

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 12, 1989.

The House met at 8 p.m.

### BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to be able to rise in these Chambers and speak on this Budget. I can honestly say that it has never been so gratifying to me as it is this time.

I had the privilege of moving the Throne Speech and, due to my excitement of the occasion, I forgot to congratulate you as Speaker of the House, also the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Chornopyski), the Clerks and the legislative staff. They are always so friendly when we meet them and they give us a friendly smile. I think they are doing a great job.

I want to start off my remarks by, first of all, speaking about my constituency.- (Interjection)- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), I think he will have to try to contain himself during my speech. If not, I would wish that you would make a ruling on him.

The constituency of La Verendrye is very diversified. It has a strong agricultural base. It has a strong business climate. It has a very good labour force. It has considerable industry in the area. Naturally, we would like to see more industry in the area, like most of ours would. The agricultural sector is also very diversified, but I think that the constituency is richer for it.

As much as we are hoping that through the new Minister of regional development we will get a little more decentralization and also a little more industry to the constituency, I also am hoping that through his ministry we will be able to get some of the different subcommittee offices to the southeast so that they are not so dependent upon the urban centre of Winnipeg on all their services that are required.

Basically, I want to highlight some of the issues in the Budget. I found it rather interesting that our Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) for the first five days was undecided. I still think that some of their Members are still undecided, and I think that sort of motivated me that I should go over the Budget once more with them.

I realize that the New Democratic Party has indicated that they will support the Budget, and I must say in all fairness I really appreciated the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), his speech this afternoon. I think it was a good speech. It was a speech that he indicated they did not agree with all of it, they would like to see more in certain areas, but in general they could accept it and they could vote with it.

\* (2005)

Mr. Speaker, I think there are still a few Members on the Liberal side who feel very much the same way and so, for that reason, I feel motivated that I should

review parts of the Budget once more with them. Maybe after I am through with them, discussing this Budget once more, then maybe some of them will have seen the light and seen the responsibility that they have been elected to their constituency and the responsibility they have. Hopefully, with that, they will maybe change their mind and be able to vote with the Budget, and have the people of Manitoba appreciate them as their representatives.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have to be stewards of what has been entrusted to us. We have to show responsibility with that. I think the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) put it the other day very well, when he indicated that it was even through biblical times that when you had your good years you should fill the bins, so that when you had your years of drought and so forth that you could use those bins to carry you through in the leaner years. I think that was well taken, and I think that is maybe one area where we today disagree with the NDP philosophy. They would like to now naturally see us deplete all the funds that are available and that are going into this fund that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is going to be establishing after the Budget has been approved.

So first of all, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) in his wisdom has been able to cut the deficit by over 70 percent in two years. I cannot understand how anybody in his right mind can actually vote against that type of a cut. But, Mr. Speaker, if I could have your attention, I would wish that you would watch the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) a little more closely. I think you should.

I would like to actually mention to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) that seeing we know how he is going to vote, maybe he does not even have to spend his time in the House. But then again, who am I to judge where he spends his time?

Health and Education will receive a 7 percent increase. In a time when we see the Health fund—for instance, let us go through the Health budget: \$1.5 billion to fund Manitoba health care system, an increase of almost 100 million from last year, that is this increase alone; \$54 million more for Manitoba hospitals this year; \$13 million more for Personal Care; \$11 million more for Pharmacare. These are things that we, on this side of the House, are really grateful for that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has been able to come through with a Budget that will look after the health and welfare needs of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

I must indicate to you, I commute back and forth from Steinbach every day to this Legislature. In the morning before I leave, I usually stop in at one of the local restaurants. I have met literally hundreds and hundreds of people, and all they do is praise us for this Budget. They praise us for this Budget. Not one person has come to me and has said, you should have done this, you should have done that. You know what

they ask us, what they ask me? How in the world, in the short period of time that you have been in Government, have you been able to turn that whole thing around into a position where for once you could have a balanced Budget? They realize that. They know numbers. They know financial statements. They can read accounts, anybody can. Maybe not anybody, that is true enough. So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that is the response that I am getting from my constituents.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

\* (2010)

**Mr. Pankratz:** This Budget is putting \$857 million to support schools, post-secondary education and training programs to provide more opportunities for Manitobans, \$13 million more for Manitoba universities, \$13 million more for Manitoba universities, \$13 million more; \$37 million more for the private and secondary school system.

Private schools, that reminds me of the private schools. Why should private schools not get additional funding? Why does our Opposition talk against private schools getting funding? You know, you cannot have it both ways. You are going to vote against this Budget, so obviously you do not like that this money is going for private schools. Obviously, you do not like it or you would be able to vote in favour of this.

Mr. Speaker, Family Services, \$491 million for services to aid and protect Manitoba families, \$6 million more for day care services. There you have it, \$6 million more for day care services, \$1.5 million more for programs to help prevent wife abuse.

This is just something incredible with this Budget. I can see why the Opposition is scared that this is an election Budget. I can see why, because the longer people realize and see and study this—yes, I think this is a pamphlet like was questioned before, whether I had this in my pamphlet. I expect to send this out to my constituents, and I want to have them realize right from the start when they hear on the radio how the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) really is talking against—she will have to vote. First of all, she is undecided for six days. Now the Members are one at a time stating they maybe will and maybe will not, most of them I think.

I believe we have an opportunity here where we could see where the Province of Manitoba—(Interjection)—Here again there is quite a bit of interference, but I think we must realize that this Budget, just all in all, is something that is very difficult for the Opposition to object to, and I think that is why they are floundering.

Agriculture and rural development, the first thing that was asked of me after this Budget was how come agriculture got cut.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Yes.

**Mr. Pankratz:** See, the Member for Dauphin, yes. I would like to get his interpretation of agriculture. I wonder if he knows what agriculture means.

The fact remains that last year this Government put \$18 million into drought assistance, \$18 million in one program alone. Mr. Speaker, do you think that it is up to the Government to budget for disaster? This would be unreal. That is why our Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) in his wisdom saw the need to put up this fund. If there will be another disaster in agriculture or if there will be a disaster in some other, whatever it may be, then there is a fund where monies can be drawn from at that point in stage.

**An Honourable Member:** Flood assistance.

**Mr. Pankratz:** Flood assistance, the Member states flood assistance, a good possibility. If we will get more rain like this, it is possible.

I think this Budget addresses the needs of agriculture at the present, and I think that is all that Budget should do. Just in case hypothetically we would all of a sudden get an earthquake or anything of that nature, that is what it seems the Liberals would at the present—some of the Liberals, pardon me. I should not mention all the Liberals because I think some of them can see this Budget as a very good Budget. I think they will really have to do some soul-searching before they can find a ways and means to vote against this Budget. I think that is why it is very important that we once again try to draw it to their attention, this Budget, and hopefully when the vote is the day after tomorrow, when we will have an opportunity to vote on this Budget, that they will vote with us.

Mr. Speaker, Environment, a new department with a broadened mandate and a 10.6 percent funding increase reflects the importance of environmental protection. This is great. I think this is a new initiative on behalf of this Government. We are really supporting this and I hope that it will be beneficial to all people in the province. I know it will be because it is under a good ministry.

\* (2015)

Entrepreneurial support, 38 million for programs to encourage trade investment and the formation of new business enterprises, establishment of the Manitoba Business Starts Loan Guarantee Program to help women and rural residents form new businesses. Mr. Speaker, up to \$10,000 per new business, I think that is tremendous for a small business to start. Under the previous administration, one of the Members came to me and he said, do you know how to start a small business? I said, no, how do you start a small business? Just buy a big business and in a couple of years you are a small business.

I think we are very fortunate that we had a Member in the previous administration and actually, if it would be appropriate, I would like to dedicate a minute of silence in this House to him. The Honourable Member for St. Vital, Mr. Walding, who saw the light and in all fairness he was an NDP Member, but he saw where this province was heading to, in what direction. I think in all fairness we owe a lot of this, that we have been able to turn the province around, to Mr. Walding's foresight.

