make it meet the inflationary pressures of the bills that they have before them, they know that their standard of living is being eroded. But what isn't as obvious is that Manitoba workers are suffering one of the largest drops in their standard of living of any of the provinces. Only Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland workers have fared more poorly over the past three years in respect to the purchasing power of their wages.

Now I won't dwell on the money too long, we all know that money is not everything. The quality of work goes beyond the size of the pay envelope and as far as I'm concerned, one of the most important requirements for any job is a safe and healthy working environment. It is an attitude that I can tell you, is shared by any worker who has witnessed the tragedy that accompanies a workplace accident or a workplace illness and not withstanding the breast-beating of the Minister of Labour last night, this has been one of the areas of greatest failing of the Conservative Government.

The greatest failing because they have wasted the unique opportunity which greeted them at the time at their election victory. Only one month previous the new Workplace, Safety and Health legislation had been proclaimed by the then New Democratic Party Government, and the Minister was right, it was only one month earlier that it had been proclaimed. But the fact is that it had been passed the year before and the fact is that that legislation was the result of many long hard years of work on the part of many of the Minister's own employees, if he would ask them he would find out, in developing what came to be accepted and came to be known as one of the best occupational health and safety laws on this continent.

Their efforts over many years resulted in a piece of legislation which has been held up for a motto for other jurisdictions and until most recently was considered to be one of the most progressive pieces of occupational health and safety legislation in the country. We no longer can claim that what I believe to be a very important distinction because of the fact that they have refused to deal in any sort of a positive way with the opportunity that that legislation represented. But back in October of 1977, when they

came to power, the Act was new. It needed the support of a sympathetic government in order to meet its full expectations. What did it receive? Well, it's plain what it received instead was the cold hand of the Tory government which starved its staffing, starved its funds and which ignored and even violated and is even in violation today, of the provisions of that legislation, so the Tory record as their record in job creation, in the field of occupational health and safety, is one for which there can be very little pride. I would suggest it goes beyond that. It is one of the back door erosion of the powers and rights that the original Workplace Safety and Health Act was designed to provide to Manitoba workers.

Let's take a quick look at their actions as the government in respect to that Act. They have accused their own inspectors of harassing employers, when all they were doing was trying to accomplish their normal inspection routines. We all know that that happened. It's a matter of the public record. The Minister, the previous Minister of Labour has said, yes, that is the case. So they've done that. The Minister now has refused to appoint a Chief Medical Occupational Officer, even although he is required to do so by the law itself and for three-and-one-half years, we've asked him, when are you going to appoint that officer and what the Minister said in return to us was: yes, we know the value of the officer; yes, we know that the officer is needed; yes, we are going to appoint that officer very shortly, it's just a technical matter. For three years he said that and then a couple months ago, he finally had the courage to come out and say, no, we don't intend to appoint that officer, not to change the Act, but just to say that they intend to continue violating that Act and they have refused the advice of their own Advisory Council and denied consequently, hundreds of Manitoban workers, of the advantages and protections of mandatory Safety and Health Committees.

The Advisory council called for a broader, more systematic implementation of designated work sites for Committees, that would have covered hundreds of thousands of Manitoba workers and given them the benefits of those Committees, and they have rejected that advice, after a year or two years of telling us they were awaiting a recommendations from the Advisory Council and when they got them, they turned them aside and went about on their own course of action, which has resulted in that denial of that very important mechanism to hundreds of thousands of Manitoba workers. They give lip service to regulations, yet we see no regulations. They say they're needed, yet we don't see them come forward and they set up committees.

The Minister of Labour is famous for setting up committees. He set up the Asbestos Committee. Anything come from it? Not that I know of, no regulations, no positive programs. They set up the Lead Committee — anything come from that, can you tell me the result of that? Very very little. They set up the Right Committee. That's a classic example. They set up a committee to look into the mining safety and health conditions in Manitoba's metallic mining industry. The committee comes back with some very substantive, very powerful recommendations, and they send these

recommendations to another committee, and that committee came back with some very substantive and very powerful recommendations and yet we hear nothing; we hear nothing. Maybe they're hoping for the best three out of five, I don't know, but the fact is, that while we wait, the conditions don't get any better in the mining industry and we know, we can read the record, the conditions in workplace, safety and health in the mining industry according to the lost-time frequency and the severity rates, are not getting any better, not getting better, no matter what the Minister says.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the whole area of occupational health and safety, the statistics betray that government's lack of commitment and that government's lack of action. Last year 46,627 accidents were reported to Workers Compensation. Now how does that compare with 1977? Well in 1977, 43,256 accidents were reported in a similar way and a difference, as you can quickly note, is 3,371 more accidents reported to Workers Compensation in 1980 than in 1977. If you take those and make a quick comparison to the job creation record, you will find that the percentage increase in the number of accidents reported to Workers Compensation over that period of time, has out-paced the percentage increase in the Tory job creation record. Accidents have grown at a faster rate than employment in this province and yet they tell us that they are dealing with the matter. They tell us they are putting forward positive programs. Hog-wash. They are not. They are not and in fact the statistics betray their lack of action and it must be noted, that when they came to power, the statistics were going down. There were fewer accidents in 1976 than there were in 1975; there were fewer accidents in 1977 than there were in 1976; and yes there were fewer accidents in 1978 than there were in 1977; but in 1979 and 1980, we see the climb again and that climb was entirely predictable, given their attitude toward workplace, safety and health in this province and the monetary costs of that increase in accidents is staggering.

The Manitoba economy last year lost \$27 million in compensation pay-outs alone and experts calculate that for every dollar paid out in compensation pay-outs, the loss to the gross provincial product is between \$5.00 and \$15.00, so let's make the extrapolation, because of related costs; re-training costs; replacement and machinery costs; down production time; replacement of workers' wages; the figures amount to a five to fifteen factor for every dollar paid out in compensation costs. And what that means is that last year, the Manitoba economy lost anywhere from \$136 million to \$410 million, because of occupational accidents and injuries and those figures grossly underestimate the real impact, but they're the best figures we have available to us.

So that is a deficit in financial and human terms, that no government can long afford to ignore. It goes beyond dollars and cents. It robs young workers of their youth and it robs old workers of their retirement years. It is a senseless slaughter which must be stopped.

Another area in which the government has failed the workers of this province, is in their reaction or again better said, in their lack of reaction to the growing phenomenon of plant closures and

production slow-downs and it must be said, in all fairness to them, this is not a Manitoba phenomenon alone. It is part and parcel of changes which are ongoing throughout the industrial world. No province is immune, but what differentiates Manitoba from most of the other provinces, is their lack of response to either the closures or to the problems which they create for Manitoba workers and communities alike. They shrug their shoulders, they throw up their arms in mock concern and yet they do nothing.

