



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 27B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 22, 1991

The House met at 8 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, before we broke for supper, I was indicating to my honourable friends opposite that there are certain positions taken that the citizens of Manitoba are going to listen to, but they have to be ones where you demonstrate a certain amount of consistency. On the one hand, you cannot say to this government, now facing very essential and necessary decisions for the future of this province, that every one of those decisions is wrong unless you can clearly demonstrate your past record in government would clearly demonstrate to Manitobans that you would make different decisions or you have to provide alternatives. You know, as we approach this decade of the '90s, after I would think two decades of rather free spending at all levels of government, those options are no longer there.

There are some difficult choices that taxpayers across this country are demanding of government. It is pretty easy to sit back in the luxurious pews of opposition and say, well, you did this, that and the other wrong. We used to have a little bit of a sport doing that as well. The difference was that when we did it we were right, because the NDP were, 90 percent of the time, wrong.

Let me tell you why they were wrong 90 percent of the time. What are the solutions today to Manitoba's budget process? If my honourable friends—and I will deal with my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party—were on this side of the House, what is it that they would do differently from the budget presented by the honourable member for Morris, the Finance minister (Mr. Manness)? There are about four options one can go through, four choices one can make—choices seems to be a word that everybody wishes to use nowadays.

If you are not satisfied with the level of spending that we announced, is your choice more spending? Now, I seem to think that the answer to that from anybody who has observed this House in Question

Period and the speeches, both throne and budget from the New Democratic Party, they would state clearly and unequivocally that they would spend more. Okay? So I think that question is answered by their actions from opposition and their requests of government.

Then in determining you are going to spend more, if you were in government today presenting this budget, you have to answer, what new taxes would you put upon the people of Manitoba to enable you to spend more, or would you exercise the option of increasing the deficit and go out and borrow more on behalf of the future generations of the province of Manitoba?

* (2005)

Now, New Democrats, I am not sure where they are coming from today. They have not clearly announced that they would raise more taxes mainly because they know that Manitobans for two elections, 1988 and 1990, said clearly, no to more taxes. They can hide behind this shibboleth that they put up all the time of making the corporations pay more taxes but, again, one has to examine, what did they do in government under Howard Pawley, 1981 to 1988? They raised taxes, more taxes and more taxes. While they were doing that, who got hit the worst with NDP tax increases? Was it the corporations that they talk about today?

An Honourable Member: Was it?

Mr. Orchard: Well, of course, it was not.

An Honourable Member: It was not.

Mr. Orchard: Of course, it was not. The corporations under the New Democratic Party, Howard Pawley, Finance minister Schroeder, Finance minister Kostyra, paid less and less of a portion of taxation, while the citizens, the individuals of this province, paid more and more. Under the NDP, the truth of their rhetoric was they raised taxes on individuals and collected less taxes from the very corporations today they deride from opposition.

Now, you see, that is the kind of inconsistency and, Madam Deputy Speaker, dishonesty that the NDP are renowned for in trying to have it both ways, to speak out of both sides of their mouth on taxation

policy depending on whether they are government or opposition. Now, we know very well that the New Democratic Party would raise the borrowings of the Province of Manitoba, and I want some of the new members who have not had the opportunity to go back to the introduction, back in 1982.

In 1982, the Jobs Fund was created by Howard Pawley and the NDP, and the Jobs Fund was going to get Manitobans back to work. It was going to be their vehicle, their window on recession fighting. Well, I begged my honourable friends, in both the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, to go back and read Hansard, Question Periods in 1982, where the Jobs Fund was created and, particularly, follow the questions of the then member for La Verendrye, Bob Banman, of the then Minister of Natural Resources, Al Mackling, because what Al Mackling did in his budget and his annual appropriation for the department was to hire—I believe the number was 40 students and unemployed Manitobans to plant trees.

An Honourable Member: Right. I remember that.

Mr. Orchard: Do you remember that?

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Mr. Orchard: And this was going to be their summer work project, and they were going to work at it for, I believe, about three months. It was enough time for them to qualify for any unemployment insurance benefits there were, but these individuals, about 40 of them, were hired by Al Mackling and the NDP to plant trees, to work productively in the province of Manitoba, to create wealth for the future and, by planting trees, renewing our resource. A green and environmental process.

Now, they worked for about two weeks and then along come the Jobs Fund, and do you know what happened to those 40 people?

An Honourable Member: What happened?

Mr. Orchard: They got layoff notices from Al Mackling, because he had to put the money into the Jobs Fund, and I tell you, as I stand here, go back to Hansard and read that flip-flop, double-talking fiasco by the NDP on the Jobs Fund. They laid off tree planters in the Department of Natural Resources for summer employment to put the money into the Jobs Fund, so they could put up a green sign anywhere in Manitoba.

I beg my honourable friends, the Liberal Party, the new members in the Liberal Party, to go back and

check those Hansards. That was the way the NDP played the shell game with employment opportunities under the Jobs Fund and Howard Pawley and the NDP.

The other thing to find out is, when did we pay for the Jobs Fund? The answer is not yet because we just wrote off several hundreds of millions of dollars in debt that now those unemployed Manitobans, compliments of the NDP, when they do get back to work, are going to have to pay taxes to pay for the jobs that went up on the green Jobs Fund signs to paint barns and fences and mow lawns in the province of Manitoba in '82, '83, '84. I note with some satisfaction that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the now Leader of the New Democratic Party, rather blushing laughs because he knows that the Jobs Fund was the phoniest fund that one has ever had foisted upon the people of Manitoba.

* (2010)

Okay, we know the NDP are going to go out and borrow. You know, I want to tell you this, we knew this was happening as early as 1983 when I spoke to the Budget Debate. I forewarned the then Finance minister Vic Schroeder that he was driving this province into an unmanageable financial situation and the crunch would hit.

In 1986 and in 1987 when I spoke to the budget, I referred honourable members to the graph that appears on financial statistics, page 9, which is the refinancing of past borrowings that we have to do, and how the decade of the '90s was going to be the refinancing crunch that this province of one million people would have to endure because of past borrowing by the NDP to do what, to fight the recession from 1982, '83 and '84.

Today we are going to go in this decade of the '90s, and we are going to refinance NDP borrowings from the mid-'80s for jobs that have long been created and gone, for benefits that are no longer there because there are no physical assets in place to benefit the people of Manitoba, only green Jobs Fund signs and other useless initiatives that the NDP undertook.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let us take a look at some other interesting figures that come out of this. I beg and I ask my honourable friends in the opposition to at least read the danger signs that are there. Go to pages 12 and 13 of the financial statistics. You will find that as a percent of gross domestic product that in 1982-83 net general

purpose debt, which is debt incurred simply to operate government, no physical asset, no hospital, no school, no water diversion project, no water storage project, simply to pay salaries and to operate normal government. It was 13.2 percent of GDP in 1982-83. It doubled in six short years under Howard Pawley and the NDP to 26.3 percent.

Does anyone in the opposition New Democratic Party ranks believe that was sustainable? It has fallen back in the last several budgets to about 22 percent, still a significant amount of money. In that same period of time, the public debt cost, including that famous corporation, Manitoba Properties Inc., took as a percent of expenditure, '82-83, 5.7 percent of our total expenditures went to pay interest, growing and doubling in six short years to 11.3 percent.

Did my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party believe that was sustainable for a population of one million? Because if they did, they were fools. Yet, when we listened to them in debate on this budget, do we hear them saying that was not an appropriate thing to do, that we ought not to borrow, that we ought not to finance the future for today's consumption? No, we do not hear any of those denials of wrong-headed policy from Howard Pawley's years.

We hear whines and cries of complaint about investment. Well, I want to talk to my honourable friends about pages 20 and 21 of the economy. They keep saying that private investment is down and down significantly and that Manitoba is losing. Well, take a look at the investment under private. It has gone from \$1.536 billion in 1986, which were Howard Pawley's years, up to \$1.713 billion in 1990.

* (2015)

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that down? Of course it is not down; it is up. We could do all of those statistics and we could go through it, and we could prove that on several instances—they have been right a couple of times in the New Democratic Party—but in most instances they are not telling Manitobans anything of accurate fact about this budget, nor are they sharing with Manitobans where they would take the economy.