Then we have the Justice, 11 million extra to provide extended services, and to clear up backlog in the court system and the Land Titles Office. We have seen within the first eight or nine months we took office, that backlog was cleared up, and now the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) is working with the Land Titles Offices. He has done a lot of work with that and with the court system. All in all, I must say this is a tremendous Budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the NDP had a Member who brought down their Government. We had a Member who defected our Party. Actually the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) is a nice Member. I hope you people will treat him well. He is sensitive to certain issues and so forth, but in all fairness he is a good Member. I, personally, would wish that he would see the light and possibly come back to where he should be, where the people of Springfield have elected him to be, a Conservative in that riding, but that is naturally the decision he will have to make.

But on August 10, 1988 he stated, "I think that despite what we have heard from the media and other Members opposite"—at that time he was on this side of the House—"I happen to believe that this is a good Budget. It is not perfect. No Budget will ever be, but it is a very good Budget, worthy of our support." Then he goes on, "I would like to quote the Leader of the Opposition in a couple of comments she has made in regard to this Budget and in the election. During the election," I am quoting the Member for Springfield, "she said that she could not possibly promise to hold personal and corporate taxes at current rates, and now she wants them cut. The exact quote was: 'How can I bring down the debt and deficit of the province and commit to holding down taxes?' We did it." The Member for Springfield says, "True, there was—maybe some call it a windfall, there was a few extra dollars coming around—but had that money been in the hands of the previous Government, would they have done what we did? I doubt it very much."

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on and on and quote them.—(Interjection)- Well, I should maybe put a few more. The Honourable Highways Minister (Mr. Albert Driedger) indicates I should put a few more of these on the record. No one can change a Government's fiscal plans in a few months. Today he sits on the other side with the Opposition and he is speaking against this Budget, this was the '88 Budget on August 10, and now he speaks against this one. This one he cannot support, a Budget that I believe he will have a lot of difficulty with.

I am quoting him again. "I am afraid that it would have been squandered, but I ask, had the Liberal Party formed the Government, what would they have done?" This is quoting the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch). "What would they have done? Would they have done as we did or would they have done as some of the Members say, spend, spend?" Well, let me know because—(Interjection)- that is right. "Spend, spend." They indicated \$700 million more that they wanted to spend in their last year's Budget—\$700 million more. I am quoting the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch). "We do not know. We may never find out. We are not sure . . . That is one thing that is important to

remember, that the Government has no money. It is the people's money. We are here entrusted, whether in Government or in Opposition, to do what is best for the people of Manitoba." I am quoting him. I think that is a very valid statement that he indicated, that this has been entrusted to us as elected people. I think that is very important that what we do here in this House that we are good stewards of the finances, the taxes that are imposed through our legislation and that we are good stewards of this that has been entrusted to us.

\* (2020)

I have to go back again to this Budget, that this is something that we can just be so proud of. I think we are showing to the people in the Province of Manitoba that we are good stewards. We are giving back personal taxes of 2 percent, plus we have the child care from \$50 to \$250 per child. Now, what have we added in taxes?—(Interjection)- Yes, as of September 5, 1989, 1 cent per litre.

**An Honourable Member:** Terrible.

**Mr. Pankratz:** Well, I agree with you. Personally, I would have wished that we would not have had to do that, but I am so pleased that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) also has stated that this is going to go for road improvements. We have not seen road improvements in the southern part of the province. Yes, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), there were road improvements.—(Interjection)- Yes, you are right, the Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), he has, right to his cabin—(Interjection)- somebody is stating. I would not doubt it. I have not been up there but they tell me those roads are beautiful in the Dauphin area.

I am happy to see that the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness), as much as I would not like to see the 1 cent per litre but I am happy to see that this is directed specifically to roads, roads that southern Manitoba so desperately need. I must also indicate that since this last year now we have got the new Highways Minister (Mr. Albert Driedger), there was virtually no road building in our constituency. Thanks to the Member for Emerson (Mr. Driedger), I am very pleased with the Member for Emerson that in my constituency, as in quite a few others, there is a lot of progress being made.

Mr. Speaker, the other tax that will be increased is on the cigarettes. I want to read to you from Hansard from Monday, 29th February, 1988, where the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) states, "I do give the Minister credit for the cigarette tax. As far as I am concerned, I would ban them forever from the face of the earth, but in terms of revenue it is a reasonable incentive for people to give up smoking and I congratulate him on that."

So, Mr. Speaker, once again there is no reason to oppose this Budget on that increase. I am just beginning to wonder when these Members will actually analyze and see on what basis they shall defend their vote, that I think some of them Wednesday will come around and possibly support the Budget.

I must say again, I am happy to see the NDP can live with it, and who I would think would be the first

ones who should not be able to see eye-to-eye with us on this Budget. I am pleased they are seeing they can live with this Budget, and are prepared to accept it and vote in favour of it. I think rightly so, if it is like the Leader of the Liberal Party states, that each Member will be able to vote on their own, that she is not going to dictate like she tries to do in this House, like she is not trying to run the show. Once the Members will be able to realize they can vote on their own, that they are elected for their constituents, I think then they will realize this is a good Budget and they will vote with it.

\* (2025)

I think we all realize the last week has sort of been devastating for the Liberal Party, with some of the comments that were in the Free Press and the papers. I do not know whether I should go into detail.

**An Honourable Member:** Go into a lot of detail.

**Mr. Pankratz:** Some of the Members in this House would like me to read some of these excerpts from the papers. I will just refer to some of them. I will not read all of it. My time would not permit me to.

“Liberal attack on the Tories backfired with a vengeance yesterday when federal officials said it is impossible for Manitoba to get tax break benefits six months earlier than announced in the Budget Monday.” I am prepared to table all of these clippings I have before me, so that the Members of the Opposition Party could read them. Maybe they do not get the papers. Maybe they do not know what it states in some of these because it indicates, and I think you should well remember that, to bring forward that type of a structure, you have to first know that you can pass a Budget. In this case, with a minority position like we are in, we have to negotiate with other Members. This is why we are actually pleading with you tonight as well.

**An Honourable Member:** Income tax cuts.

**Mr. Pankratz:** That is right. There is another point I would like to make. The Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) in his Budget Address also indicated the interest that this province is paying, \$1.6 million a day, \$1.6 million a day. I think we are fortunate we are not the people who created it but I think in all fairness, because we are elected, we have to be responsible for it. I think the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness), Members of Cabinet, I think they showed responsibility. I think they showed very good leadership. In my constituency and as I indicated before, in the restaurants and the people I have talked to, phone calls I have received, everybody is just pleased with this Budget. I think in all fairness I would wish the Members opposite would—

**An Honourable Member:** Come to their senses.

**Mr. Pankratz:** Come to their senses, yes, I must agree, come to their senses.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, William Chornopyski, in the Chair.)

In closing, I just want to go to Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition). On June 12, Sharon Carstairs must start thinking before she talks. I think this was done by Fred Cleverley, and I have always appreciated his comments. It states here in his comments that “the society for the preservation of Official Opposition status for Manitoba Liberals humbly offers some advice. If the Liberals are not going to sink into their place, raising again the spectrum of NDP rule, then the Party and particularly Sharon are going to have to pull up their socks. For starters, Sharon is going to have to become a bit more consistent.”

**An Honourable Member:** That is impossible. Her inconsistency is consistency.

**Mr. Pankratz:** It said consistent. The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) was just making a comment from his seat. What were you referring to? I think he was conceited eh, is that right? Arrogant, what did you use? I think you gave a pretty good explanation of that in your speech. It was a very good speech, and I hope to reread your speech a couple of times. I think it was a very good speech, Member for Churchill. I possibly will use parts of it.