Now there is no doubt that given the best efforts of any government, there will be a certain number of plant closures and production cut-backs, as economies contract and expand and scarce resources are reallocated. Only a foolish government would attempt to prevent each and every closure. At the same time, only a callous and an uncaring government would allow such closures to take place unhindered, and that is in fact, what we have had over the past number of years under a Tory government.

The general statistics are both illuminating and staggering. Over half of unemployed Manitobans today are the victims of lay-offs because of plant closures, bankruptcies and foreclosures and other production cut-backs, and those statistics only reflect part of the problem. Communities as well as affected, as John Condra the Chairperson of the Swift's Committee, said it had a tremendous impact on the community, as well as upon the individual workers, but they believe that somehow Adam Smith's invisible hand will guide the unemployed Maple Leaf Mills workers, the unemployed Swift's workers, the unemployed workers from other closures and bankruptcies and production slow downs to job employment and opportunities that were not available to them before. Well it just doesn't happen. The government has to play a role in that.

So it is obvious that governments have a dual responsibility in the event of unavoidable closures. The first is to affected employees, the second is to the general community and those are responsibilities which any government should take seriously.

I could go on and on with the list of problems, but I do want to use the time that is left to me, Mr. Speaker, to talk about some of the ways by which a good government should address some very serious issues which confront all working people, and firstly let it be said that I believe and I think most New Democrats believe, in their heritage, that they are proud of their linkages with all working people in this province. Just as we take pride of the roots that were built in the coalition party of farmer, of working person, of professionals and other individuals and that pride is especially warranted — I want to pay special tribute to the previous government, in regard to the previous New Democratic Government's labour legislation. That legislation was violently attacked by those members, by the government opposite at the time of its introduction. I read the record. Every one of them to a person voted against that legislation on third reading and yet they have failed to introduce any significant changes to that legislation since they came into power in October of 1977. Their silence and their lack of reaction to that legislation is strong tribute to the public support and the respect which New Democratic Government's

labour relations legislation has earned in the past and I believe that government has a responsibility to review the past and as well, to build upon the foundation of existing legislation. It should refine in fine tune where necessary, that legislation, because challenges change, times change and legislation must in fact be changed. Attitudes must in fact be changed in order to meet the challenges and the unforeseen demands of the new day.

It's no secret that many people in this province are concerned about the problems which many times accompany the negotiations of a first contract. All of us have witnessed too often, over the past few months, the results of intransigence in bargaining that can result in unnecessary strikes and lockouts, all of us want to avoid that long drawn-out and sometimes confrontational situation, such as we have seen at the Winnipeg Clinic and such as we've seen at St. Adolphe Nursing Home. Recognizing the problem, I believe that government has a responsibility to assist negotiators through unusually difficult times. There is precedent for that; there are conciliation services, so it must be said that without going into the fine details, that first contract legislation is meant to be that form of assistance. It is not intended to replace the normal process in negotiating, neither has it replaced the normal process in negotiating in other jurisdictions where it has been successfully implemented. What is has done is allowed for and encouraged more realistic attempts to reach a settlement during first contract negotiations.

Also experiences in other jurisdictions have shown us that there is a role for the Labour Board to play, in that the powers of that Labour Board should be strengthened so that they can have more influence in respect to when parties refuse to bargain in good faith and we need only look to the province of Ontario, to see what is happening there and the benefits in providing for a stronger and more active and more comprehensive Labour Board.

So I believe that those two measures will, and this is a preventive approach, will result in a more harmonious labour relations climate in this province.

I'd also like to talk a bit about workplace, safety and health. Just as an NDP government brought that legislation to life in the first place, so will it be an NDP government that will breathe life back into the legislation. Government's must act decisively and quickly to make certain that legislation is once again put to work. Governments must provide both direction and support for the Workplace and Safety and Health Divisions so that they can finally begin to fulfil their mandate.

As well, I believe, a good government should not the follow the course of action of the Tory government and try to restrict access to Workplace Safety and Health Committees for all the workers but should attempt to broaden and strengthen the system of Health and Safety Committees so that the majority of Manitoba workers can benefit from the advantages and the protections of those committees.

As well, I think it is time again to look at that legislation and to refine it and fine tune it so that it meet the challenges of today. It is good legislation but it does need a number of changes. One is to strengthen and clarify a worker's right to refuse unsafe work, to refuse to work under unsafe or

unhealthy conditions. The other, I believe, is to ensure greater access for workers to information about workplace hazards, hazards which they have to confront on a day-by-day basis. I believe if you provide those two powers to the workers in the workplace, and I believe they are responsible, and will use the powers responsibly, that you will enable workers to build the type of workplaces for which we all yearn. I can tell you that you can't impose upon an industry a good safety and health record. You can't build a safe and healthy workplace for workers, but workers can build a safe and healthy workplace if they are given the tools and the mechanisms by which they can do that.

So I believe that a responsible government, that a good government must in fact provide three essential rights to workers in respect to workplace and safety and health conditions. The first is the right to have full information as to the hazards which confront them as workers. The second right is a right to refuse to work under conditions which they believe to be unsafe or unhealthy; and the third right, the most important and essential right, is a right to participate freely and fully in workplace safety and health activities. Those three rights are fundamental to the creation of safe and health working environments.

Another area of grave concern to all New Democrats and I believe to all Manitobans is the economic and social destruction being generated by unhindered plant closures and productions shutdowns. There must be some protective devices put in place to provide that protection to affected workers and communities in the event of unavoidable — and I stress that word unavoidable — plant closures and shutdowns.

Now I think first a government has a responsibility to create the type of economic environment in which those shutdowns take place on only a very limited basis, and there will always be some as we said. The economy is fluid, it is moveable, but an economy that is strong and healthy will minimize the effect of plant closures on workers and on communities as other industries come in to take up the slack that is created by a closure or a production shutdown.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has 5 minutes.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will try to — I assure you I will in fact finish within that time. As I mentioned earlier, only a foolish government, — I say that because I don't think they would give me leave to go on, although I wouldn't be adverse to asking if in fact it was to be suggested that was possible, but let's assume it's not.