We know what New Democratic Parties under Howard Pawley did and under Ed Schreyer did. We do not know what a New Democratic Party under the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), would do. We do not know

where he would approach government. Now I want to tell you that is of concern, because the member for Concordia said to his backbenchers in caucus, he said to the collection that is there with him, let us just hold on because all we have to do is wait this out. We do not have to tell Manitobans what our alternative is, because we believe—

An Honourable Member: Who told you that?

Mr. Orchard: Who told me that? The deputy leader of the New Democratic Party asked who told me that. Your Leader told me that, the member for Concordia, the person who sits right next to you told me that, that all you have to do is keep your heads down and this government will make all of the tough decisions that he knows in his heart of hearts have to be made. He wants their caucus, the New Democrats, to keep their head down, do a little bit of criticism, and they will inherit a province in much better financial shape after this government is over, the sort of keep-your-head-down dishonesty approach. Do not tell them what you would do; merely hope that they will accept silence as policy.

Well, that will not work in the decade of the '90s, and that is where the New Democratic Party is wrong. You know, I want to tell my honourable friends that choices are not easy, choices are difficult. There were warning signs since 1983 that the Howard Pawley administration was not taking the province in an appropriate direction. There are warning signs that today, in this nation of ours, other provinces are saying we have to come to grips with our spending, and they are making difficult and tough decisions right across the length and breadth of this nation.

Part of the difficulty I will fully admit today, in 1991, is exacerbated by the current recession which is not helping any province. It is exacerbated by federal policies wherein they are not providing the kind of funds provinces would like to see, but then their problem—not that I am trying to justify their decisions in any way, shape or form, but they have got a massive debt problem in the nation as well.

In Manitoba we are acutely hurt, Madam Deputy Speaker, by the fact that agriculture has been very, very hard hit by a series of factors from drought to market prices driven down on commodities for which there is no international trade war subsidization, to the market commodities being depressed because of trade war subsidization. Agriculture has not contributed its normal vibrancy

to the buying power of the Province of Manitoba, and I will give you just one small example. It is on my farm. In the five years that I have been operating the farm, my expenditures have gone down by 50 percent in planting the same number of acres of crop. That is a removal of purchasing power of \$65,000 per year on one small farm that I happen to work in Manitoba, and that is happening across all of agriculture.

You think that does not have an impact on employment in the service industries to agriculture, on investment in rural Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg? It is not that farmers are wanting to do that; they are forced to do it by the economics that are there.

My honourable friend, the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos)—I have to tell him I take exception to his statement the other day that because farmers had got this quote, unquote, \$400 million that he mentioned, they should be satisfied, and this province should not do anything for them. That is wrong-headed thinking from the member for Broadway.

Now what my honourable friends in the opposition have to come to grips with is that the decision making we are going through in Manitoba is not unique in Canada. Newfoundland budget—how many times have we heard about 300 nursing layoffs, 2,000 civil servant layoffs and rollback of existing contracts. The same thing in New Brunswick where they are flattening out their expenditures. Those are not neo-Conservative governments that we hear the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party talking, but those are two Liberal administrations. We are going to wait and see what our honourable friends in Ontario do.

Oh, now my honourable friend from Wellington says the new definition of neo-Conservative is Liberal as well as Conservative. Well, is that not an interesting thing, because before supper—she was not here—I mentioned that you take the red tie off a Liberal, you get a New Democrat.

* (2020)

Point of Order

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), on a point of order.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Madam Deputy Speaker, I do believe it is out of order for a member

to refer to another member's absence or presence in the House, and I would ask the honourable member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) to withdraw those comments.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Wellington does have a point of order. I would request the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to retract that statement.

Mr. Orchard: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, of all the people to do such a terrible, unconscionable thing to, I apologize 100 percent to the member for Wellington because, Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to get her vote for the Lady Byng Trophy again this year.

Point of Order

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Madam Deputy Speaker, now that the member for Wellington has piqued my interest, I wonder if she could tell us whether she was here or she was not here.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Minister of Urban Affairs does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I very much enjoy the help I get from all the people in the House in addressing this important issue.

Let me tell my honourable friends that other provinces are dealing with the same difficult budgetary decisions. They have oppositions that are putting forward ideas as to how to do things better, not simply to criticize as to what the government is doing. This has been notably absent in this Chamber from both opposition parties.

I do not want to conclude from that, Madam Deputy Speaker, that both opposition parties with few exceptions are bankrupt of ideas on how to deal with the circumstance that Manitobans face today. Do my honourable friends in the opposition recognize that a number of nations are going through the same kind of difficult financial choices? It is happening throughout the world today.

The third thing I would like to observe with my honourable friends in opposition is, do they think that this is the first time nations of the world have faced financial difficulties which has engendered

necessary but essential difficult choices? A study of history will tell you that is not the case.

I related during the throne speech I believe last session the instance of J. Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister of Great Britain, who went to the money markets to borrow money to support the pound sterling and the integrity of the British nation. The money lenders told him, yes, we will lend you the money, but you do two things. You reduce expenditures and you raise taxes to make your government more solvent and financially capable.

The one expenditure cut he undertook as Prime Minister of Great Britain was to lower the welfare payments to three million unemployed Britons who had just elected him because he was not a Conservative Prime Minister, he was a Labour Party Prime Minister, but he did it because the choices were difficult to make but he made them for the nation. If you think that is new and has not happened before, I want to quote to you a small quote, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I think will make all honourable members think just a little bit, "The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled and the assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed, lest Rome become bankrupt."—Cicero, 63 B.C.

So if one thinks that these problems faced by governments are new in the 1990s he lives in a dream world, an unreal world. I have to tell my honourable friends that I have been elected 14 years. A number of us have spoken in this House about wrong-headed policies. A number of us have offered alternate policies and I have done that in health care from opposition.

* (2025)

Now I am delivering those things because when I offered the good suggestions they fell on New Democratic Party deaf ears. I will take my role in this House and compare it to any critic who is currently in this House, and that is why, from time to time, and I do not want to ruin his political career, I appreciate the support of the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), because when something is done right, he has the decency to say, yes, that is an appropriate thing to do. I want to tell my honourable friend something. If you think that loses the Liberal Party and its Health critic points in the public mind, you are wrong. It gains in credibility so

that when you speak and you voice a concern that the government is moving in the wrong direction, you speak with credibility because you are not afraid to admit that something was done right.

Therein lies the difficulty of the current New Democratic Party official opposition. They have nothing but narrowed partisan criticism. They talk about dismissals in government and layoffs. Well, yes, those were done and those were not done with any kind of levity or joy or anything but sad feelings and remorse, because some of the individuals, who many of us in our departments saw laid off, we had worked with, particularly in my ministry where a number of them were middle-management people. There was no joy in that.

You know, once again—and it was put on the record earlier on this afternoon by one of the speakers from our side of the House—let the New Democratic Party not self-righteously lecture us on dismissals, because when I was Highways minister my deputy minister did a very fine job as deputy minister. He had been in that position for probably two decades and he represented the province well. When he was fired by the NDP, under Howard Pawley, he was not called in and thanked for his service and told there was nothing personal, that this was an administrative decision of the government, not at all. He found out, the Deputy Minister of Highways found out that his minister, the now member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), and Premier Howard Pawley had fired him in his absence while he was on holidays, and he heard it on the radio when he came into Manitoba.

So let not any Manitoban think that the New Democratic Party has a corner on compassion for people because that is one firing. When they had the retirement party, the member for Dauphin, as Highways minister, went there and tried to sing praises to the deputy minister and that deputy minister said, thanks but no thanks. If you liked me that much, why did you fire me when I was on holidays without telling me, and why was it in the media first? Good questions, are they not?

I just say to my honourable friends, when you are saying that what we are doing is wrong in government, that our policy is wrong, that our direction is wrong—and I will appreciate that right now you want to hit while the iron is hot; you want to strike while the iron is hot; you want to make all of the criticisms you can—the obligation is on you to give accurate information. I know that is difficult for

opposition members because the temptation is always there to stretch things slightly. I appreciate that.

I also appreciate that during the Budget Debate you may not have the opportunity to share your ideas with government in this Chamber but more importantly to share them with the people of Manitoba, because we are not the listeners in this case—on the Treasury bench and in government—but the people of Manitoba are the listeners. What the people of Manitoba have said—and I think this is part of the cynicism wherein elected officials are not viewed as being very, very credible people.