\* (2030)

Then I want to go to one other point, and that is Friday, May 19, 1989, point of order. The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) jumped up and I can just see how she jumped out of her chair, point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker says what is your point of order? Mrs. Carstairs: “This particular Member in his usual disgraceful fashion”—this is the Leader of the Opposition speaking—“is making comments for which there is absolutely no basis in fact. He and he alone has played partisan politics on the issues of Portage la Prairie from the very, very beginning while clothing himself in political rhetoric, and I demand an apology.”

I think a Member who was elected in '86 when I did, when she would tell me from her chair that she wanted to only be in Opposition and be critical of the Government Party only if it was factual, she was not going to be opposing anything on the basis of just because she was in Opposition. I think everybody in this House realizes that the only—she feels that being in Opposition she has to be critical and oppose everything that the Government of the Day does, even when the Government comes down with a Budget that we have not seen like this in a decade.

The Members of the Liberal Party, if they will review the Budget closely, I think in all fairness the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is prepared to spend additional time with them if they need it to explain certain issues on it to them. I think then they will realize that this is a good Budget for the Province of Manitoba, and then they will vote with us.

With that, I want to thank you for bearing with me and for me having this opportunity to speak in this House on this very good Budget. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) has the floor.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity once again this evening to speak to the Budget. It certainly is one that I have a great deal of mixed feelings about, some good points about it certainly, but some very difficult areas that I find very difficult to support.

I can tell you I am very pleased to see our election commitment implemented by this Conservative Government with regard to tax breaks for families. It is something that we campaigned for just over a year ago, once we realized there would be additional revenues coming from the federal Government. At that time, we realized when we were making that commitment there were additional revenues coming from the federal Government that were being made available to the province, something that the Member for Morris, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), has acknowledged rather grudgingly, that it was not his good management—

**An Honourable Member:** He put it right in print in his Budget Speech, pal.

**Mr. Plohman:** Just printed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just barely printed. Of course he did not acknowledge to the extent he should have the contributions made by one Eugene Kostyra, the former Minister of Finance.

What he forgot to mention with any forthrightness and strong statements was that the reason he is feeling so smug in his chair here tonight, and why he has been feeling rather comfortable in his shoes was that the former Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Finance in the previous Government, made this all possible. I would like to see the Member for Morris, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) stand up once in a while and say thank you, Eugene. I think he should be saying that much more frequently because he put you there.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please; order, please.

**Mr. Plohman:** Well, he has lots of people to thank. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) mentions, thank you, Jim Walding. Of course, he has a number of people to thank, but certainly one of the people who made it possible—and you know this bunch over here, these Conservatives, said there was gross mismanagement across this province during the election. That was not true but they knew it played well. We had the Conservative media and the Liberal media, we had the Conservatives and then we had the Liberals joining in because it sounded good too. The Conservatives knew better but the Liberals joined right in harmonizing beautifully with the Tories on that, because of course it sounded good and they thought the people would go for it. Well, Jim Walding was right. They did.

Now what the Member for Morris and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has failed to mention and highlight is that is precisely the reason why he has been able to come forward with the kind of Budget that he has at this time. Now there are a lot of shortcomings but, as I indicated, the cuts for families in taxes was

a very important aspect of this Budget. Unfortunately, the Minister of Finance was not completely honest last year. Well, he was always honest but he chose different ways of presenting his figures. Rather than showing a \$48 million surplus last year that was the legacy left by that NDP Government in fact for 1988-89, he instead showed a \$152 million deficit which he could have shown because of that \$200 million.

In fact, is it not ironic that it was a New Democratic Government, and this is interesting for the Liberals to hear because I believe they really did not know that the New Democrats were good managers. They believed they were not, just like the Conservatives said. They believed the Conservative rhetoric. I heard the Liberals speaking the first year here. Time after time, they spoke in a very conceited fashion as if those New Democrats did not know what they were doing.

The fact is it is shown in only one short year and a couple of months after the election that we knew exactly what we were doing. The only thing is there is one fellow who is off in Victoria who was not going along with that at that particular time for various reasons. The fact is this New Democratic Government knew precisely what it was doing and that is why the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is sitting so comfortably in his chair right now, albeit with a minority Government, which makes it not so comfortable sometimes. He definitely has to weigh that from time to time, and he did when he brought this Budget down.

He pulled out the paper that was prepared by the staff in the Finance Department for Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition) just over a year ago. He said, hey, that looks pretty good, I can live with that. He put it in the Budget and there it was, \$61 million which is 58 plus inflation. He has the same program here almost to a "t" that the New Democratic Leader brought forward. I wish he would tell the people of Manitoba that over and over again. Thank Eugene Kostyra. He can thank Jim Walding, but thank you, Eugene Kostyra. Thank the fact that he had the good fortune to walk into a windfall of federal revenues, and then thank Gary Doer for bringing forward such a good program that he implemented in this Budget. That is all he has to do. It takes a little bit of humility, and he can do that if he really tries. It is difficult I know when he is sitting with a surplus Budget. It is difficult to have humility, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but even the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) could find it.

Now, is it not humorous to see the Liberals say that they thought of it. We heard the facts tonight about where this came from, right? They were just spoken in this House, but the Conservatives say, well, we kind of felt maybe the families should have a break for a change. But they got the idea from Gary Doer and the New Democrats. Is it not interesting that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) suddenly discovered in the comments—you could see right after the Budget—that she is the one who brought forward and put the pressure on this Government to bring in the tax breaks for families? You never heard hide nor hair of it.

\* (2040)

**An Honourable Member:** Who?

**Mr. Plohman:** The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), the Official Opposition if you want to call her that. The fact is, the real Leader of the Opposition, the real Opposition Leader, is the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). We have the Liberal Leader who now says, yeah, we were in favour of cuts for families too. Is that not humorous? Is that not outrageous? She is the one who went around saying that she was going to give breaks by cutting out \$200 million of taxes for corporations by removing completely the payroll tax. Then she was going to phase it in over a period of three years but then she said, I do not know what three years.

We could see the indecision that was there during the election by the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs). Now it has come out again in this House, this indecision with regard to the Budget. She was rather positive about taking credit for the tax cuts for families. I do not think there were too many Manitobans who believed her on that. I do not know if there were very many at all. As a matter of fact, I think she has lost all her credibility, if she had any, when she came into this House after the last election campaign.

More and more people are realizing that the Leader of the Liberal Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in this province will try to change courses, depending on where the wind is blowing. She does not stand by any principles or by any set policy. Then she came out -(Interjection)- well, you know it is interesting that I heard these rumours that I was going to join the Liberals and then I thought to myself, well, would that not be ironic, would that not be ironic, would that not be ironic? -(Interjection)- The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) said he turned me down. He should try saying something credible in this House. Even the Government Members do not believe him.

The fact is I thought it would be terrible that the president of the Liberal Party would lose out in his battle for the nomination in Dauphin in the next election if I were to do that. Now I thought that would be awful, so I decided, after wavering to stay back, to stay with the New Democrats, to stay in my real home and at the same time when the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) came forward by flip-flopping all over and not knowing how she was going to vote, it cinched it for me. I felt there is no way that I could ever, ever - (Interjection)- Oh, was I? It was really something else. But like I say, I could not bear to do that to the president of the Liberal Party just when he had everything going for him.

I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that insofar as the taxation benefits for families, I can support this Budget.-(Interjection)- Well, I want to tell you that the Liberals had put their star way up in the sky. They thought that there were tremendous opportunities there and I did not want to deflate that just at this particular time. I told the Members that I just could not go through with it. I am saying this all to the Deputy Speaker with tongue-in-cheek, just so he realizes that as far as the record is concerned some of this is just wavering a little bit from what the actual story was on this one. I

did hear these rumours. I want to tell you that after the flip-flopping on the Budget, I just could not see my way through it.

Now I want to talk more about the income tax benefits here and the corporate taxation. I note that the income tax changes here, projected by the Budget, show that there will be a decline by a fraction of 1 percent. Roughly \$2 million for personal income tax is projected. Revenue from corporate income taxes is expected to decline by 20 percent, or \$45 million. Of the total income tax collected in Manitoba from corporations, it is only 16 percent of the total income taxes that are collected, only 16 percent. I wonder whether families in Manitoba would appreciate that kind of a share insofar as these large corporations getting tax benefits such as that, whereas the families are footing the bill for the majority of it. I have to tell the Conservatives that is an area that at some point they are going to have to face.