Only a foolish government would attempt to force a maintenance of production in all instances of anticipated closures. However, certainly a government on behalf of the people who elected it, on behalf of the general citizenry who it is supposed to represent, has a responsibility to ensure that closures are examined as to their economic justification. The fact is that not all closures are as a result of an unprofitable operation. There are many closures which take place because of reasons other than economic considerations. So governments have a positive role to play in ensuring that closures are reviewed, so that in fact if an operation can be kept functional, it will be kept functional, and in the event

of a closure I believe that government has a responsibility to provide some protective devices for workers, a responsibility to ensure that older workers, who are the most stressed and the most affected by these closures, are not forced into poverty because they are too old to get new jobs, and their early retirement benefits are cut so much because of the closure that they cannot live in what we would consider to be an adequate standard of living. So I think government has a role to play there. Older workers have a right to a decent retirement, in dignity, with pride, and they have that right because of the contribution they have made and are making to this country and this province; and younger workers have a right to productive employment and a responsibility to better their skills, if at all possible, through training and on the job experience. So, it must be said that governments should build the type of economic climate which prevents closures, if possible; the type of economic climate which provides for the taking up of the slack if possible, and at the same time, realizing full well that there may be some closures, put in place general mechanisms to ensure that workers and communities are protected.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, this is not an encouraging Budget. It is not the type of Budget that one would have anticipated after having listened to three previous Budgets of the government. It is an admission of their failure to bring forward the types of programs and policies and to build the type of society which they sincerely wished to see built. I don't deny them their motivation, I just believe that they have put in fact their chips in the wrong basket; they have placed their bets on the wrong people; they didn't bet on the people of the province, they bet on the multi-nationals, and because of that we see the type of situation that we have today, where they on bended knees have to come forward in this Chamber and present the type of Budget which will do very little for the people of this province.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will be in Churchill at the time of the vote, so I would wish to use the last moments that are available to me to indicate that I support the amendment and that I cannot in fact support the budgetary policies of the government as presented in their Budget of the other night, because I believe that they in fact do not address the issues. I believe that in fact they are little more than a series of apologies and an admission of failure on the part of the government to do anything positive during their three years in government.

**MR. SPEAKER, Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):**  
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would, as many of the members of this House have done, particularly from this side of the House, I want to compliment my colleague the Minister of Finance on what I would consider a professional job, and a credible job of presenting to this House a document which truly lays out the economic policies of this government, that truly demonstrates in the document the direction and the procedure which our First Minister, the Premier of the Province, has taken us, Mr. Speaker.

In looking at some of the attached documents, which are included in the Budget which the Minister

has presented, Mr. Speaker, I think it contains pretty much the general thoughts and the directions that have not only been communicated to the people of Manitoba, but to the Prime Minister of Canada, and I think it reflects the thinking, the continued pressure, the continued concern, that he has had and the government of the province have had on the most important issue that has been facing us since the late 1970's, and that of course is the economic conditions, not only of Manitoba, but the economic conditions of Canada and what can be done or could be done, in fact, to better the output of this country, the productivity, so that the country itself could in fact strengthen its position in the free western world.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate indeed that the powers of Ottawa and the people who are supposed to be responsible, Mr. Speaker, have not seen fit to put the economy as the number one item on their agenda over the past few years. I think it is a sad day in this country when we have the misleadership that we have seen by the Federal Government, supported by the members opposite, when it comes to dealing with the issues that affect each and every one of us.

I would also like to include, Mr. Speaker, the — I know the hard and diligent work that the colleagues of the Minister of Finance, the hours they have put in to support and to do their best to put forward their individual programs and to cut the programs to fit the cloth and to make sure that we could present to the people of Manitoba, a document which we all in fact can support.

I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally believe that the kind of a projected deficit that we are projecting is in fact one that is very acceptable because the money that is being projected will be used to better Manitoba, to spend on capital projects, not to in fact fritter away, as we have seen over the past few years prior to our getting into government, in fact in operating of the government, not investing in the future infrastructure or the development of the province, it will better everyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to stand here this afternoon and support the Minister of Finance's proposed resolution and the Budget, as well as I am pleased to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and compliment our Premier on the way in which he has taken the lead in Canada, not only in trying to deal with the economic issues that are causing the difficulties within this nation, but the Constitutional matters that, in my opinion, haven't been of major importance until we have seen a Prime Minister who basically wants to change the way in which we govern this country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is appropriate that I address that briefly as I come to the closing of my remarks.

Again, I compliment the Minister because it truly is a professional document laying out the history of what has happened in the past few years; indicating what developments have taken place since we have been in office some three-and-a-half years, and some projections into the future of the positive things that can happen within Manitoba.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, to stand here this afternoon and bring to the attention of the people of Manitoba just how those kinds of developments have affected agriculture, but more directly related to me as a member of the Legislative Assembly and

representing the southwest corner of the province, the recent announcements that have taken place with intended intent to develop our oil reserves that are in the province. Mr. Speaker, those oil reserves did not develop since 1977. Mr. Speaker, they have been here for years. Why, Mr. Speaker, weren't those oil reserves tapped, or why wasn't there an incentive to go after them? Mr. Speaker, because the provincial government before we got into office did not believe that kind of development should take place, and what does that mean? It's very interesting to hear the comments from the Member for Brandon East, from Transcona — because we want to make sure that the people are well aware of the kind of representation that they are getting. Mr. Speaker, the member indicates or tries to tell us the lack or the loss of investment and all the investment that took place. Mr. Speaker, a recent announcement by a company known as the Clarion Oil Company are investing some \$5 million in a small community in southwest Manitoba, a small part of the community. The Member for Virden, who is well aware of the activity that is created when oil drilling and development takes place, Mr. Speaker, that it does help that particular area, \$5 million, 20 holes which in fact are as many as were drilled totally in Manitoba last year or almost, some 27 last years as opposed to the 20 that were announced this year. Each oil well that is developed or brought onstream, Mr. Speaker, means an additional four or probably three to four more wells, Mr. Speaker. So the multiplying effect of a find or an additional find, or an additional development of a well that has capacity or the ability to produce, Mr. Speaker, means a large and totally increasing kind of development; the service industry, Mr. Speaker, to those wells; the drilling; the actual work activity in the servicing to the people that are in that area.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a development. It is some \$5 million from one company, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, some of the other announcements that are made by some of the other companies who are possibly, and I have read in the press a figure of some 100 additional wells, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got confirmation of those figures, but I would say that at least it's an indication that there are other people interested in doing what has to be done. They are doing it, Mr. Speaker, even though the Federal Government have a heads-in-the-sand energy policy, that I am wondering why anyone would want to develop in this country or get into the oil or energy business. However, I think they do have some confidence. They first have demonstrated it in the Province of Manitoba, and the taxing regime that we have created to encourage them to come and do the very thing that should be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say for the Member for Brandon East that there is in fact an immediate cash injection in an investment in that industry.

Let's proceed up a little further north, and I think it is also fair to note, Mr. Speaker, in the developments that are taking place, that it isn't all happening within the Perimeter Highway, that it isn't all happening in one region of the province, but is very much regionalized, Mr. Speaker. Let's move north to the area, which I am sure you are very familiar with, Mr. Speaker, and which you represent, where in fact it is

public knowledge that there is a known quality of potash, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, people who are interested in getting into the business of doing what? Of mining potash in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. That potash, Mr. Speaker, didn't come into being since October 11th of 1977. Why are those people interested, Mr. Speaker? Because there was an encouragement from the Provincial Government to get involved in the development of our mineral resources, Mr. Speaker.

What were they doing, Mr. Speaker, while they were in office? In fact, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if members opposite even knew that there was any part of Manitoba outside the Perimeter Highway.