That is not anything that individually we have done. I am sure that each of us, all 57 members as we go to our constituencies, will find that we are accepted as being good representatives, that we work hard, that we try to do our job right, but how does that translate into the general malaise across this country which says government and elected people are terrible, terrible administrators of the tax dollars? How does that translate into individual personality?

I know that for a fact because I have been into some opposition constituencies, and as MLAs you are reasonably well thought of, even by members who would support my party, but how does that translate into a general distrust and dislike of politicians?

* (2030)

Well, I will tell you why, because I have been here 14 years and I have seen this trend grow. People are sick and tired of the carping partisanism that we get into in this House. They want answers to problems. They do not want to have a rehash of what the difficulty is. They want your ideas on how to make it better.

All of you will have had provided to you, from time to time, advice which says I wish you people could get together in an all-party spirit and make things happen. You have all heard it in your constituencies.

That is why the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) three years ago was almost a sure-fire shoo-in to be the next Premier of the Province of Manitoba. You go back three years ago, everybody was saying it was a given that we would have our first woman Premier in Manitoba under the leadership of the Liberal Party.

You know what? It did not happen. You know why, because when that person came in here as a single opposition member she said, I am going to be different. I am not going to get into the partisan rhetorical statements that are made from time to time simply to flap her gums and to make it happen. Then within a year and a half she fell into the same trap, did the same thing that every other opposition leader has done, culminated by this beauty of an amendment that she moved the other day to the throne speech. It decries every single initiative of this government without providing that alternative that the Leader of the Liberal Party promised to the people of Manitoba, that she would not, in a hollow-voiced manner, simply beat the drum of opposition and tell government where they were wrong. This Leader of the Liberal Party would do it differently and provide alternatives. None have been provided, Madam Deputy Speaker, and that is why three years ago the lustre was there. Today the shine is gone, and it will remain gone.

That is why I want to close by saying to my honourable friends in opposition—I just want to encourage them that where you believe we are wrong, this is the greatest crucible with the best communication people you can hire sitting in that press gallery day in and day out, to provide to Manitobans your ideas on how government can work better. When you provide none of that advice but only the hollow-drum criticism and, in many instances, advice that is completely opposite with the New Democratic Party in particular, to what they did in government, then you have no credibility in the public mind.

Today Manitobans and Canadians are asking, demanding and pleading for leadership in this Chamber. They know that we, as MLAs, face difficult decisions and they want to hear solutions, not hollow criticism.

I have listened to this budget debate and, Madam Deputy Speaker, I say with regret I have heard very few ideas on how to do things better from either opposition party. That will not do; that simply will not wash in the 1990s. So I urge my honourable friends in closing—and I will attempt to listen to as much of the debate as I can, and I will listen for those ideas.

To my honourable friends in the back bench of the New Democratic Party, do not worry about undercutting your Leader. Tell Manitobans where the New Democratic Party will come from; tell them what you stand for; tell them what you will do—I see

my honourable friend for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) is nodding her head—even if it means you want to shoot the cormorants. Thank you.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): It is always a pleasure to stand in this Chamber to represent my constituents in Transcona and to have the honour to do so. Of course, following the remarks that were just delivered by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), it is always an act to follow for anyone who stands up after and speaks.

An Honourable Member: A very hard act to follow.

Mr. Reid: Well, I would not say that it was a hard act to follow. It was an act to follow. In that sense, there are many things that have been discussed in debate in this House over the last several days—the Budget Debate that is.

I would like to translate some of those things into more human terms. We have seen a lot of figures that have been bandied about here and about deficits and how it is going to affect it, but I am going to translate some of these budget figures into human terms and how it relates to my constituency in Transcona, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Transcona has always been a great place to live, to work and to raise your family. To a large degree that has not changed until just recently. We have seen in the community, in the last three or four months, some major announcements that have impacted upon the families in the community itself, particularly with respect to their employment.

The Canadian National Railways is the largest employer in the community, employing nearly 2,000 people. We have seen since January of this year, there were 75 employees who were laid off and, of course, that will affect their families as well. There is no recall date that I am aware of. Then after that we saw and heard the announcement, the shocking announcement, that 1,545 employees were going to start an extended layoff starting in July and carrying through till September and potentially much longer than that.

Of course, that is a disastrous announcement for these people in the community, particularly at a time when there are no other jobs available of this quality that they can go out and seek alternate employment in. Then after that announcement of 1,545, we saw another announcement a week ago where another 79 permanent employees had their employment terminated. They were laid off on a permanent basis. Then just last week there was another

announcement, further layoffs to these employees, 117 more full-time employees were laid off on a permanent basis. This brings the total number of people laid off from this particular plant to 1,806 and represents nearly the full complement of the employees who were employed in that particular plant.

Now this puts the people who are in the community of Transcona in a particularly difficult position because not only was this providing employment for these people and the source of income for their families, but there were also spin-off industries that were affected by these layoffs. The employment for these people who were employed in the spin-off industries, of course, will have to suffer the consequences of these decisions as well.

In the throne speech, it was quite clear from the comments that were in there, and I will read some of them for the record, and I quote: We remain a significant centre for financial services and transportation and communications (end of quote).

If you look at that statement in itself, the only reason the financial services are being provided is to take up the slack in the foreclosures that are ever increasing in our province of Manitoba.

Then, of course, the rate of losses in the transportation sector are very significant, and that could have a potential of reducing us from a major player in a transportation sense down to that of a minor bit player in the overall scheme of transportation in this country.

In the throne speech as well, Madam Deputy Speaker, it indicates that the government is aimed at building a strong economy that will provide jobs. Well, as I just stated for the record a few moments ago, the number of employees who have lost their employment in the community in my constituency of Transcona totalled 1,806 people. That is one particular industry that I am aware of. I know there are many others in the community of Transcona who have also lost their employment due to the inaction of this particular government to make corrections that will create jobs and stimulate the economy of this province.

* (2040)

These layoffs, and I relate these in human terms with respect to the budget, represent a bleak future for the families, many of them with young children, in the community. They have no prospect for future employment because times are very difficult right

now and there just are no jobs that are available. These families, of course, many of them having worked for many years at this particular industry, are going to be eligible for unemployment insurance, but then after a period of time the unemployment insurance runs out and these people will revert to the welfare system that is in our communities. This, of course, places additional strains upon the government resources and that will lead to more difficulties once these people have to go on welfare, Madam Deputy Speaker.

We see that when people are forced to go in this direction, their personal self-esteem drops, it is shaken to the very core, and it creates a great deal of strain on the family unit. This family unit, of course, has a tendency to disintegrate under these pressures, and then you find situations of abuse, alcoholism and suicide because there is no hope for these people and they have no future.

Those are some of the human terms that I wanted to relate with the budget and the numbers that we have been bandying about here for the last several days.

There is also one other major piece of information that I want to put on the record here today. The government talks statistics over and over and over again in this House. Well, this piece of information will talk about food banks and the increased use that these food banks have had in the community of Transcona where I reside.

One particular organization in my community, Transcona United Church, was supplying services and food for the needy families in Transcona, and they were supplying 55 families, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the month of November 1990. Since that point in time, the number of families having to make use of those services has increased to 91 in February of this year. That represents a 66 percent increase in the number of families that have had to utilize food bank services. Then in discussions that I have had with members of my constituency over the last couple of days, I have also been made aware of the fact that an additional 15 families have had to start making use of these food bank facilities. That gives an increase to somewhere in the range of 106 families that are now utilizing food banks in the community of Transcona, and in less than five months that represents an increase in the use by 93 percent for the food banks.

I do not see any actions, Madam Deputy Speaker, on the part of this government to bring about any changes to the way the economy of this province is handled and mismanaged, and that there are no opportunities for these people to seek out or to gain alternate employment to allow them to return to a more normal life. If each of these 106 families had an average of four people to them, that would represent 424 people. Many of us know that there are families in the community that do not go to the food banks in the community. Because of their own personal pride, they would rather seek those types of support services outside of the community and go to other areas for that support. So the numbers of 424 or approaching 500 people could be significantly higher than the figures I just stated a few moments ago.

These families are living on diets of pasta and other starch products and have little protein because those are all of the resources that are available through the food banks to provide to these people.

Also, we are witnessing in the use of food banks a large increase in the number of young people using this particular service. Some of them are single parents; some are single adults. These people, of course, have lost their jobs and there is no possibility that they will find employment in the near future. The number of young users using the food banks is now approaching approximately 50 percent of the total number of people who use the food bank services.