Now, he also removed some rather important taxes he feels with regard to the corporate tax, the 1 percent reduction in the corporate tax, he said, the bank tax. I think this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) should consider this very carefully. He used an excuse that somehow federal tax reform would be the reason for him coming forward with some movement on the capital tax. He said that may be appropriate. He said he was interested in our views.

Well, I have to tell him that these same banks that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is feeling sorry for as a result of changes in the federal taxation policies are the same ones that have profits of nearly \$2 billion in the first half of 1989, nearly \$2 billion. Their profits are up over 50 percent over the previous year, and I fail to see how he can justify this kind of a change in taxation for these corporations when they are generating those huge profits at this time. I really cannot understand how any political Party could support that kind of rationale on the part of this Government, except perhaps the Liberals. They would be willing to let the banks off the hook as well.

If we look at the unemployment factors, again I have a great deal of difficulty with the way this Government is operating. Now we are the fourth lowest in the country insofar as unemployment is concerned. We used to be the lowest or second lowest in this country. Winnipeg is high enough. The rates have been very high, for a short time close to St. John's, Newfoundland, but that has been said in this House several times because it is worrisome.

But the fact is that in rural areas this Government is not objecting to the movement of people out of our rural areas, hastening the decline of our rural communities and our rural families because that is exactly what is happening with federal Government policies at the present time. But we do not see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, any loud protest by this Government, this Conservative Government in this province, to the changes in the UIC, for example, unemployment insurance which has resulted in people being paid to relocate out of our rural and northern communities to areas of lower unemployment like Toronto, where the unemployment rates are low.

That is the kind of changes that the Conservative Government in Ottawa is putting in and not protested

by this provincial Government that sees people moving out of the rural areas, hastening the decline rather than creating jobs. I think the Minister responsible for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) has a tremendous challenge on his hands if he wants to seriously make an impact and reverse this trend which is becoming alarmingly difficult in the last number of years, particularly under the Conservative Government in Ottawa because of their policies of profits only for Crown corporations, the bottom-line profits, on CN layoffs and VIA cuts—well, VIA cuts made by former Liberal Governments, that is true, deregulation policies introduced first by Lloyd Axworthy and the Liberal Government of Pierre Trudeau.

We also see the rail line abandonment policies, the privatization and closure of post offices. All of these policies are hastening the decline of our rural areas and they do not have another policy in place to overcome that. That greatly disturbs me, particularly in light of the fact of this Budget. Rural economic development has been cut by 7.5 percent in this Budget, 7.5 percent under rural economic development. It is interesting to hear the Minister responsible for rural economic development (Mr. Penner), which is the department which provides funding to regional development corporations, is down from \$1,264,100 to \$1,169,400 which works out to a 7.5 percent decrease when they have formed a Rural Development Department. What can the Premier (Mr. Filmon) say about that when he has a Minister responsible for rural economic development and he cuts the funding for rural economic development? What a charade, smoke and mirrors. I wonder whether that is going to be able to pass the people's scrutiny.

Tourism marketing, so essential for the Parklands region of this province and many other areas, is down by 8 percent—tourism marketing. How can they justify that when so many rural areas will suffer and northern areas will suffer that could benefit from this marketing. They talk about trickle-down theory, that they believe in the philosophy that they do not put money into job creation. They reduce taxes and get the businesses to create jobs. This is certainly one within that philosophy. I would think that you market the province so that people will come and the businesses will thrive and you can employ people, but they are even cutting in that area. I do not understand how the Premier and his Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) are going to be able to justify that.

\* (2050)

They have cut Manitoba industrial opportunities. The Venture Capital Program is down 44 percent, huge cuts. Meanwhile the people and the communities are being devastated by tremendously high cuts in the rural areas as well.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Shameful.

**Mr. Plohma:** It is shameful. The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) says shame, I say that is shameful. We see no effort from that Premier when he gets on the phone to his counterpart, the Prime Minister of Canada,

imagine. Could he give me a straight answer today when I asked what he is doing about those things? Did he raise those things? Did he raise those serious concerns to Manitobans? Oh, he says we always talk about serious things. He did not tell us that he has raised those issues. He did not get a commitment from the federal Prime Minister to sit down face to face with the people of Portage la Prairie, with the people of Churchill, with the people affected by the ERDA agreement cuts and have those reversed—no commitment from that federal Government.

Unlike my colleague, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), and my Leader, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), and the other Members of the delegation, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) and myself and a number of people from the communities, the MP for Churchill who went down and sat down with two Ministers, the Member responsible for the Wheat Board and Western Diversification Fund, the Minister, as well as the Minister of Transport for Canada, Benoit Bouchard, and extracted a commitment to the Port of Churchill from them at this meeting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is what has to be done when you meet face to face with the federal Ministers. Certainly, I would expect the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to be able to do that by phone but he is going to have to get those face-to-face meetings, and I do not even know if he asked for them. He would not even say he asked for them when he talked with the Prime Minister, and I think that is regrettable. That is a disservice to the people of this province.

Unfortunately, we do not even hear the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) make any noise, very little about the Port of Churchill. She has spoken about Portage, but we see some token statements about the Port of Churchill. She does not realize the tremendous impact that port has for this country, the tremendous importance, or is it just the fact that the people up there do not vote properly, and there does not seem to be any hope for the Liberals.—(Interjection)— Maybe that has something to do with it, I do not know. Maybe I stumbled onto something there. Let me tell you, these cuts in rural areas are devastating by the federal Government.

I want to read part of a letter that one constituent has written to the Member for Dauphin-Swan River, the federal MP, Brian White, because he is silent.

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development):** A good man.

**Mr. Plohma:** The Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) said, good man. There is a Member of Parliament who is silent on all of these vital issues affecting his constituents. He is silent because he has no impact. He cannot influence the decisions that are being made by that Government, and that is what the Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Penner) says, good man. Well, let us take a look.

“Dear Brian White, Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Christine Maniel. I am the wife of

a CNR employee who may soon be unemployed. I am also the mother of a beautiful three year old girl named Crystal Dawn. We live in a mobile home which we just bought in Roblin. We are all real people with real feelings and I think it's about time the Government realized that. Something must be done about the proposed CNR job cuts. My husband, Greg, and I are very frightened by this, as are other CNR employees and their families.

"We are the people that voted you into office and I know that you owe us a great deal. Now is the time for you to stand up and support the people who supported you.

"Please try to remember that we are people whose livelihoods are being threatened. We are willing and able to do whatever it takes to stop this from happening. You are either with us or against us. If you are with us, stand up, raise your voice and help us! If you are against us, some day you might meet Greg, when he's standing in front of you in the unemployment line.

"Please help us. Let my daughter have the chance to grow up in a healthy safe place where she will know her heritage and her grandparents. Please don't let us down. I'm sure you will be hearing more from me and other CNR employees and their families. Thank you for your consideration."

Those are the kinds of families, those are the kinds of real people affected by these massive cuts by the federal Government: two families in Benito; four in Birch River; four in Grandview; four in Mafeking; two in Minitonas; two in Pine River; four in Roblin; two in Sifton; four in Churchill; three in Cormorant; six in Gillam; three in Ilford; one in Pikwitonei; Pitt Siding, four; The Pas, four; Thicket Portage, one; Thompson, two.

All of these communities are going to lose people, workers and their families as a result of these callous layoffs because of federal Conservative policies that have been pushed forward by the Government in Ottawa, by the Liberals in Ottawa before them, and tacitly and quietly supported by this Conservative Government in Manitoba.