Mr. Spekaer, it is development of that kind and nature that is going to diversify the economy of Manitoba and take some of the weight off the back of the agricultural community, who have been continually carrying the load of taxation from the beginning of time in this province and I am pleased to see that happen. Mr. Speaker, several hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent in the development of that particular proposed mine project, hundreds of people employed right in this western part of Manitoba.

Let us proceed to look at some of the other developments that have taken place. Of course, the announcement yesterday by the Alcan Aluminum Plant, where in fact they have strong intentions of moving ahead to do a further feasibility study. Mr. Speaker, that's a commitment again of how much money? Millions of dollars. What does it mean, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, it means that the province is encouraging, through the private initiative and the private enterprise system, people to come, Mr. Speaker, to invest in Manitoba because the climate is here to invest. It isn't up to the government to create the jobs, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the government to create the climate so that the private initiative and incentive can go ahead and.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on and I think I will. Let us look at the other mining developments, Mr. Speaker. Years ago when we saw the gold mine close in Bissett — Why are they back in business? It isn't, Mr. Speaker, because they were scared of being nationalized by the social regime that was in this province at one time. No, Mr. Speaker, because the price of gold and the province's taxing laws encouraged them to get back into business. What does that mean to the northeast part of this province? Mr. Speaker, it means more jobs and more capital investment, some \$15 million, the rebuilding of a town, Mr. Speaker, that under the last government depleted and decayed. It decayed, Mr. Speaker, because their policies were wrong and it's proven right in those particular communities.

Mr. Speaker, we again look at the document and I refer to it as a real professional document, something that the members opposite should take note of. The picture on the front of the Budget — what does that show you, Mr. Speaker? That shows us the future heritage of this province. That is the hydro-electric power generating station, Mr. Spekaer. It shows the horsepower being taken off the water and sent down these hydro lines to the future of Manitoba. It's an objective, positive document, Mr. Speaker, that tells the story right in that picture. If

you look at the water foaming through the dam, that is unharnessed horsepower, but if you look at it boiling through the generating stations, that's the horsepower taken off it, down those lines to the future of Manitoba's heritage. Mr. Speaker, we are here to develop that, not to destroy it like the members opposite did, Mr. Speaker. We believe firmly that the development of a Western Power Grid, sharing our resources with the people of Western Canada, will help unite Canada, not tear it apart as the members opposite would do by supporting the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very firmly that the hydro development power will be the main resource that will in fact help the future generations of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what have we done? One of our main pledges was to do something about the Hydro and what did we do when it was announced, I believe two years ago in our Budget? We froze the Hydro rates for the people of Manitoba, a constant rate at a time when all other sources of energy are doing what? Skyrocketing, Mr. Speaker.

What did the members opposite give us? They gave us 45 cents out of every dollar to pay the debt on our Hydro, Mr. Speaker, 45 cents on every dollar to pay the debt on our Hydro and the 150 percent increase in our rates and they stand up and have the audacity to criticize this Budget, Mr. Speaker. Where in the world do they get their common sense from, from a scrub pail?

Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed that we can put a Budget before the people of this province with such ability and professional foresight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk briefly about the agricultural industry and the policies that have been implemented and some of the programs that have been developed and, Mr. Speaker, let's make it very clear and very plain on the record that our policies and our objectives are not to completely put controls on the farm community and take away their rights and their freedoms to own land, to take away the right to have the ability to produce for the people of the world by putting a cheap food policy in place, like the Federal Government and like the members opposite would support. No, Mr. Speaker, we believe the private initiative, the private ownership of land, is the main generating power and the main generating initiative that will in fact feed the people of the world, not starve the people of the world like they do in Poland. Mr. Speaker, it's on your T.V. every day what is happening in that country. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's a socializing, communistic state-control of the farm community and we won't stand for it, Mr. Speaker.

The prime example, Mr. Speaker, was the State Farm Program, which, by the way, the members of the Progressive Party have made statements that they would get right back into it right up to their neck, to take the farms away from the people of this province. That, Mr. Speaker, is the Progressive policy and it's one that they adopted from the NDP Party, who know where they got because of their policies that wanted to take over the farm community.

Let's take a look at what we have done with the Credit Corporation. In 1978, immediately after we got into office in 1977, we reversed the policy. We stopped buying the land, Mr. Speaker. We returned it in 1978 to a lending institute to support the farm

community, not compete against the farm community as the socialists did. What did we do in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, and it hasn't been talked about very much? We increased the amount of capital to support the farm community through loans, Mr. Speaker, by how much? By 75 or 74 percent. The amount of capital available to lend out to the farm community increased from something like \$19 million to \$33 million, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the farm community needs it, not to compete against the farmers but to support them through loans programs. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make some changes, or see some changes made, that will further support those people because of last year's drought conditions and because of the tough economic situation they find themselves in, to further support those people who are in the greatest of need, not the people who aren't in need, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the Crown lands sale policy, where in fact we are taking the land from the State, selling it to the people who want to produce the goods that we need to generate the incomes for the nation.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the Crop Insurance Program, which again was a program implemented several years ago by a Conservative Government, and it was carried on by subsequent governments. This year, Mr. Speaker, there will be some \$55 million paid out to the farm community. I'm not very happy, Mr. Speaker, to say that the farm community need it because of short crops. But it was there, Mr. Speaker, to support those people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to the farm community that they should consider it again this year because the weather conditions at this particular time, we have seen excessive winds, and I would have to say that it looks at this particular time that serious consideration should be given to further protecting themselves.

Mr. Speaker, there were also some concerns from the farm community that the program wasn't working as well as it should, so we implemented a study of it so in fact we could make changes or consider changes that may help the farm community. We are assessing those, Mr. Speaker, and hope that we will be able to make some announcements shortly on those kinds of recommended changes.

Mr. Speaker, we hear about the plight of the hog producers at this particular time and I think it's important to note, again we have made a move to support the hog industry. Mr. Speaker, what happens when you introduce a support program? The first comments you get from those people whom you are trying to help is that it isn't enough. That's a traditional concern of the people when you start handing out money. Well, Mr. Speaker, the industry needed support but they have to get on to their own program. First, we believed it's the national government's responsibility because it's a nationally-produced commodity, but there was lack of action, Mr. Speaker, lack of a meaningful program. A second point, Mr. Speaker, we have committed \$10 million, five through a direct grant and five through a loan guarantee and, Mr. Speaker, unlike the members opposite, who introduced a program that was supposed to be one for the beef industry, that was supposed to help the beef industry but in fact hurt the beef producers, Mr. Speaker, we want to

work with a hog committee, with a producer group, to set up the program so that they will continue to have a program that is very much in the best interests of themselves, not the government. Any government, Mr. Speaker, that introduces a program should do it with the spirit of helping that industry and getting out of it again and that's what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, letting them go on their own, not suppress them as the socialists would do.