So this government likes to talk about statistics. I think that it is important that we attach people to these numbers and the impact of the budget decisions that were made by this government in their announcement of their budget decisions of last week. We cannot just let the figures stand for what they are, but they have to relate them in human terms, not just in cold, uncaring, impersonal facts.

The government has to take responsibility for the economy that they created and the fact that they have no plans for job creation in this province, the one thing they spell out very clearly in their throne speech document that they state as a priority. We have seen no actions in that direction to this point, and I think that is very unforgivable on their part. Madam Deputy Speaker, these people have no hope, no trust and no future with this government.

I would like to switch the topic now, Madam Deputy Speaker, to something that was raised by

my honourable colleague in the House here before our dinner recess and that was the fact that there were contributions to political parties in this particular province. There were several facts that were put on the record that I feel must be clarified for the record.

I think that it is important that the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) did raise this issue. I had intended on letting it lie for a period of time and not raising it but since he has opened the door, I am going to take advantage of this and put some statements on the record.

We have, of course, seen the latest documents that were released in this province about the political contributions to the various political parties in this province. The Liberal Party has now received 78 percent of their contributions from the corporate sector and yet just seven months ago that figure was 74 percent, so there has been an increase of 4 percent in the political contributions from corporations to the Liberal Party of Manitoba. This particular Liberal Party and their member for St. James has stated that the New Democratic Party has received huge donations from the union movement in this province.

Of course there are facts to bear out that we have received some donations, but when you hold all of those facts in the true light of day, Madam Deputy Speaker, we only received 21 percent of our monies from the union organizations. When you compare that to the 78 percent that the Liberal Party receives from corporate donations, I think there is a significant difference there.

Some of the ones that I would like to state for the record I think are very significant figures and they should be put on the record to make it very clear to Manitobans who actually is supporting the Liberal Party and the efforts that they tried to put forward on behalf of their specific, special interests.

There are nearly \$58,000 in donations from banks and financial institutions going to the Liberal Party of Manitoba. Now that is a very significant figure, and I often wonder why banks and financial institutions would provide that type of financial support for the Liberal Party. I suppose that somewhere down the road we will see why they receive those types of donations. Of course they are going to be beholden, this Liberal Party, to these major financial institutions and, of course, we have

seen by past policy that that has been the case in this country.

Of course, we also see Power Corporation, who happens to have—major Power Corporation, as the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) states. They have donated \$5,000 to the Liberal Party coffers in this province. Of course, this particular corporation controls Investors Group and Great-West Life Assurance Company.

We also see that Cargill Grain Company—now, I wonder why Cargill Grain Company would provide such a large donation to the Liberal Party of Manitoba. They have provided \$10,000 in one single donation to the Liberal Party. Now I have to wonder why, Madam Deputy Speaker, they are providing this, and I am wondering if it has something to do with the past Liberal policy and maybe future Liberal policy of a federal government, and, of course, they are trying to hold the door open for any decisions that might be made.

I have to relate that in respect to the port of Churchill in this particular province, something that I have grown quite fond of supporting in recent months when I have known the plight of the community of Churchill and the communities on that particular bayline route—Cargill Grain, of course, has very strong interests in the Atlantic, the Seaway, and the Pacific ports in this country, and maybe this \$10,000 will go a long way towards some future decisions that may be made by governments of the day in power.

Madam Deputy Speaker, one last figure that I would like to put on the record is the fact that the oil companies, of course, have made significant contributions to the Liberal Party coffers over the last election campaign. They donated \$12,000 to the Liberal Party. That may not be a significant figure if we were to compare it with our friends across the way, which we will see in due course, I am sure, but nevertheless that is a significant figure looking at the interest that the Liberal party is going to represent for them in the future.

* (2050)

When we talked about the Power Corporation and the donations that they made to the Liberal party, and I talked about \$5,000, the Power Corporation, of course, I stated for the record, owns Great-West Life and Investors Group and this particular corporation had profits in 1988 of \$217.9 million and

yet paid no income tax, zero income tax, Madam Deputy Speaker.

When we take a look at the fact that the banks and the financial institutions have made significant contributions to the Liberal party, Madam Deputy Speaker, we see that the Confederation Life Insurance Company with Manitoba holdings in insurance and real estate made profits of over \$103 million and paid no income taxes in 1989. In total, there were 118,162 profitable corporations that did not pay any income taxes. That is very unfortunate considering the tax load that is placed upon the working families in this country.

I think it is time, Madam Deputy Speaker, that we move back to a fair system of taxation in this province and this country and that we make sure that all those who are profiting and who have a source of income like this pay their fair share towards the operation of this country and this province. Of course, we have seen many announcements by this Conservative government since the election in the fall of 1990, and one of the major announcements that we saw in this province was the fact that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) of this province froze the incomes of the Civil Service and the people of this province to a figure of 3 percent.

Yet the Premier's own senior staff received a 15 percent increase in wages last year, Madam Deputy Speaker. I wonder how the Minister of Finance can equate those two figures and show the people of Manitoba that there is fair play taking place here.

We also saw that the Treasury Board, the Filmon government's ministry of cutbacks, received an increase of 34 percent. It is very interesting when we look at the fact that they only allowed their employees to have a 3 percent increase over this year and the cost of living has increased nearly 6 percent. I wonder how this minister expects them to do anymore belt tightening when they already have had to go the limit already.

It is very obvious, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the members opposite are very sensitive about some of the subjects that I have raised here today and that they take offence to these remarks because they are so sensitive. That is unfortunate for them, but they are in a position of power now and are in government. They have the opportunity to correct these deficiencies and these unfair practices, and I call upon them to do so.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) states that his government is being blamed for the layoffs at CN. Of course, that happens to be federal government Conservative policy, but at the same time his Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) has to take some responsibility for his inaction or his inability to place any pressure upon the federal Minister of Transport to have those layoffs that are coming at the worst time possible held in abeyance or rescinded in totality.

Canadian National Railways, for the Minister of Finance's information, and I know this for a fact because I used to take them to task for it when I was an employee of that corporation, and that company is going to be in a position of owing over \$700 million in deferred taxes by next year. I do not think that is a proper position for any Crown corporation to be in. They should be setting the example in this country and paying their fair share of taxes, particularly in a time—and the fact of the matter that they had profitable years for 10 out of the last 11 or 12 years. There is no reason why they could not have paid their fair share of taxes to the operation of this country.

One of the things I would like to switch my comments to now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to move toward my area of critic's responsibility and that is Highways and Transportation. We talked a few moments ago about transportation cuts and the impact that it is having upon the communities, particularly my own community. Of course, we saw approximately a year ago where VIA Rail has cut 50 percent of the service and approximately 50 percent of their train operations and about equal amounts of their staff.

At the same time the Minister of Transportation federally has not taken his Crown corporation chief executive officers onto the carpet for the comments that they have placed on the record since the beginning of this year, particularly the comment that the president of VIA has stated where the remote mandated routes are no longer necessary and should not be maintained. I think this is a very deplorable statement for any head of a Crown corporation to make, particularly when this place is in jeopardy, the future of these communities and the people who live in them along the bay route up to the port of Churchill. These communities have for many, many years relied upon the services provided by this particular passenger rail.

We have seen in this province, of course, the loss of two truck operations, the carriers in this province, in the last several months. -(interjection)- We will get to that in a moment, yes. We will touch on that in a few moments when I relate to you my most recent trip to Churchill which the member was unaware of that we had made recently. The trucking industry, of course, is in very difficult times right now, and we have seen many situations take place in this province. Manitoba has historically been the capital of trucking in this country, since we are the centre point and it was quite convenient to ship from the centre point of the country in different directions.

Also, I have received correspondence from several very much affected parties in the owner-operator area of the trucking industry, and these people have some very serious concerns that I think are going to have to be addressed by this particular Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger). When we get to the Estimates process I intend on asking him some very pointed questions about this subject, -(interjection)- because of the impact that it is having on the viability of the owner-operator operations. Of course, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says that the Minister of Highways is very worried about that. If he was that worried about it he would have taken the necessary steps to see that they remain viable and he would have done so by now.