That is something that they should not stand up and be proud of in this province. They should feel terrible about that and should reassess their policies of support for that kind of policy that takes bottom-line profits first for Crown corporations, does not consider the history of those Crown corporations, how they helped to build this country, a vision of Canada that involved service first, regional economic development and safety as the primary concerns, and put them ahead of profits for these Crown corporations.

I want to speak briefly on the issue of health care in this province. How much time do I have left, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after all of this heckling and everything. You might add a couple of minutes on.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member has 15 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Plohman:** Oh, that is great -(Interjection)- you see, the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) thinks that

40 minutes goes very fast. That is why he only speaks for 20 at a time in this House, 40 is twice as long.

**An Honourable Member:** What is the point you are trying to make?

**Mr. Plohman:** The point I am trying to make is that he said I better speak fast. I do not have much time left. Well, I have 15 left. It does not go as fast as he thinks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this year the Conservative Government tells us that it has increased the budget for health care by \$99 million and they are very proud of it. We hear them talking. What this Government says and what this Government does are two different things. A close examination of the Budget reveals that the real expenditure increases are only 2 percent when the total approved Budget for last year and inflation are taken into account, 2 percent. How far will this go in addressing the very serious problems that exist in our health care system? Bed closures, program cuts, waiting lists, and despite all of this, the Government found the money to increase spending for public relations in the department in the last two Budgets by 25 percent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Manitoba want quality health services and a system they can rely on, and instead we have an \$11 million Pharmacare increase to cover increases as a result of federal Conservative drug patent legislation that these Members in this Government stood up for in support of the federal Government and, again, the federal Member of Parliament for Dauphin-Swan River, Brian White, leading the charge on patent legislation that would protect the multinational corporations and increase the price of drugs, prescription drugs, in this province. They supported that legislation and now the taxpayers are paying for it and the individual senior citizens are paying for it because of the increase in prices that they said would not increase.

\* (2100)

This Government will not bring back the In Vitro Fertilization Program, they will not help stem the exodus of pediatricians and mental health workers from leaving the province. The changes that they have made, the \$99 million, are not helping to pay for the home care bills for the people of Manitoba that need home care for senior citizens. They are not reducing the waiting list at nursing homes, and I am going to tell you that a year from now Manitobans will still be waiting nine months for surgery with this Government, for heart surgery in this province and maybe it will increase, regrettably. There will still be people waiting for treatment in our cancer clinics and families across this province will be having to make choices about buying needed prescriptions, medication for their children or buying groceries.

We have heard time and again how the Conservatives will make health care a top priority. During the last election, we heard them promise to halt permanent hospital bed closings pending a detailed review. How long did that review go, how long did it take? A month, six weeks, before they were closing hospital beds? We



heard them promise no user fees, no new user fees for medical services, and soon after the people of north Winnipeg began receiving invoices for home care services.

These are just some of the promises that we heard from the Conservatives during the last campaign, and we know now all of the things that they have done. This Government's record on health care is a bad sequel to the Lyon years and we know what happened then. It provides, and I think the Liberals should keep this in mind, a glimpse of the chaos that would result if the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) had her way, who is the advocate for charging for meals, for soap, for slipper fees, for slippers and toothpaste. That advocate, the Leader of the Liberal Party would have that kind of a system, a chaotic system in this province if she were ever to get into Government to implement her policy on health care, and that is why we cannot let that happen.

There are more than 1,000 citizens waiting for personal care home beds. The Conservatives have increased Pharmacare deductibles by \$13.50 in the last 11 months.

Nursing layoffs have taken place in Winnipeg, Brandon and Pine Falls, and they have resulted in treatment delays, patient transfers, and still others being left unattended at night. They played politics with an important AIDS Awareness Program and within weeks of being voted into office they shelved Manitoba's only In Vitro Fertilization Program. These actions cannot be forgotten and they cannot be ignored by this Legislature.

As much as \$21 million remains unspent in the Department of Health in 1988, according to the Third Quarter Report, of which a portion had been allocated for capital construction. What is particularly galling to Members of my Party and our caucus and this Legislature, the New Democratic Caucus, is that the Government reneged on promises that were made and programs that were in place for new facilities. The people of Dauphin feel that and see that directly, a cancellation of the nursing home extension, personal care home extension of 25 beds that was almost ready for construction, the cancellation in Dauphin, the cancellation of the public health facility that was ready to go to construction in June of 1988.

These have been cut by a callous Conservative Government who said they did not have enough money in their budget, and yet they had money left over in the capital budget and now they have a slush fund of \$200 million that they have set up, and they cannot use that argument anymore. They cannot use that argument anymore. They cannot use it when they want to argue that those health facilities cannot be built because of a shortage of funds. They cannot use it when agriculture needs support; they cannot use that excuse when home care services need support; they cannot use that excuse when day care and child care services need support and crisis centres and education, and the list goes on and on. They will be reminded of that monthly, daily, hourly in this House.

The Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) when he was speaking says he wonders whether I know what

agriculture is. I think that is a very conceited statement to make - (Interjection)- I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if the word "conceited" does not exist, that it certainly would describe what he said. I think people realize what he is saying is that a New Democrat raised on a farm does not know what agriculture is about, but he knows as long as he is a Conservative.

He says, he wondered if I need to stay in the House because I am going to vote with the Budget, like we will take your vote but get lost, we do not need you for anything else. That is a conceited statement to make. - (Interjection)- We know what that Member said. I wonder if he treats his voters in his constituency the same way, give me your vote and get lost. Is that the way he approaches it? That is what he said to me, we know how you are going to vote so maybe you should not be in the House, do not bother staying here, he said, because of course I was interrupting his train of thought and it was not that difficult to do.

I want to take a look at agriculture. Agriculture cuts are terribly deceitful. I would even use the word "deceitful" insofar as the agriculture cuts. The fact is that in this Budget we have seen nearly an 18 percent cut, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in agricultural spending. - (Interjection)- I said I thought I might term it that. The Members are worrying about some of the words I have been using. They do not understand "conceited" but they seem to understand "deceitful."

The fact is, agriculture has seen an 18 percent decrease, a rather huge decrease this year. They have seen a cut in a number of agricultural programs, in the Special Farm Assistance Program that was set up under the Farm Mediation Board to provide assistance to those facing bankruptcy and foreclosure by the banks. We have seen cuts in the beef stabilization and beef support because of the tripartite program. We have seen cuts in the Emergency Interest Rate Relief; we have seen elimination of the Emergency Drought Relief Program. That is how they have stood by their voters of rural Manitoba, and they say they represent the voters of rural Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If that is the way they keep faith with them, then I know that those voters cannot trust this Government for any support in the future.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor.

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** I am pleased to have this opportunity to address this so-called, "Good News Budget."

As my Leader pointed out, the only real good news in this Budget is a tax break to Manitobans and we like it. We definitely like it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Dauphin, on a point of order.

**Mr. Plohman:** On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My apologies to the Member who is speaking, but I really did think that 40 minutes went awful quickly. Could you please check your time, again. I understand that I was cut off five minutes short on my speech.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** That is quite possible. My apologies and if you wish we will extend you the five minutes. I am sorry.

**Mr. Plohnman:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I very much appreciate that. After being advised by some of my good colleagues in this House that there was five minutes less than I had been entitled to, I appreciate your granting this opportunity.

What I wanted to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that I had just started talking about agriculture and the fact that the voters of rural Manitoba have been betrayed by those people who say they represent rural areas of this province. They have had rather significant cuts in the Department of Agriculture. They have made cuts in some very important programs that were put in place, such as the Special Farm Assistance Program, and they have made significant cuts in support for beef stabilization in this province over this last year, down from nearly \$5 million in the previous year to some \$3.5 million this year, about a 27 percent reduction in support for the beef industry in this province by this so-called rural Party. Insofar as the representation for their voters, I would say they betrayed their voters with the agricultural policies and budget that they brought in in this particular Budget.