Mr. Speaker, again, it's an unfortunate situation when we had to get involved in the leasing of hopper cars to help the grain farmers, because again we had a lack of the industry to support the farm community. But, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't any hesitation from our Premier when it came to dealing with the economic issues of the farm community and support from the Treasury Bench and members of caucus. They got involved and they got involved when the need was there, Mr. Speaker, and I'm pleased to say that those are the kinds of things that we feel are important.

Last year's program, Mr. Speaker, to support the farm community during the periods of drought, that money went out to the farm community. The programs were administered with the support of the municipalities, the municipal representatives. What did that do, Mr. Speaker? It told those people we believed in their ability to help administer and that they would operate the programs fairly, unlike the members opposite who always felt that it had to be a bureaucrat or someone directly connected to the government that knew better than the farm community whom we represented, by the farmers themselves, Mr. Speaker. So it is important to note those particular points.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education again did a fine job. It's unfortunate the members opposite didn't sit in and listen and learn something from our Minister of Education. Seventy million dollars pledged to take some of the education taxes off the homeowners and the farm owners, Mr. Speaker, a commitment that this government made to the farm community, \$70 million. That is something that I am very pleased indeed to say that I supported, and supported heartily, to help the farm community as far as removal of some of the weight on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't hurt to repeat it for members opposite and I know it's repetition, but let's go through it, the other taxes that we have removed to let the farm community go and do some of the things for themselves. The gift tax, Mr. Speaker, if a farmer wants to gift his farm to somebody, or property, or not only a farmer, anyone in this province, the province doesn't want their big hand in there to take away the efforts or the fruits of hard-working society, Mr. Speaker, removing the government from the people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, succession duties. More people in this province than you would believe are affected by succession duties. The Member for St. Boniface should know that. In fact, I believe everybody will be affected some day or another with succession duties. Mr. Speaker, it isn't a fair tax; it is taxing away the people's fruits, the fruits of their work; it's taxing away the hard work that they did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a reduction in the income tax. We have seen a lifting of the limits on the corporate capital tax, Mr. Speaker, that shouldn't

have been put on in the first place. In this year's Budget, what have we done? We have removed the corporate capital tax on wholesale paper, again helping the people in small business and helping the people who are buying cars or farm machinery.

Who, Mr. Speaker, put the tax on grain bins in this province? It was the Honourable Member for St. Johns who felt the people of the farm community should pay to store the food for the nation, Mr. Speaker, and he thought it would be a smart thing to do to tax the grain bins of the farmers of this province. We removed that, Mr. Speaker, so that people could keep some reserves of food for the nation.

Let us further talk about some of the other investments because I think it would be only fair to note that some of the other investments have to be put on the record, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to be able to do it again.

For the Member for Brandon East when he, Mr. Speaker, says that capital investment was far greater under the NDP, let us list a few, and I'm not talking about Statistics Canada, I'm talking about what the people out in the country and in the city understand. Real investments are right. Real money, real investments and real jobs. Go back to the western side of the province, Mr. Speaker, and there's a real interesting story here. We've seen Manitoba Pool Elevators, Saskatchewan Pool Elevators invest in what? In an oilseed crushing plant in Harrowby, Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, at Harrowby, Manitoba and what are they doing? They're investing \$40 million, Mr. Speaker. Why? Because they've got confidence in the province, they've got confidence in the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean in real terms for the Member for Brandon East? It means some 3,000 farmers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan will be able to contract their oilseed crops or a portion of their oilseed crops to that particular plant. It means 86 jobs to that community. It means a tax base to the people in the municipal structure. It helps that community pay for their rinks, their community centres; it's private money going into the community to help that community, not a big government going in handing out tax dollars to do what? When governments hand out tax dollars, they buy people's freedom for a buck that's depreciating every minute.

Mr. Speaker, there's some principle behind this. Mr. Speaker, when we see the development taking place at Harrowby, it makes a real good story for the western part of Manitoba. Kraft Foods were determined to build in Brandon until they ran into the opposition from who? The Member for Brandon East, Mr. Speaker. Hundreds of millions of dollars to invest in that city, hundreds of jobs, Mr. Speaker, and what did they do? Down with Kraft because 1 percent of the farm population, they're multi-national, they aren't any good for anybody, chase them out as they chased out the manufacturers of the generators so they could buy from the Russians, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hear some comments from the Member for Burrows, when he talks about why aren't we seeing any alcohol produced for production of gasoline. Mr. Speaker, when did the gasohol plant close? The distillery at Minnedosa closed under the socialists opposite, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is going to produce alcohol and for the people who

think we're going to use valuable food products to produce mobile energy and produce horsepower. Where did we get it from in the early 1900s in this country? Some 20 percent of their acreage was used to produce oats to feed the horses to produce horsepower, Mr. Speaker, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the history of this country. Mr. Speaker, we will see alcohol produced in that plant and what does it mean to that small town? It means 20 jobs that were taken away under the NDP. It means a million dollars investment and it means markets and energy for farmers, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us just go west of town here to the Honourable Member for Portage constituency, where we've seen what? We have seen a several multi-million dollar investment by the Imperial Oil Company to invest in fertilizer service, some twenty some million dollars. Yes that's real money, Mr. Speaker, real money. What about the Simplot development in Brandon East? Does the member ever talk about \$30 million invested in Brandon? No, Mr. Speaker, no he's talking about Statistics Canada saying, well, investment is down, up or wherever it is. The people can see what's going on and he's going to be fooled when it comes to the next election, Mr. Speaker, because they can see right through the tissue paper that he's trying to put up before them.

Then about the manufacturing industry, the real manufacturing industry that we can see happening. What about the expansion at the Versatile Plant right here in the City of Winnipeg? Why don't we hear about that, Mr. Speaker? And where do they export, Mr. Speaker? They export farm equipment to some 75 countries of the world, right from this plant, Mr. Speaker, right from this plant. Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of hard real developments that we are seeing take place in Manitoba and it's happening because we've got policy and direction in an economic sense, common sense, from a Premier and a Cabinet and a caucus that believe the private sector can do it better than the government, and it's being demonstrated and you can't stop it even with your negative attitudes that aren't going to do you any good when you face the people of Manitoba, who are the real resources that we have to work with, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, some of the future things that have to be done in Manitoba and there's no reason why we shouldn't lay it on the record and talk very plainly about it, because that's what the people of Manitoba understand. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks a devastating wind that have taken certain amounts of topsoil off of the prime agricultural land, that's a concern of ours. What do we have to do, Mr. Speaker? We've seen social programs, education programs, health programs, to help the people, Mr. Speaker, to help the people and I'm proud to be supportive of that, but, Mr. Speaker, we have to do something further in this province. We have to develop the river systems, Mr. Speaker, to back the water up for our generating stations. The water just doesn't come out of a pond right in front of the dam, it comes from this side of the Rocky Mountains, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it comes from all across this side of the Rocky Mountains. We need infrastructure and we need dams, Mr. Speaker. We need dams, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba to store the water for the farm community; to store the water

for the small towns and villages that want to develop their industrial base and their food producing, like the towns of Portage la Prairie, Mr. Speaker. We need to invest money.

Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't bother me if our deficit increased, if we invested in those hard, real things, Mr. Speaker, because people understand that, Mr. Speaker. It's an investment in the province that will pay dividends and pay a multitude of dividends. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's hard for me to understand because we see the engineering people, the people who provide us with the figures on whether you should build a dam, what they call a benefit cost ratio or a cost benefit ratio, it doesn't matter, but anyway you have to be able to get more money back for money put in. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's time the social engineers of this world started to put a cost benefit ratio to some of the money that they spend, Mr. Speaker, so that in fact we can see what the returns are.

Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly that we have to come to grips with the development of our water reservoirs, so that we can help the farm communities, so that we can help the towns and villages. Mr. Speaker, let us look at a multiple use of the water; let us look at a multiple use of the land, not just single out one specific use. Farmers can grow trees, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to be a forester to grow trees, farmers can grow trees as well, Mr. Speaker, as other things.

Let us look at the highways and transportation system in this province, Mr. Speaker. It went into a deplorable state, Mr. Speaker, under the New Democratic Party, because again, Mr. Speaker, they didn't know what people needed to support them. Mr. Speaker, we need to put a lot more money into the development of our roads and our highways and port development. By gosh, we've got to see more port development than the one port we have in this province. Mr. Speaker, again a responsibility of the national government, but very little action and a lack of attitude to support that kind of infrastructure that's needed.

Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of things we need, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how much more time, if you could indicate roughly the amount of time I have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has 10 minutes.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that I've had another 5 minutes of it used up by my colleagues and the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to look a little bit of the at some of the broader issues that are affecting this province and I think it's definitely within the realm of some of the policies and some of the direction that have come again from the Premier of this province and from the Government of Manitoba.

Let's just look at the overall development of what we feel, or I feel is important to the development of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the issues that have been continually put before the people of Canada, the issue of energy, Mr. Speaker, has been handled irresponsibly by who, Mr. Speaker? By, not the NDP, Mr. Speaker, but the national government, the Liberals in Ottawa supported by the New



Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. Let me put it plain on the record, Mr. Speaker. I don't want people in Manitoba to pay world energy prices, because, Mr. Speaker, they are set by who? By a irresponsible group of people who are blackmailing the world, Mr. Speaker, blackmailing the world, but, Mr. Speaker, the production of oil and gas isn't unlike the production of agricultural goods. The people who are in the business have to be paid fairly and equitably for that production; the same as people who are working in a factory, Mr. Speaker, have to be paid for the time and effort that they put into their work, Mr. Speaker. You wouldn't expect people to take money out of their tax money to support the labour movement. Mr. Speaker, that wouldn't be an acceptable approach to this country. Mr. Speaker, it has to come out of the productivity and the hard work that goes into it and it's the same with the oil and the energy policy, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's been demonstrated that the energy policy of the Federal Government supported by the New Democratic Party is like their cheap food policy, Mr. Speaker, and it's been demonstrated and demonstrated time after time. When the farmers of Western Canada, Mr. Speaker, this summer, were asked — not asked, Mr. Speaker, it was direct Federal Cabinet policy and what even irks me more, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board isn't elected to Parliament, he's appointed to parliament by the Prime Minister. What is his background, Mr. Speaker? His background was a Socialist from Saskatchewan, a Farmers Union supporter, Mr. Speaker, and he crossed the border to join who? A left-wing Socialist Liberal Camp in Ottawa, the Trudeau Liberals, Mr. Speaker, and that direction, Mr. Speaker, did what? They directed the farmers of Western Canada to sell their barley to Eastern Canadian feeders at less money than we could have got on the international market and that's not bad, Mr. Speaker, that's again the Federal Energy Policy all over again, but the irony of the thing, they allowed the producers of barley of Eastern Canada to sell into the international market at more money. Mr. Speaker, is that fair? Is that uniting Canada? No, Mr. Speaker, that is driving Canada apart and members opposite support that kind of separation movement by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it's on the record, it's a fact that it happened, and we're supposed to continue to take that kind of action, that kind of policy. No, Mr. Speaker, and what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is pay a fair and equitable price for the people that want to do the work and the efforts, but we don't want to pay a blackmail price to the people of the far East or the OPEC countries, who believe it's their right in life to hold up the rest of the world. That, Mr. Speaker, is not a tolerable situation.

What about, Mr. Speaker, the interest rates? The economy of Manitoba is dramatically affected by what happens in the Canadian and the North American situation. Mr. Speaker, what do we hear the Federal Government say? They said, well, the Conservatives, Joe Clark, should do something about the interest rates. They got into office, Mr. Speaker, they got into office on what? On the people of Canada voting against an 18 cent excise tax on their

gasoline and now they're doing all other things to wreck the country. They got in, Mr. Speaker, under false pretences. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the effects of the interest rate, we're now hearing the Member who used to be for Fort Rouge, saying, we have to see what President Reagan's going to do with the interest rate. Mr. Speaker, how quick they forget.

Constitutional issues, Mr. Speaker, are something that I would just like close on. We have a Premier, Mr. Speaker, who I am very proud of and stands up and he stands up for the right of the people of Manitoba. He believes, Mr. Speaker, as I believe and this government believes, that the rights of the people are protected by the people they elect to these legislative assemblies, Mr. Speaker, and don't change that, Mr. Speaker, or you will give the Prime Minister the right to control the lives of the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, that isn't what we have built in this country. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba, I believe, has to be continued to be built on the attitudes of the people. I believe the attitudes of the people are very positive about what is being demonstrated in this country. I believe, Mr. Speaker, and you hear the members opposite say, oh, they're an arrogant government. Mr. Speaker, that isn't arrogance, that's pride. We're proud of what's happening in this province, Mr. Speaker. We're proud of our constituents and our people. Mr. Speaker, that's what has to happen. We have to be proud. Mr. Speaker, we have to respect one another, and I think that's what this Assembly is all about is respect and I believe that we could continue to maintain the respect for one another and the system in which we've operated under so well for a hundred and some years, if we continue to respect the system of government that we have.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to our constituents and the people of Canada not to let the Prime Minister destroy or to separate us. What happens, Mr. Speaker, we have a national police force which they're trying to take the funding away. What better way to get away with getting rid of a system or a something we've had a national pride in, our Royal Canadian Mounted Police. And what do they do? They take the funding away, Mr. Speaker, a responsibility of a national government to protect the people with a law enforcement system that has been the pride of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say, the Prime Minister of this country claims that he came back to run Canada, to keep the eastern part of this nation in Confederation. If he feels this so strongly about a united Canada, then he should either change his mind and listen to the people of Canada, the eight Premiers that believe, Mr. Speaker, that they represent and they know they represent 60 percent of the people, the Prime Minister should change, or he should, if he believes in Confederation, then he should step aside and let Canada go ahead, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I know it's a tough act to follow, Mr. Speaker. During the course of the Budget Debate, I have been trying to see if

there are any signs or signals of an approaching election. I thought a few months ago that the Minister of Education had given some indication there might be an election in the offing with his announcement of his new formula for funding education, \$70 million, etc., etc. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, when we took a closer look at that and took into account inflation, and took a look at the effect that it has on many school divisions on a division by division basis; when we took a look at the effect that it has on the commercial property levy, and only a minimal effect in most cases on farm and residential, so it became apparent that was no sign of an election being around the corner. And then I thought, when the Minister of Finance brought down his Budget, that there might be some indication there.