It seems that the government is only listening to the large—we will call them—corporate carriers, and these large companies, of course, it is very clear, have been taking advantage of the owner-operators in this province, and that they are bringing about unnecessary fees and charging those fees to the owner-operators. Of course, they have been withholding some of the funds that are due and payable to these owner-operators on completion of services.

I think that this minister has to take some very serious steps in a very short period of time, put it on the fast track to resolve this issue so that the owner-operators can continue to provide services for our province. These owner-operators, I am told, transport nearly 60 percent of all the truck traffic that travels through this province, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think it is important that we preserve their interests and do everything we can within our powers to make sure that they remain viable.

* (2100)

We have also seen, over the last several months, where this government in this province has not represented the interests with respect to our airlines and the services they provide to the communities in this province. I had the opportunity to question the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) on several occasions concerning the open skies policy and the position I had hoped that his government would be taking.

The negotiations for the open skies process with the United States of America commenced last week, and I had the opportunity to question the minister to find out if we had sent representatives to sit in on those hearings to make sure that Manitoba's interests would be represented considering we have 3,600 jobs at stake.

Of course, this could have a very significant impact on the communities in Manitoba and the services that are provided to these communities. There is a need to seek out permanent solutions to the ills that have befallen the transportation industry before we lose the companies and the jobs and the services that they provide. We cannot just sit on our hands or throw them up in the air.

I think it is important that to resolve these types of issues—and I call upon the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) to create an all-party task force to study the transportation problems in this province and how they are going to affect -(interjection)- you bet, I want to be on it. -(interjection)-

I have 20 years of experience in the transportation industry; I think I have something to offer a particular task force that would take place. I may not have all of the answers, but I would be willing to listen to the people. Contrary to what the members think, I would be willing to listen to the concerns and the interests of the people in the transportation sectors, and that it is important that we do something now before we lose our very major role we now have in the transportation industry. -(interjection)-

Well, I have offered the Minister of Highways and Transportation some advice through the last Estimates process, but unfortunately, to this point in time, he has not taken me up on those offers, contrary to what the members opposite might think.

There has also been a myth, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the Conservative governments were better business managers. That myth has been portrayed and expanded upon by the members

opposite for many years now, and it is very clear that this budget and the previous budget prove that the Conservative members are no better and quite probably a lot worse at managing the economy, since at least the NDP would maintain essential services and jobs in times of recession. We make work, unlike our colleagues across the way, and we do not let the people who are unemployed and fallen upon hard times rely upon the few resources, if there are any resources available, to sustain them through the difficult times. We were, and we will be again in the future, a caring government, unlike the government that is in place at this time. -(interjection)-

They must be very sensitive to this, Madam Deputy Speaker, knowing that the truth hurts, but I had to raise that as a matter for the record.

An Honourable Member: Where is your brother?

Mr. Reid: My other brother.

An Honourable Member: Your other brother.

Mr. Reid: One day, I may have another brother Daryl here. I do not think the -(interjection)- I have to rely on the good memories of the members opposite. They are a little bit long in the tooth, Madam Deputy Speaker, to recall if there has ever been a Daryl in the House before. -(interjection)- I thank the members for that information. It is nice to be the first Daryl who has had the opportunity to represent any of the constituents in the province of—Transcona.

With the good wishes of the people of Transcona, Madam Deputy Speaker, and, of course, their support in the future, I hope to remain in this House for many years to come. I hope that there will be other Daryls who will follow me into this Chamber, as well, from our particular party.

This budget, we see, to move back to the subject at hand—there have been some misunderstandings that have been placed on the record by members opposite, particularly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) with his announcements about deficits in this particular province. When he tried to tell the people of Manitoba that the deficit in this province is only \$324 million, well, I would like to put the true facts on the record so that the people of Manitoba will be able to see for themselves what the true facts are. This province has a deficit of \$470 million, and this shortfall, or deficit, is the worst piece of incompetent mismanagement that I have had the

displeasure of witnessing in my short time in this House.

An Honourable Member: Daryl, do not say it with a smile on your face.

Mr. Reid: Well, I have a bit of a smile on my face, Madam Deputy Speaker, even though these figures and these facts are a very, very serious matter for our province and the people who live in the province. I smile because the members opposite seem somewhat to take offence to my remarks with respect to that, for putting these facts on the record, and they are very sensitive when I make these comments.

An Honourable Member: What were you going to tell us about the Churchill road?

Mr. Reid: We will get to the Churchill road in a few moments. I have a lot of information that I would like to share with the member.

When I expressed my displeasure at the facts—how much time do I have, Madam Deputy Speaker? Eight minutes?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Eight minutes.

Mr. Reid: It is this Conservative government and successive Conservative governments in this province, in this country that have told the peoples of this country and this province for a long time that they have been better managers and that they were better managers. I state, for the record, Madam Deputy Speaker, that after this budget that we saw here this week and the budget that we saw last year, this myth has been destroyed and will never be able to be resurrected. -(interjection)- Read the Hansard.

I would like to move on now, and talk a little bit about the port of Churchill and my recent opportunities to travel up to the community of Churchill. Of course, that was an opportunity that was given to me by the honourable member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), and he was—the honourable member for Rupertsland has been and continues to be very concerned for the well-being of the constituents he represents. He has and continues to fight against the program cutbacks that this government has tried to foist upon the people of Manitoba, in particular his region that he represents.

We had the opportunity to travel to the port to attend Chamber of Commerce meetings in the community of Churchill, Madam Deputy Speaker. I know the members across the way might be a little bit shocked to hear that New Democrats actually do

go and attend Chamber of Commerce meetings, but we do because we are interested in concerns about the problems that are facing these particular communities. We want to see if we can be of some assistance to them to help them solve these problems, whether it is by our term in government, and helping to erode, erase these deficiencies, or to impress upon the government the need to take some action that will correct the problems facing these communities.

While we were at the meetings, and there were representatives of the Norman region and the Keewatin region from the Northwest Territories, there were many concerns that were raised and, of course, we have seen over the last several years the decline in the use of the port of Churchill. We have also seen the elimination of the SAC base. That has taken many thousands of people out of that particular community. I believe the resident numbers have been reduced from around 7,000 down to approximately 1,000 people still remaining in the community to this day.

That is an unfortunate situation that has occurred and I think some serious steps have to be taken to change the direction that community has been headed in for a period of time. I think we have to bring some concentrated pressure to bear upon the federal government to start utilizing that port to ship our products, our manufactured products and our grain products to our customers elsewhere in the world.

* (2110)

We have seen the figures over a period of time now, that 3 percent would be enough to keep that port viable and that, I think, would be a good starting point and a good target for us to aim for. We have, of course, heard at those meetings that the people were very concerned about the loss of their rail line, because that provided their only ground link with what they term the outside world. I think that it is important that the government and the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) in this province bring pressure to bear, and that he bring and raise to the attention of the new minister, the new federal minister of highways and transportation the issues that are facing the port, the community of Churchill, the communities along the way and the people they provide services to.

I think that one of the areas we will be getting to when we get into the Estimates process, and, of

course, I will be questioning the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) on this, is the fact that we have lost another 114 jobs from his particular department for which he is responsible.

We will be interested to see the areas that these jobs have been eliminated from and how they are going to impact upon the services. We already know how they are going to impact upon the personal lives of the people who are losing these jobs. I have spoken earlier in my comments about the wrong decision at the wrong time that this government has made by their budget announcements and the job losses that are involved with that process.

When we get into the Estimates process as well, I am going to be questioning the Minister of Highways and Transportation as to his reasons why they are offloading 2000 kilometres of provincial roads onto the municipalities. I think that is a significant cost for these municipalities to bear, particularly in these times, because that will force them into the position where they are going to have to increase their tax rates to their residents in their area. That is a continual offloading, similar to what we have seen with the federal government, foisted upon this province over the last several federal budgets.

But one of the most serious concerns that I have noticed in the budget document is that there has been a significant decrease in the funding that was allotted for the Winter Roads program in this province, from \$196,000 for the year down to \$90,000 for the year. That represents a 55 percent decrease in funding.

Of course, most of us in this Chamber know that this funding provided services and employment for our aboriginal communities in the province of Manitoba, and I intend on questioning the minister why and how and where these cuts are going to be made and how they are going to impact upon these different communities, the services and the employment levels that they have.