\* (2110)

They played around with the tax relief for farmers with regard to the School Tax Relief Program that was brought in by our Government. They claim that they have a 35 percent reduction in school taxes this year. The fact is, they do not have a 35 percent reduction and it comes on the heels of a 25 percent reduction, much of which went out of the province because there were no changes made, no distinction made between absentee landowners and people farming the land in this province. The previous year, all of the producers in Manitoba, 99 percent of them, received more from the program that the New Democratic Government had put in place than the one that they put in place the year following.

We did not see the Liberal Party in this province raising these issues on these program cuts in this House, and I want to see the Conservative Government change their ways with regard to rural development in this province, in agriculture. They have neglected it terribly in this province with this Budget, and the Liberal Party has to raise this issue over and over again with this Government. I will be raising it, my colleagues will be raising it, to bring back the conscience of this Party, if they ever had one, for rural Manitoba because they have betrayed those voters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just say in closing that we are supporting the Budget because of the cuts for families, the tax cuts for families. We believe that those are good cuts and that they came right from our platform. But let me tell you that we will not stop from raising the issues that we think are wrong in this Budget, and we will not stop from ensuring that Manitobans understand why this Government was able to bring forward a Budget that was so close to being balanced and probably should have been this year, because of

Eugene Kostyra and his Budget and because of the lack of windfall profits from the federal Government and transfer payments. Let them not talk about good management, let them not talk about mismanagement by the previous Government. That does not enter the equation at all.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will have 40 minutes of mine, I hope so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this so-called Good News Budget. As the previous speakers from my caucus have pointed out and my Leader has pointed out, the only really good news in this Budget is a tax break to all Manitobans, and we like it. But that is where the good news ends.

For the last one year, let me go back to when the last Session started. This Government promised to enhance the health care system and they have talked at great length about innovation and a new era of partnership. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have made these promises last year. They have repeated them this year again, but when are they going to stop promising and start delivering the health care to Manitobans?

Last year, the Government set aside \$500,000 to create the Health Advisory Network. This body, we were told, would not study issues. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) admitted in a speech last October that our health care system had been studied to death. Those are his words and the Health Advisory Network would "provide a mechanism for realistic, practical and action-oriented co-operation so that we can begin to rebuild the sense of shared ownership and responsibility that our system needs."

What has this Government got to show for the last one year and after spending \$1 million now? Unless we count a major demonstration at the steps of the Legislative Assembly, 500 nurses demonstrating just for the simple fact they wanted a simple place on Health Advisory Network and that place was denied. It is a shame. What kind of co-operation and partnership is this?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has recently announced a health promotion program. This certainly is good news, so we must place more emphasis on promoting healthy lifestyles and preventing illness, but this program is too flawed. These funds, it appears, will go primarily to businesses to be used in the workplace only. This is only a part of the true health promotion program. What about seniors? What about children, youth and unemployed and individuals who work for small firms? Is this the only way of addressing the health promotion program, just to go for big business? That is a shame and that lacks substance in the health prevention and promotion program.

The Government is proposing to decrease salaries in the health promotion program by 1 percent, and has not allocated even a single penny more for other

expenditures. An additional \$500,000 will go to external agencies. This \$500,000 is to be used for health promotion, but only for specific groups and this Government is sitting back and waiting for an answer from the public. They have no direction, they have no policy of their own. They are suffering from a typical do-nothing syndrome, wait and wait and do nothing, but that is showing in all areas of the health care system. We do not have a policy which will address the future needs of Manitobans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker -(Interjection)- the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is saying from his seat that I do not believe what I am saying.

**An Honourable Member:** He should be ashamed.

**Mr. Cheema:** I think he should be ashamed that I am here to do a job. I am here to represent my constituents, and he is insulting 44,000 population in my area. I will remind them at election time that is what he is saying.

I am pleased, as I was discussing, with this new-found interest in health prevention and promotion program. Last year, it took them nine months just to print an AIDS brochure. This year, they are again talking about outreach programs, but we have not heard a single step from this Minister's office about when they are going to implement the outreach worker program. As we all know, that issue is not for one Party. The health issues are in the public interest that we must act quickly as soon as possible, as AIDS is becoming one of the leading causes of death, and the only way of preventing AIDS is through prevention and this Minister has failed time after time.

When we are speaking of health promotion, how about maternal and child health? There is only \$160,000 that has been added for this specific fund. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have repeated, we are pleased that the Breast Screening Program will be started but that was our initiative. We announced that four weeks before the Minister even knew about that and we are pleased that he did it. If we read the report on the Health Professionals Education Committee of the Canadian Cancer Foundation, they are estimating that it will cost approximately \$2 million to screen women between the ages of 50 and 69 every two years. How does this Minister and this Government intend to serve this population with only \$160,000.00? That means they will address the need of only 12 percent of the population of the women between that age group. How about the rest of the 88 percent? They are ignoring it. I do not think they know where they are going.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just go to another area which is extremely important for all of us, and that is for the Hearing Conservation Program. This year, it has been cut by 4.1 percent and there is only an increase of \$2,000 in the other expenditure area. We do not know what that means. This preventative program will actually have at least a 12 percent cut for the last two years. How can we provide a program which is so essential for seniors, essential for children who need speech therapy services? We have to know at an early age whether they will need treatment services. This Budget does not address the issue. Voters of Manitoba

will not ignore that, and that is why I was saying the tax cut was good news but the rest of everything is a complete failure.

\* (2120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister for Northern Affairs and Seniors (Mr. Downey), I always had great respect for him. He knows most of the issues but this is in his area of his portfolio that the Hearing Conservation has been cut. He should speak to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). There is one good news in this Budget and that is the increase in the Budget for Continuing Care of 9.8 percent, and I thank the Minister of Finance. That is an important area because this program is so essential to keep the seniors at their home and to also enhance the Early Discharge Program. It would save taxpayers a lot of money for the years to come. I think that is an excellent way of putting money where it is really important.

Let us go to the other line, that is the Gerontology Program. The total money that will be spent will be \$278,900 and this will serve 12 percent of the population of Manitoba. This department is designed to frame what will be important for seniors. How can they justify \$278,000 for a 12 percent population? I think they are missing the boat here. That is very important.

How can they provide with \$278,000 for this Psychogeriatric Program? How are they going to expand the day hospitals? I was listening very carefully to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman). His constituency has the largest population of seniors in rural Manitoba, largest population. He should be advocating—I think he is doing a good job advocating for his constituency—but still I think he should ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) why they have put their personal care home on hold. Why are they not given the new building for the health centre? Why not start a small unit for psychogeriatric care in rural Manitoba? The prime place we feel will be Dauphin, and we will do that if we get a chance. That is the real approach.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just again draw your attention to the Minister for Seniors (Mr. Downey). As I have pointed out a number of times, about 30 percent of the beds in the city right now are occupied by the seniors who could be at home or in a nursing home or in extended care facilities, but there is no provision in this Budget to address their needs. That will save money for the taxpayers definitely if some initiatives are started now. We are not saying it is going to be of benefit right away. It may take a few years. There is a time to start that and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) should do that now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us talk about the cornerstone of this Throne Speech, the environment. The environmental health component budget only got a 4.1 percent increase. That is after adjustment of cost of living. The increase is nothing. It is a lip-service and I think they are ignoring the fact that environmental health is extremely important at the workplace, in homes, at every place in the environment. I think this is the one point maybe they should consider next year

if they get a chance, but that will be up to the voters of Manitoba to decide. I think they have a judgment and they will do that.

Let us talk about northern and rural health. We have heard a lot that they are in favour of community-based health programs but, with only a 2.6 percent increase, how can we provide a community-based program? I think that is a shame and that area has been ignored. With the rate of inflation which is about 4 percent, this actually amounts to be a cut in services. I think that area people will never forget. That is the way to save money to provide a tax, to save money for taxpayers to have a community based . . . concept started as soon as possible, and especially when the health services costs are rising, you have to have new ideas, for this is not coming from this Minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am particularly distressed about the mental health services. The entire Budget has increased by only 2 percent, less than half of what it will need just to keep up with inflation. Indeed the Budget is for \$15,000 less than it was two years ago. How can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) justify and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) justify the mental health programs of rehabilitation, treatment and prevention can function within this Budget? Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been calling the last one year for planning and constructive action to clean up the mess at all levels of mental health work. There has been a minimum improvement but more action is required, more planning is required. The Minister of Finance is saying it is coming, Sir. Well, we will see.