Mr. Speaker, I read the entire Budget Speech. I read both pages of it —(Interjection)— Yes, the Budget, I don't even want to use the word, Mr. Speaker, because it might be unparliamentary, but I only found about two pages of any relevance that one could properly call the Budget. (Interjection)— Oh, 57 and 58, we'll come back to pages 57 and 58. There was no sign of an election around the corner, so, Mr. Speaker, I think that henceforth I am going to watch the Minister of Highways. What he does, offers the best indication of a coming election.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, you watch the Minister of Highways. If you find the Minister of Highways cutting his two-and-a-half foot stakes and sharpening them and loading them in the trunk of his car and tying little red ribbons around them, and driving up and down the country roads, and driving them into the shoulders of the road —(Interjection)— Well, that too is also a good indication. When you see little stakes along the roads, well, that gets people all excited; well, the government is going to do things. Mind you, nothing happens because an election is gone and over and the roads will continue remaining in the same condition.

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed going past the Tory caucus room, there's a sticker there —(Interjection)— No, no, it's in full view of the door, and the door is usually open. The sign says, "I came back to Manitoba." Now finally, Mr. Speaker, remember for four years this government said, oh, nobody is leaving Manitoba, in fact the population is increasing and everybody is so happy, everybody is working, and so on and so forth. Now we see a sticker in their caucus room, "I came back to Manitoba." Now, Mr. Speaker, if one came back, one must have left; one must have left. So there's an admission that people did leave Manitoba. But I will tell the Honourable Minister of Finance that the people who are coming back are not his friends, they are not his friends, they are supporters of the Progressive Party. Yes, they are supporters of the Progressive Party. They are coming back in time to satisfy the residence qualifications in order to get on the list of electors. That's who they are, who are coming back.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Budget Speech, and then of course hearing comments from the present Minister's predecessor, and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on many an occasion he would be asked whether he attended to this matter and the other and usually his excuse was that he was too

busy watching the Gong Show. Well, I have the impression, Mr. Speaker, that there are many others on that side of the House who are avid Gong Show fans and probably that's what they have been spending their time doing.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the present Minister of Finance read last year's Budget Speech. Do you remember last year when his predecessor said, "But I believe it is fair to say that our greatest sense of accomplishment results from our success in restoring the principles of fiscal responsibility and accountability in the government of Manitoba." You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the general tone of the Throne and the Budget Speeches since 1978. In 1978 the government said, "We must clean up the socialist mess. We must tidy up the legislation and remove all forms of government intrusion into the private lives of individuals." In 1979 they said, "We are busy cleaning up the socialist mess." In 1980 they said, "We've cleaned up the socialist mess, and now we are off and running." And then last year — I would just like to remind the Minister, he says, "Mr. Speaker, our government's first priority, our most urgent priority has now been met, and the budgetary improvements we are able to introduce this year and those which will follow in years to come," — made a commitment at that time of the other improvements following in the years to come — "will be a direct result of our government's determination over the last two years to restore a secure financial base in this province." And then toward the conclusion of the Budget Speech, his predecessor says, "The initial transitional adjustment period is behind us, that's behind us. Our economy is back on track, and we have blue sky ahead of us. The task now is to maintain and where possible to accelerate the rebuilding process. Although this is our government's third Budget, in some ways it is also a first. It marks the start of a new stage in our development process and it opens a decade of new opportunities in our province with a set of policies and program reforms which recognize these opportunities and respond to them with responsibility and realism." And then in 1981, Mr. Speaker, in 1981, we came to this Chamber, last Thursday, expecting the Minister of Finance to stand up and continue from where his predecessor left off last year, but, no, you remember what he said for — how many pages — 71 pages, that's right, the 57, 58, back to blaming the previous government, back to saying, well, there's all kinds of things we would have liked to have done, but look at this mess that we inherited from the previous government.

But last year — well, you fellows forget what you said last year. Last year you said you cleaned it up. So if you cleaned it up last year, why don't you continue this year from where you left off last year instead of turning the clock back another three years back to 1977? You said, you assured the people last year that you cleaned up that socialist mess that you inherited —(Interjection)— that rat infested nest. And now you are back saying, well look at the terrible state of affairs that we inherited from those socialists, so really you can't expect us to do all that much, and giving all the other factors that must be taken into account, even the OECD, I think. (Interjection)— That's right. You know, when the Federal Government and everyone else . . . Well, Mr.

Speaker, I've never watched the Gong Show but once or twice, perhaps I did. Now that was the Gong Show of the year, the Budget that we heard; what was labeled as a Budget that we heard last Thursday — the Gong Show.

This afternoon the Minister of Education stands up and he calls the Progressive Socialists in a hurry. I thought maybe there is something in our amendment that may have prompted the Minister to think in those terms and I took a look at our amendment. Well, we talk about betterment of a human condition by making post-secondary, vocational, academic, and professional education available as social rather than individual expense. And this afternoon I heard the Minister of Agriculture also urging the government to move in that direction and to make funds available for programs designed for social development, so then the Minister of Agriculture must be a socialist. Well, it sort of pleases me, so obviously I have at least one member from that side, from the government side, who is going to support us on the subamendment. You know that is encouraging and perhaps even a . . . We would like to have a fourth member.