There are many other areas that I could talk about, Madam Deputy Speaker, that are of interest to me, and, of course, I have raised a lot of the major ones now and how they are going to impact upon the community of this province. I have raised many issues to do with the transportation sector, and the

fact that the transportation industry seems to be in serious decline in this province.

I call upon the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) to open up a channel of dialogue with his new federal counterpart, and to bring to that person's attention the problems that are facing the transportation industry in this province. -(interjection)- Well, they keep playing musical chairs in Ottawa, hoping that they are going to get the right combination, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I do not think this musical chairs process that they have been going through is going to have any impact on the decision of the Canadian people a year and a half from now.

With that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my remarks and thank you for the opportunity.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Madam Deputy Speaker, within the bosom of this humble, beautiful, obedient, loyal servant of Her gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, hope doth truly spring eternal, because I really believed, despite my many years, that this was a budget that could be unanimously supported.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I say that seriously, because if there is one thing all politicians have heard, from all sides, about the priority of health care, of the priority of family services, of the priority of education, that surely is something that we have heard across the length and breadth of this land from everybody. That surely is the one message in this whole issue that is very clear.

I will add one fifth item, and it is the matter of the concern for environment.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am truly surprised why there is not at least an acknowledgement of that fact that this budget embraces all of those four or five main features. That is why my colleague in Health got the additional money. That is why my colleague in Family Services got the additional money, or the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), and the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). I speak, and I was to address, for a little while, from one of those departments that understands only all too well, because I had to participate in the prioritization of funding to make that possible.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me assure you that with all the concern that I have for the services that my department is called upon to deliver, there is absolutely no question of the wholehearted support of all Treasury bench members for the direction, the

purpose, the objectives set by this government as represented by this budget. So what we are talking about then surely is a question about how to achieve certain ends. We have said so, and that should not surprise any Manitobans, that we believe in living within our means. We believe in spending within the limits of our capabilities.

Our friends opposite, they have another course which regrettably Manitobans are all too painfully aware of where that has led us and we have repeatedly, repeatedly, said so. I will repeat some of that during the course of my few comments, but surely there cannot be any argument that this budget reflects that main central theme that I believe Canadians, Manitobans, have all expressed to politicians of all parties that we prioritize health care, that we prioritize the social services.

Madam Deputy Speaker, maybe it is because we do funny things with words. You see, in my understanding of the word "priority" is that you have to make the choice, you have to make the choice as to which is more important. That is how you raise, that is how you make something more important and something a little less important, because you have to make that choice. If you are going to say everything is equally important and just add more money on top of it, then you have not prioritized anything. You have just added, and in this case, put the people of Manitoba further into debt, but you have not prioritized. So let us understand what the word "prioritizing" means.

That is what our First Minister (Mr. Filmon), that is what our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that is what Treasury Board has asked all departments of government to do. The fact that perhaps some departments have been asked to prioritize a little harder than others, we will become aware as we go through the Estimate process, but that is what it is all about. We believe, with sincerity, that is the right course for Manitoba.

Now, I had kind of, I guess naively, believed that perhaps some of the history that is unfolding around us, around the world, would have brought our New Democratic Party friends closer to at least the acknowledgement or persuasion that indeed it is the private sector that generates the wealth, but you know—Mr. Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) maybe you missed it. I do want to read back to you—and I want to tell you, she is going to become my favourite member here, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), because she put a dandy

on the record. In case you missed it, Minister of Finance, I want to read it. I want to first of all say this is all one sentence, and this is what is causing the deficit.

It is: "The tight money, monetaristic, Reaganomics, right-wing Conservative, dead hand of Adam Smith, supply-side, social-Darwinistic, financial, fiscal and monetary policies followed by Conservative governments throughout the developed world has led to this problem we are in," Now that is a dandy. I say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), there is hope, we will have some of those old debates of yesteryear. There is hope, there is hope.

* (2120)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I put that on the record simply to say that, okay, that is a legitimate debate, a legitimate philosophical difference between the other side, the official opposition, and this government. We have said no to higher taxes, we have said that it is critical, because we believe it is the private sector that will fuel the necessary wealth to provide those goods and services that people of Manitoba expect us to do, that we have to follow this course.

To do that, Madam Deputy Speaker, we were all asked, each minister, and we will continue to be asked, to seriously look at what our departments are doing. Is it necessary what they are doing in the first place? Can it be done in a different way? Can it be done by some other organization?

Certainly, as it affects my department, it is my belief that I will have no difficulty in providing the level of services and in fact in many instances enhance the kind of services and at the same time be able to contribute to the maintenance of the priorities established by this government as enunciated in this budget, which helped make it possible along with other departments and along with the prudent financial management of what members opposite call the rainy-day fund, despite the static level of our revenues, despite the difficult financial times we are in, to maintain the trust with the people of Manitoba that this government would place health care, would place family services, would place education on its list of priorities.

We have had to do different things and I will not go into great detail at this time, but allow me just to mention a few, as by way of an example. I invite critics of the department, when we have the

opportunity to examine the department's Estimates, to go into greater detail.

The Manitoba Government Employees' Association has had fun in suggesting that because some fiscal responsibility and restraint is going to be exercised, all kinds of services are going to be lost to Manitoba. I refer to the ones that they use in the television ads, newspaper ads, that refer to my department. Parks are going to be abandoned.

Madam Deputy Speaker, no parks are going to be abandoned, but if we find an opportunity to operate a campground more effectively, more profitably quite frankly, in some other person's hand and still provide those services, that will be done.

I do not know how many skiers there are in the Legislative Assembly, on the other side, but I know that we have some. My department of Parks has for years operated a ski hill at Spring Hill. We also always lost money in operating that ski hill, except for last year, when two energetic entrepreneurial Manitobans, who were world-class skiers themselves, I might say, took on that responsibility, and my understanding is virtually doubled the skiing opportunities at that facility. We assisted them with helping to dress up the hill a little bit with some forestry plantations, but the important thing is that that facility, which was costing us \$3 for every dollar we took in revenue now is not contributing to the operating costs of my department, in fact at the same time providing greater skiing opportunities for residents within the city of Winnipeg.

Honourable members will recall two years ago, when I first stepped into the ministry, there was some concern expressed about a campsite like Norquay Park camping grounds on the Trans-Canada Highway. People at Portage la Prairie were concerned, the mayor was concerned, the town was concerned. I can report to honourable members of the House that camping facility was bid out, put out on tender. A resident from the Poplar Point area, a widow lady with two grown sons, bid on the project and she is operating the park better than we operated it at Parks, so the service continues.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have not had too many opportunities to raise the question that has caused some interest with respect to the proposals and plans for Oak Hammock Marsh, but I want to tell you the fact that money was going to be scarce was not just sprung upon us a week or two before this

budget. I was aware upon taking on the ministry that I would not find within the priorities of my own departmental spending, never mind that of government's, the three or four millions of dollars to build the kind of facility at Oak Hammock, with or without Ducks Unlimited involvement, that the 80,000, 90,000 visitors who are coming now to the marsh require.

It was the opportunity, quite frankly, of offloading in this instance to the private sector that responsibility and that is what initially and to this day makes me such a strong supporter for that project. The issue of the environment is not the issue and it never really has been.

Even my strongest opponents to the scheme have backed away from the question of environmental damage to the marsh, damage to the wildlife. There is no credible wildlife biologist who supports that claim.

Allow me to quote from a particular letter that says it best, who while in violent opposition to the project as a partnership with Ducks Unlimited acknowledges that a major conservation centre such as one being proposed would be appropriate, but it should be retained by government. They even go on to say that it would be appropriate that perhaps we could lease out the operations to an organization such as Ducks Unlimited.

Madam Deputy Speaker, they have not been listening to what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has been saying, they have not understood the reality of times. The truth of the matter is I do not have the \$3 million or \$4 million to build that facility, and if I did, or if this government had it, they would not be directed to that source. They would have been directed to another source. That again is an example though, rather than just fold up your tent and not do anything, we will end up with a world-class first-rate facility to continue the ever-increasing need for interpretive and educational wildlife services at little or no expense to the government.

In fact the agreement calls that the \$170,000 to \$200,000 that the taxpayers of Manitoba now pay to provide that service at Oak Hammock, within five years, we are shed of that responsibility because it is believed that the facility (a) will be self-sustaining, but even if it is not, the responsibility will be that of Ducks Unlimited Canada.

So that and many other ways are ways that my department is coping with the financial restraints that have been posed to us.