Substance abuse is a tragedy, not only that it does waste lots of hours and destroy a lot of lives and a lot of homes, but this budget of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba has only increased by 1.5 percent. That is a real cut. It is not an increase after inflation, this is a cut. People of Manitoba will not forget that and we will remind them every time we get a chance.

Let us talk about Pharmacare. This Government is planning to spend an extra 10.5 million on Pharmacare, not to add to the new drugs or to reduce the price, but this money, \$10.5 million, is what the taxpayers of Manitoba are going to be forced to pay for Bill C-22. This is the punishment for Bill C-22 and seniors will remember that.

Let us see, we are getting some increase in the Manitoba Health Service Commission budget, but we still continue to hear about the waiting list for surgery. There are 90 patients who are waiting for surgery, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would like to read one letter from a young family. This is for a 35-year-old man with a young family who has had several heart attacks. In February he was told that he needed by-pass surgery immediately. Four months later, this man and his family were told that they would still have to wait. If, after spending \$1.5 billion, you cannot provide the heart surgery, I think there is something lacking. That is the leadership and that is no direction policy from this Government.

When they took office last year, it was 45 patients waiting for four months. It has increased from 45 to

90 in the nine-month period. That is just for elective surgery, and there are a number of patients who do not even come to hospital and they know they have to wait further. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they give the argument, they are telling them it is going to cost money, but they should ask themselves—the Minister of Health should sit down with his staff and ask them how much it is costing per patient going to a doctor per week, per visit, for ECGs, for stress tests, for surgical repeat procedure, is costing more money for the taxpayers. We are forgetting people who pay a large chunk of their money for taxes. They are entitled to have the best care possible and, if we cannot provide it after spending \$1,500 per person in Manitoba, something is missing. The leadership and the planning is not there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitobans are concerned about rehabilitative services such as physiotherapy, occupational therapy and speech therapy. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) takes pride that he increased staff by two at the Health Sciences Centre. Well, that is fine, at least something good came out of that, but by just increasing two persons at Health Sciences has not decreased the waiting period by not more than a few weeks. There are still patients waiting. When a child cannot get speech therapy services, he is going to be a liability for taxpayers. He will not be as fruitful a citizen as others could be. We are denying him or her the right to be the best person he or she can be, and that is a shame.

\* (2130)

After cutting the Hearing Conservation Program and not giving the funds for the speech therapy services, this Budget clearly tells that they are failing time after time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us see about the Manitoba Head Injury Association. They have a major concern, and this year they met with the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), I believe, and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and they have not heard from them. Let me just repeat this story, what this story is. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of patients who are occupying acute care beds. Those patients could easily be in either rehabilitative services or in the rehabilitation program for head injury patients. We do not have that program and that in fact will save money for taxpayers when you are occupying one bed in a hospital that is costing a minimum of \$250 to \$300 per day, depending on which hospital and what kind of bed you are occupying.

We are doing a disservice if we are not providing the best care and the best services for Manitobans, and this Minister has repeatedly shown that they do not have the planning. They are just waiting, waiting and waiting and let the system fall apart and then come as a crisis manager and that is what he is being known as outside this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, about five to six times in this House an important issue was brought last year for St. Boniface Hospital about the obstetrical care, the maternity ward care. It was closed almost about 27 times until last Saturday. A number of patients have

been transferred or diverted to the other hospitals. Of course they are low risk, sometimes there may be a possibility of high-risk. We have warned this Minister time after time, please look at the issue, but simply he is passing the buck, he has not made a decision. We hope that we do not have a disaster so that he will not be able to answer that question in this House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no provision in this Budget to allocate more funds for either hospital.

What about the Seven Oaks Hospital? The previous NDP Government just took the obstetrical unit away, even after two years of service. That was ill-defined, ill-directioned policy and the whole North End is suffering. I think they have to answer, and that answer was given to them last April.

We are not saying that any political Party will have the right answers. No one will have the right answers for all the health care policies, but there should be a common path for all of us to work so that we can save money for taxpayers. The money can be saved definitely if there is planning, but their planning is lacking.

Let me just go one step further. All the Honourable Members, most of them are from rural communities. I am going to name some of the communities where we do not have a permanent doctor, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Altona, Brandon, Dauphin, Flin Flon, Gillam, Lac du Bonnet, Pine Falls, Rapid City, Rosburn, Selkirk, Shoal Lake, St. Claude, Ste. Rose, Steinbach, Swan Lake, The Pas, Thompson, a number of others.

It is not laughing matter -(Interjection)- I am not making a political issue. I am telling you what is happening and you are not listening, your Minister is not listening.

When you go to your voters and you tell them you are spending \$1,500 per person and you cannot even provide the primary health care, I think that is a shame. You have a solution right now in Manitoba. You have a doctor sitting right here in Manitoba and it will not cost more than \$7,000 per community to have a doctor for five years, I guarantee you that. Our Party guarantees you that it will happen, but you should have the will to say that we have a good program, let us follow that.

It is not a political issue. If we go there tomorrow or any person visits a community, someone has a heart attack or an accident or a major disaster and it is happening. Why can we not just have a doctor per community? We have a program. The Minister of Health said it was good, but he did not act on that. It is already three months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us go to the other areas of shortage of doctors. It is a shortage in each and every area, and we are not saying it is only their fault. It is probably not right now, because they did not create all these problems. It has been building up for the last 10 years. Leadership has to be shown now so that it does not matter which Party comes to power. Still they could show to Manitobans, after spending such a huge amount of money, if we cannot even give them the primary services, I think it will be a shame—\$1.5 billion is a lot of money.

The other day we raised one major issue in this House, that was the shortage of an anesthesia specialty in

Manitoba. That is a real one and that did not grow up in one day. That was said by my Leader very clearly, it has been building up for the last 10 to 15 years. If we do not act now, next year it will be a problem. To cancel 20,000 surgeries per year, it will be a disaster. It does not matter which Minister is there, he or she will have a tough time to face Manitobans.

Where is the planning? Why do we have to wait for crisis after crisis? We asked the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), did you have a meeting with the Health Sciences Centre or Children's Hospital about the children's specialists leaving? In a way, maybe he is right, he said it is not his responsibility but still the fund is coming from your Government. They still have the responsibility to provide the leadership so that the programs can be preserved.

The ophthalmology program was gone, it is coming back. That is the good news, but other programs are fading away. Can he imagine seven children's specialists leaving Children's Hospital, the only kidney specialist leaving Manitoba, the oncologist leaving Manitoba, orthopedic surgeons. All the good people are leaving for a variety of reasons, but how are we going to attract the others? We do not have any planning. If we are not going to have planning now, I mean all of us will suffer, including Members from all sides. Definitely our children and our families will be affected. There is not even a single person, not even a single human being who does not suffer in their life from some illness, mental or physical. If we cannot provide after \$1.5 billion, we are missing a major action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of areas where we can address the weaknesses in the present health planning. There is a lengthy stay for emergency surgery, for the cancer treatment, for heart surgery, as I said earlier. But that can be addressed if the action is taken now, the planning is done now. But we are not seeing any action.

This year's Budget with the \$2.48 million, how can they address Clinic? Clinic has been waiting for years. That is a political decision not to fund Clinic, and it provides a good service, it saves taxpayers' money. It is saving taxpayers' money by people who are providing hundreds of hours of volunteer work, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they are not helping those people serve the community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me say that, as I said earlier, it is easy to criticize but one has to have a plan-(Interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been convinced for a long time that the prevention and the health promotion must be the foundation of health care in Manitoba. My colleagues, all of us, and my colleague from Ellice (Ms. Gray) has been emphasizing on the health promotion for the last one year.