Now is this socialist to participate to the extent of at least 50 percent in the exploration development of the mineral resources belonging to the people of Manitoba? The Minister says yes. (Interjection)— That's what? —(Interjection)— Compulsion? The Minister himself in the Throne Speech, or all the Ministers collectively. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the fifth or sixth paragraph in the Throne Speech where the government said that the government can no longer turn a blind eye to what's happening in the private sector and that if the need should arise the government must participate in the resource development of our province and take on an equity position. So the government can say that. We said something similar; to the Minister of Education that's socialism. Is the exercise a fiscal responsibility? And that's our third amendment, and I am just refreshing the government's memory on these amendments because as it happened for whatever reason they did not appear in Saturday's paper and if the members don't read the Orders of the Day, this may have slipped their mind. Is the exercise of fiscal responsibility socialism by seeing to it that its revenues, the government's revenues keep pace with expenditures? Is a failure to obtain a fair share of the revenues generated by the mineral wealth owned by the public; is that socialism? It's not the point whether I am a socialist or not but the Minister said that this is socialism in a hurry. But surely, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Now that's right, that's right, it depends on who is preaching the sermon. That's right, that's Progressive Socialism or developing programs to enable Manitobans to participate in productive employment? Anybody on the government side who would vote against that? The Minister of Health, he would vote against the development of programs to enable Manitobans to participate in productive employment. He's opposed to productive employment. He's opposed to productive —(Interjection)— so, okay, so now we know where the Minister of Health stands on the matter of productive employment.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the members on the government side get up and say that there is more

money plowed into Health and Education, and this is the government's document, not mine, not something from Statistics Canada, this is the government's document — Estimated Expenditures and Revenues, and Health, Community Services and Corrections, 38.6 percent, down from 39, close to 40 percent in 1977. Education 21.1 percent, down from 22 percent. They say they are spending more money; in terms of dollars yes, in terms of dollars, of course, but then one has to remember that there is the inflation factor to take into account. But in relative terms which to the whole Budget indicates where the government's priorities lie, there is evidence of the government spending less money for Health and Education than had been spent in the past.

In fact we know, Mr. Speaker, that the government is assigning less money to the support of our universities and the evidence of that fact — this afternoon, the Minister quoted some figures, some statistics, from the current academic year. Now, unfortunately, I don't have as ready access to those figures as the Minister has, but the most recent figures that I could come up with that would reflect the operations of the three universities in Manitoba are for the previous academic year. However, I do have figures, which other members of the House have, dealing with the University of Manitoba. The last issue of their official publication showed their budget and showed the anticipated fee structure for the forthcoming fiscal year. It does show an increase; not only an increase in dollars, Mr. Speaker, but an increase in percentage terms. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you were to compare the current university fees with those of four years ago, you would find over a 40 percent increase. If you compare the level of support offered to the universities by the province, the percentage increase is less than three. When you compare the percentage that student fees account for the total university operating expenses, that too has increased over the years, Mr. Speaker, but members of the government will stand up and say, oh, we're offering more support to the universities than any government ever did before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education was talking about the funding of education. If he is really sincere in his desire to devise some new equitable formula for the funding of education, if he is really sincere in his desire to develop a formula which would provide equality of educational opportunity for all the children in the Province of Manitoba, now is the time, now at a time when the tax rebates run at about the same level, in fact, higher than the special levy, now is the time to give consideration to the abolition of school taxes from farm and residential real property and finding another scheme for the funding of education. (Interjection)— Well, if the Honourable Minister of Highways had been around this Chamber over the past few months, we would have known that this isn't the first time I have mentioned this. If he would have been around when his colleague, the Minister of Education, was attempting to defend the Public School Estimates, he would have heard that. (Interjection)— Yes, that's what I said, for the information of the Honourable Minister of Highways. Yes, that is our party plank, that services to people should be paid from general revenue; services to property should be paid from property tax. (Interjection)— It so happens that

one of your colleagues seems to have exhibited a greater interest in what I was saying than some others, so I thought that to be kind to him, and I am told that he also has a short memory and I know that in teaching one has to repeat statements from time to time.

We also heard about this government's concern about the small businessman and all the great things that they are doing for the small businessman. Last Saturday, Mr. Speaker, you will recall there was a lead story in the business section of our one and only newspaper reporting on a press conference that the Minister of Economic Development had and all the things that he is going to do to boost the tourism industry in the Province of Manitoba. He said that he is going to go out and spend \$1.1 million to attract an additional 200,000 tourists into Manitoba, that would raise the out-of-province tourists from 2.7 million visitors in the year 1979 to 2.9 million visitors. But you know, Mr. Speaker, the way the story read, you would thought, well, my goodness, there's going to be all these millions of people visiting the Province of Manitoba, but those figures were expressed in visitor days. Really, what the Minister is saying, is that he is going to go out and he is going to attempt to find about 22 additional families a day to visit the Province of Manitoba and stay around for about a week. If he does that, if he gets a family an hour, if he manages to get an additional family an hour, that gives him his 200,000 visitor days, and if each family stays for about a week. So he is going to spend about \$150.00 per family. Maybe he would be better off, not that it would make any more sense, but it would make every bit as much sense as what the Minister is attempting to do, is instead of spending his \$1.1 million on his publicity program, get the hell out to the United States, into Saskatchewan or Ontario and find people and say, look, if you come to Manitoba, I'll pay your gas, I'll give you \$150.00. Instead of spending the \$1.1 million on his hare-brained publicity scheme, find the people interested in visiting the province and give them — (Interjection)— As far as the whale problem is concerned, I will talk to the Minister of Natural Resources; I will talk to him because if anyone ought to do anything to protect whales, then that's his responsibility. (Interjection)— Well, now, it depends on the state of —(Interjection)— No, no, it doesn't depend on that at all.

Mr. Speaker, it has become quite apparent by the behaviour of the Minister of Highways that the Minister of Highways agrees that this is a waste of money, that to spend \$1.1 million to get an additional 20 families a day to generate \$1.1 million on a publicity program which really is a gamble because you don't know what the end result of that would be and the very most, Mr. Speaker, by the Minister's own figures, in terms of gross revenue from those 20 families a day, from those 200,000 visitor days that the Province of Manitoba, that is, all the entrepreneurs in the service industry, could hope to receive is \$12 million; to spend \$1.1 — to gamble \$1.1 million — on an advertising program with the hope that you might get \$12 million — that's twelve to one. (Interjection)— Well, I'm not quite that type of a gambler to gamble a dollar in that fashion in the hope of getting 12 back, not from that type of a gamble, on an advertisement in a newspaper in

Montana, on a radio station somewhere in Oklahoma, and to expect to find people flocking down here to repay you. The only ones that will come back are those who are saying that they are coming back to defeat you. Those are the only ones that will come to Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why the Minister is all exercised about this program and wants to spend additional moneys; I will tell you why, because the number of tourists coming to Manitoba have declined. In 1973, in terms of visitor days, we have 3.4 million visitor days; in 1974, 3.4 million visitor days again; in 1975, 3.2; in 1976, which was America's Bicentenary, 3.1; 2.8 in 1978 they stopped counting. They noticed, oops, it dropped to 2.7 and the reports for the past three years do not give any figures as to the number of visitor days spent by tourists in Manitoba because they are too embarrassed to tell the truth; they are too embarrassed to tell the truth. (Interjection)— Well, get the reports and show me the figures. They are not there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour is 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to report at eight o'clock, at which time the honourable member has 15 minutes remaining.