In the same tone, our signing of the agreement that enters our government into partnership with the North American Waterfowl Management program is one of the more exciting programs in my department. Again, it manages to lever, with relatively few Manitoba dollars, substantial dollars for wildlife improvement throughout the province of Manitoba.

Those were the directions that our Premier (Mr. Filmon) gave us, that our Treasury Board insisted upon that we examine and what they meant by saying, is it necessary that we do it the way we have done it in the past, or are there not other ways of doing it? Is the service required in the first place? We will continue to be asked those questions, as we ought to be, in terms of how to spend the taxpayers' dollars in the best possible manner, keeping in mind the overall priorities of this government.

* (2130)

You know, I am only so happy that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did not have to impose or deal with in this budget some of the extra costs that I have seen too many legislators and too many Ministers of Finance having to deal with. I say this in context from the repeated cry from the opposition benches that says, time for the government to be proactive, time to create jobs, any kind of jobs. You hear that from the Liberal benches and you hear that from the New Democratic Party benches.

I think the Minister of Finance indicated, it was only a couple of weeks ago, I believe, that we wrote off millions of dollars—I am looking to the Minister of Finance for some help. I do not know whether it was \$120 million or \$150 million, venture capital write-offs of the last job creation venture by the New Democrats. I sat in this House, as did some of the other members who have to approve in their budgets millions of dollars of deficits of government operations.

While the New Democrats could not find more than 2 percent to give to their nurses, they at the same time, on all too many occasions, were quite prepared to subsidize the transit riders in Chicago and Boston. How did they do that? Because we used to own a bus company. The only trouble was we could not sell any buses unless we were

prepared to put \$40,000, \$80,000, \$90,000 of government, Manitoba taxpayers' money into them.

Thank God that we are no longer in the forestry business because those deficits that Ministers of Finance, this House had to cover numbered into the \$18 million, the \$20 million, the \$30 million, the \$31 million to the \$30-millions in any given year. Yet we are being asked constantly to pour money in.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that we have an energetic Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), but I doubt whether he has had time to go into all the hidden corridors of his department and to find out about a matter that lurks deep within the bowels of his department.

I appreciate, Madam Deputy Speaker, that it is against the rules to have any exhibit while you are speaking. I note that my Premier got called to order for that when he exhibited a T-shirt here not so long ago, but you understand that I still occasionally indulge in the habit of tobacco, so holding of this little match could hardly be called an exhibit. I say this as much for our new members and for all members because history does fade. It is hard to believe that this little matchbox is the only tangible remaining evidence of 52 million of Manitoba's tax dollars, hard-earned tax dollars. That is a job creation of the New Democratic Party government.

An Honourable Member: A box of matches.

Mr. Enns: Well, there was a bit more because if the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism goes deeper into the recess, he will stumble over—there may still be a couple of boxes with a couple of thousand of these matches, but if he goes a little deeper, he will find some attractive uniforms.

You know, in those days, Madam Deputy Speaker, they were called stewardesses' uniforms. Now I know that we have a more gender-neutral term; we call them flight attendants today, I think. We also had in the same colour motif, the blue and gold stewardesses' uniforms made, because you understand that government was going to create these jobs. You see, they started building airplanes at Gimli. I know it sounds like a fairy tale. They started building airplanes at Gimli, and they actually built a few. It has never been fully determined whether they could fly, but they did find out fairly early that nobody wanted to buy them. That was for certain then, and I wish the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) was present, because he can attest to the fact that every word that I say is the

truth. I know that in earlier reincarnations I have been known to sometimes exaggerate, but he sat around the cabinet table when he approved it.

So they had this problem, they had 350 people building these airplanes that nobody wanted to buy. Then, I think, it was largely at the member for Brandon East's (Mr. Leonard Evans) urging; he said, let us start an airline company. So they hired commercial artists who got them a fancy logo, and that is expensive in itself. They printed the matches. In the back they set up offices, because they had phone numbers. The flight plan was going to go to Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin, Yorkton—everybody wants to go to Yorkton—Saskatoon. Then, of course, we had to get the stewardesses' uniforms all ready, and that was going to be the last contribution.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, it really is not a funny story, because among the debt load, along with the debts of previous failed attempts, along with the piled-up costs of deficits of other misadventures, that is the debt load that we are currently paying the \$500 million-plus interest charges that make it difficult to do some of the things that all members want us to do. -(interjection)- Fifty-two million.

Madam Deputy Speaker, surely we do not have to, as we can and I will in a moment, go all around the world to get some appreciation, to get some understanding that governments do not create lasting jobs, governments do not create wealth. We have enough examples right here in the province of Manitoba. We can go across the nation and it is the same. It is not always all at the hands of a New Democratic Party government. Conservative governments and Liberal governments have played the same game with the same result. One of the best things that Prime Minister Mulroney did was sell Canadair which in one year cost Canadian taxpayers a billion dollars in tax subsidies.

So I suppose I am disappointed that at least we have not managed to kind of shift the argument a little bit, but when I hear the kind of statements made from the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), or from the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) who talks about the concerns about market-driven economy, is nobody listening or watching what is happening in our world?

I say this in a very modest way, but I do, among my private hobbies, enjoy history perhaps more than anything else. I make this prediction that may

be read 400 years from now, because it will be that long, but it is my prediction that, when historians will look at the 20th Century, the 20th Century will be noted for one particularly singular outstanding thing. Many things have happened in the 20th Century. People will think, of course, of the horrendous wars that we have had. They will think perhaps of even a country like Canada talking itself out of existence but, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is my contention that none of them will be remembered by future historians.

* (2140)

The reason that the 20th Century will be remembered and will be noted in the future is the rise and fall of an idea of a form of socialism, Marxism, Leninism, communism and its sincere embrace by millions of people around this globe, and I quite frankly did not think I would be standing, certainly in this Legislature, to witness its crumbling fall.

I have empathy for Mr. Gorbachev as he travels around the world pleading for help, as he did just last week in Tokyo.

The fact is that we have headlines: Widespread famine feared over Soviet farm chaos. Madam Deputy Speaker, that great big and beautiful country, bigger than ours, richer than ours, not beset by any wars in the last 40, 50 years—they certainly suffered terribly in the Second World War, but so did other countries—what is bringing on this chaos is a political system that is bankrupt, and I can understand intellectually why some are having so much difficulty in accepting that.

I could respect some honourable members whom I have sat with in this House who profess to that faith, and I refer particularly to a former Attorney General of the New Democratic Party government who stood in this Chamber, right beside the honourable Minister of Finance, who was an identified communist, ran for the Communist Party in federal politics. I know that.

I always remember that, because my sister voted for him. My sister thought, well, she felt comfortable with the name Penner. It had an ethnic identification with my group.

I gave him the opportunity when he presented himself in this Chamber as a New Democrat, as a senior New Democratic minister, I simply asked him, you know, in a similar debate, throne speech debate I believe it was, when it was and at what time on the

road to Damascus did he make his conversion from communism to the New Democrats because, Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not make the mistake, I do not equate the two as being the same. I am well aware that the social democrats are often the first victims of communist oppression in many instances where they are faced.

Some people have the mistaken belief, perhaps even some in this House, that Lenin and the communists had something to do with the overthrow of the autocratic, despotic, czarist regime of Russia, which of course is not true. What Lenin and the communists did was much the same as what Pinochet did in Chile. They pulled off a coup d'état on the fledgling social democratic government of Mr. Kerenski. That is what they did. The czar had abdicated in February, we had a provisional government in Russia under Mr. Kerenski, the only six months of a form of social democracy in Russia. That is what the Marxists, the Bolsheviks and Lenin overthrew in the October Revolution.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I could have a great deal more respect for Mr. Penner today if at some point today, in light of the history of today, he could bring himself intellectually to bear to say that the politics that I was taught at his father's knee—and my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) used to keep that quote in his House book—the communist policies that he taught and that he never saw a reason to renounce were in fact wrong.

I would have more respect for another member who sat with the New Democrats, Professor Cy Gonick, who is teaching economics to our students, and I do not wonder why our students are having so much difficulty understanding basic economics, because he left the New Democrats because Ed Schreyer was not left enough for them. That is the only reason he left, but that form of socialism is collapsing around the countries where they have practised it unhindered for 40, 50, 60 and 70 years, and we still find adherents here in this Chamber.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would have thought that it might have been a little difficult for the New Democrats, whose solution to everything is more government involvement. Too many of the new members do not realize all the things that they were involved. I mean, we were into Chinese food. We were into doors and windows. We were into canning beans at Morden. We were into, as I already said, building airplanes. We were doing all those things, and we lost money on all of them, on

every last one of them. We have not gotten any fresh ideas from honourable members opposite.

Madam Deputy Speaker, earlier this evening, before the supper hour adjournment, my colleague the Minister of Health was absolutely right. The advice that the New Democrats are operating under is, they simply have to hunker down and do nothing. They can occasionally come out with the cliché-worn programs of our socialist friends, and they will automatically inherit the mantle of government, because they will think we will have done too many things wrong.

The only trouble with that is, history is moving on, and it is not the same as it was in the '70s, not in the '80s. This is now the '90s, and around the world, what are countries trying to do? They are trying to introduce market-driven economies. They are doing it in Romania. They are doing it in Czechoslovakia. They are doing it in Mother Russia. They just have not quite figured out how, and it will take a long time. Our friends opposite have blinkered vision to that. Their response to everything is, more money, create instant jobs, buy some more matchboxes at \$50 million a pop.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not want to for one moment make light of the fact that running a department like Natural Resources or indeed any other department of this government is going to be particularly easy as we go through a period of virtually no growth. There are some things that are equally applied to all politicians. We all like to spend money. If you have it and if you are really honest—and no more show as parents for our children if we can afford a generous Christmas or a vacation or a holiday or something. We are by nature gregarious and generous people. Well, there are some exceptions, but, you know, that is the nature of us.

So it is more difficult to be that friendly politician, that friendly MLA in your constituency during a period of fiscal restraint, but, Madam Deputy Speaker, there is one thing that I can say without hesitation that I have seldom seen or worked with a caucus and cabinet that is as resolved and united in the opinion as to what needs to be done. We will have differences, as you would expect in any grouping of men and women, about how to tackle a certain subject from time to time, but there is no difference of opinion with respect to the correctness of the course that we are on. There is no difference of opinion with respect to the need to support this

budget. There is no difference of opinion with the absolute belief that the course that we are on spells the best possible opportunity for recovery.

* (2150)

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are no certain things in life, or in politics, and we may well be beset with other difficulties yet unannounced. We cannot foretell what serious readjustments may have to be made if in fact this country that we love and call our home is considerably altered over the next two or three years, perhaps in the lifetime of this government. There will have to be a willingness to take on all kinds of responsibilities that we perhaps cannot even conceptualize at this point in time, but that is not how you try to formulate effective policy. You take the given situation as it is, and you chart the best course that will steer you through these troubled times.

Honourable members opposite can wail about free trade, they can wail about trying to hold on an industry here and there, but, again, surely nobody can dispute the globalization of our economies. Nobody can dispute the fact that we have a choice. We can build tariff walls around this country, we can shrink our economy by at least a third because our standard of living is at least a third if not more sustained because of our ability to export.

So if we want to shrink and build walls around us, we can take a holiday trip to Fidel Castro's beautiful island, and see what that does. We can ignore foreign debt, and that is what Mr. Castro did, and see what that does; but if we want to have some semblance and if we want to be participants in what could in fact be a tremendous decade of opportunity in our growth, where we match technology with capital and at the same time we match progressive legislation and humanitarian concerns with all that man can do, then we need not be afraid. We need not be afraid of the future.

The one thing I can tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that to slide hopelessly into debt only encourages us to track those kinds of nations that in fact have done that. The picture is not pretty.

An Honourable Member: Not pretty at all.

Mr. Enns: Not pretty at all. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Madam Deputy Speaker, it is really a hard act to follow the member for Lakeside. During the past three years

I think that one of the best speeches he has given, and I always take the opportunity to hear him personally. I think we have all learned from his personal experience and his wisdom.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I will go into the specific things for the budget tomorrow. I want to touch a very sentimental and very unique perspective of the budget. There are two important things for any human being in any country, and those are his homeland and economy. Right now in this country we are worried about both things.

It is really a sad situation, because you have people from all over the world who had a different image of Canada, and the image was that two things would never be a problem in this country, the basic freedom, homeland, and the economy. Both of those things are in real danger.

Why they are in real danger is because of the faults of the various successive governments. Various governments have lived not within their means. They have promised and promised and now we are left with a big mess. That big mess has to be solved by someone. I think the responsible action must come from the governments of the day.

Without any political background of any specific party, I think all the governments in this country are trying to follow that course. It is a hard act to follow, because there has been such a massive buildup of debt. The hopes are so low, and we do not see any major economic developments. People are extremely worried that they have no future and the children will not have any future.

I want to tell you a story. The day the budget was presented I went to Seven Oaks Hospital. A person stopped me at the first door at the emergency entrance. She did not know me. She knew that I was a member of the Legislature, but not which party because she is not really tuned to any particular party.

She told me one thing. She said, I have lived in Manitoba more than 72 years and I have never seen such a sad mood all over the place. The people are very much concerned for the future of their children and grandchildren. She told me one thing. She said, Please, for God's sakes, when you people go there, tell the truth and nothing but the truth, because the era of 1980 is over. Only the real people will survive in politics and that includes all the particular parties. We have seen it in the 1990 election.

I think it was a very smart statement from a person who has 72 years of experience in Manitoba. She had experience from an economic background and very intelligent in terms of education. She gave me a very good message. That message is very prevalent in the Seven Oaks Hospital and other parts, because I could get a sample on the same day and see what the public opinion is, how the public would feel if you meet 100 people in a day. They are going to tell you how they are feeling.

There were two messages that were very clear. We would like to decrease the deficit, which is a very important message. How would you sleep at night if your own financial affairs were in a mess? I mean, how can you sleep at night if every year and year after that with a debt increasing and increasing because you are not doing good to anyone?

So if we are going to be honest with ourselves, why do we not be honest with the rest of the people? That is a message I think we all have to work very hard on, to make sure that we deal with the public money the way we would deal with our own money.

You know, it may be a laughable matter for some members, but it is a very important matter, because I do not think any one of the members in this House will deal with the financial affairs of Manitoba as have been dealt prior to 1988. It was a very sad story. To give an example, somebody has a \$20,000 income, you are not going to borrow \$40,000 every year to buy a new Mercedes, a new car you cannot afford. You know, you go to New York and have a dinner. You know the bank would love Eugene Kostyra. They would just say to him, come on, we want you here, and today we are all in a big mess.

I am not criticizing the present members, and they know it. The present party, did they not know it? They are very smart, but I think they must be honest with themselves, and if they are honest with themselves then they can be honest with the rest of us and the rest of society which is not listening to us, but they are not going to forgive any politician.

I think that is why, after last year's election, when we as a party suffered a serious setback, I personally thought what I would do as a professional, why I should do politics. I think now after hearing and after learning and after listening to my constituents who even did not vote for me, but they are telling me a single message, that we want honesty, and I think even as just one member, we

can contribute. I am not going to worry about the political future of a single person. What is going to happen, I think within this four years, if we can contribute positively, that is what we will do, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I think it is very important because, you know, what is happening, because we get schools all the time from all the constituencies and the students come, and for the last three years I always asked them, what is the most important question to you? The single thing is jobs. In Grades 6 or 7, you know, what is going to happen? My dad has a house for sale, my mother does not have a job, my brother is laid off. I mean, this is a major problem, and I think that message must come across. I think that is why it is important that we must be honest and jobs and economy and health. Everything is so much in a circle, we cannot ignore one aspect and go with another.

That is why I think a good economic recovery would solve a lot of the problems, but we must move gradually, but not ignore one section and just say

that we will only, as in this country it is very easy, because you just have to please 25 percent of the population to get into this House, because 30 percent of the people do not vote, so there are two parties—the other person is getting votes so you are basically working against the wishes of 70 percent of individuals to start with. I think you have to work for all the sections of the community. I think that is one aspect which was missing from the whole budget, and I will go into that detail—the economic growth. I am sure the minister's hands are tied in many ways. I mean that is not a secret, we are not stupid. We know it.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour being 10 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings according to the rules. When this motion is again before the House, the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) will have 33 minutes remaining.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, April 22, 1991

CONTENTS

Budget Debate

Orchard	1082
Reid	1088
Enns	1095
Cheema	1100