**An Honourable Member:** She has been doing it in a very silent way.

**Mr. Cheema:** But she is doing a good job. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us not keep ourselves just for fancy words, but let us address the issues for a healthy lifestyle, such as nutrition, substance abuse, environmental

health, occupational health, communicable disease prevention and, as we addressed earlier, screening for breast cancer.

\* (2140)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, unlike the present Government, the Liberal Government would not use Lotteries monies to fund such important programs. It is a well-known fact that the Lotteries money comes from low- and middle-class persons, and you should never fund a universal program on the backs of a few people. That is not acceptable. What is going to happen next year? That is the major difference. We think and we believe that the program should come from general revenue, not from the Lotteries funds.

We think that the home care programs and day hospital should be the cornerstone for the seniors' program. We think the personal care home program should be expanded. We believe that the community-based extended care facilities must be started now to save taxpayers' money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, can I know how much time I have left?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member has about 10 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier, the importance of the community-clinic concept of health care delivery is becoming more important and it has been done in many other countries, in Europe and in Australia and in other parts of the world, to save money for taxpayers. That is not being done in Manitoba, and the example is the Klinik funding and no new initiatives for community health clinics. The Liberal Party would favour the community-clinic concept, not only in the urban centre but in the small rural communities too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other day the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) was criticizing me that I said something which he did not like about the rural hospital. I was at Pine Falls more than -(Interjection)- I was there at Pine Falls and that was about six weeks ago, and I met with the nursing staff and some of the board members and they will tell the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) at the next election definitely. They will definitely, because he has not raised the issue in this House.

He knew about the Pine Falls Hospital. He kept quiet. I think he is keeping a secret. He is not serving the community of Pine Falls/Powerview, and they will tell him definitely and we will remind them. We have been there a couple of times and we are going again in -(Interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us talk about enhancing the Mental Health Services. We are still lacking the Mental Health Services in Manitoba as we said, but we would favour new programs.

On May 16, we announced a policy for our Party and we announced it as and -(Interjection)- the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) is laughing. He is again laughing at one of the issues. On Manitoba health issues, the Ministers are laughing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The first proposal is that residency placement should be

increased by at least three per year over four years at the University of Manitoba. Short-term programs in psychiatry for family physicians should be provided. The recruitment program to attract physicians from other parts of Canada should be initiated, and the audio-visual link between the smaller communities and Winnipeg should be started. Crisis shelters throughout Manitoba should be established to provide services to individuals who do not require hospitalization. These are the practical economical solutions, and they are again missing it. We will do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in conclusion, this administration continues to suffer from a do-nothing syndrome. They have taken no leadership and have not established the long-term planning that is essential if we are to preserve and enhance the quality of our health care system. As a result, the Minister of Health is lurching from crisis to crisis. Manitobans realize that he is a crisis manager but, unfortunately, it is Manitobans who are paying the price for his failures.

Every Manitoban has a serious reservation about the present health care system, about this administration's ability to manage it. Each one of us has the right to the best care possible after spending \$1.5 billion. This Government demonstrates again and again their health care policy is ill-defined and directionless. This Government has lost the confidence of the people, and the Budget does nothing to restore it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a Liberal Government, under the dynamic leadership of Sharon Carstairs, can provide Manitobans with an integrated, effective health care system to meet both fundamental and special needs. This Budget completely fails to address the pressing issues facing our health care system now and in the future. I cannot support it in all conscience, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Let me say that I am extremely pleased to rise as the Minister responsible for Northern and Native Affairs, Seniors and other responsibility. Particularly, I am pleased to rise this evening to speak on behalf of the constituency of Arthur and the constituents of Arthur. I have had the privilege of representing them for some almost 12 years now.

I was extremely pleased at the record of the Government from '77 to '81, of which we had the opportunity to look after the taxpayers' funds, to guide the ship of state and to try to bring back into some line of reasoning the operations of Government, and to deal with the deficits left by the Schreyer administration and the NDP Government previous to that 1977 election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased again to have the opportunity to represent the taxpayers on the Treasury Bench and to be a Member who stands to support such an important document. It seems somewhat strange, the New Democrats stand in this place and try to take all the credit in the world for a good Budget. Can you imagine if we had not had the six years of mismanagement of the New Deppers, for six years of half-billion dollar deficits, if we would have been able

to continue on from '81-88 without burdening the taxpayers with the kind of deficits and interest charges that they have had to, in fact, had to burden?

They refer to a slush fund, the Liberals will refer to a slush fund. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I dare say that we would be operating with a Stabilization Fund that could truly be the heritage fund that the people of Manitoba would be enjoying interest income from, rather than the kind of costs that they are having to pay in supporting the deficit. You know, we have to bring this whole thing into perspective. So I am pleased to be a Member of a Government and support a Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and a Premier (Mr. Filmon) who have been able to take advantage of the situation as it is before us, but one just has to stop and think of the condition that we would be in if we had not had to clean up again and pay for the experience of a New Democratic Government.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us bring this whole thing in to where, I think, we are, and I would just like to refer to the Budget document, page 1, and again quote from the Budget from which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has presented to the people of Manitoba. As he said last year, and I will quote, "Our goal is a competitive and diversified economy which will provide increased investment and job opportunities for our citizens, and pay for quality health, education and social programs." -(Interjection)- That is a basis from which the Conservative Party truly believes we should be working from.

This Budget again contains three basic principles: maintain the services in health care and education, increasing those essential services to some 7 percent or more particularly in health and education, maintenance of essential services; at the same time doing what we said we would do, deficit reduction, because we firmly believe that until we get our deficit under control and reduce that deficit then we are going to continually burden the taxpayers and not be able to continue to provide the services that are so essential, because to continue to see a deficit increase would have seen the removal and the loss of essential services; thirdly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, lower taxation and goodness knows every taxpayer knows how to spend their own money better than any Government.

I do not care what political stripe they are or who they are, there is no one better to know how to spend their tax money than the taxpayer themselves. I do not think for one minute that we accomplish anything, and this of course is the New Democratic style, you have to be attacking someone, they have to attack someone. It is the multinationals that are bad, they do not - (Interjection)- I do not know why the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) does not stop and think for a minute, what is Inco doing? They are employing people, they are the main generating engine of a whole city in this province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, without that profit, they would not be here. He makes reference to the multinational corporations of which he thinks are always bad.

\* (2150)

I have nothing against someone making a profit and creating employment. A prime example, and it is pointed

out in spades of our policy dealing with the sale of Manfor. What are we doing there? We are taking off the backs of a million taxpayers the cost of a money-losing Crown corporation, and what has taken place? We have a Crown corporation that is now going to be operated by the private sector. Not only are they going to maintain the current number of jobs they have, but they are going to expand job opportunity. It is a major, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is where it is at. The engine of economics, the driver of that has to come from the private sector if it is going to have long-term meaningful impact.

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have to do it on sound environmental principles and policies. There is a mechanism, a provincial mechanism, to make sure that is in fact carried out but that is what we truly believe, not as we have seen in the past where we have seen the former administration go off on a \$27 million adventure with the Manitoba Telephone System because they wanted to create employment for their senior managers so they sent them off to Saudi Arabia. Some \$27 million later, at the expense of the taxpayers, we are cleaning up that mess.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look at what happened with the Autopac rates. In fact, that is why we are where we are today and where they are at. The public just would not tolerate their mismanagement. Workers Compensation, it goes on and on, so one has to put into perspective as to why we are at where we are at today and of course the New Democratic Party, sitting with 12 seats, are using the reasoning that we are cutting taxes to the family and that is a justifiable reason.

I mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the real bigger reason is that they know if they went to the people of Manitoba that the people of Manitoba still remember what they did to the economics of the Province of Manitoba. Let us not fool anyone, and it is self-preservation that they are not going to vote against the Budget. Let us not kid anyone. But what one cannot understand is why the Liberal Party—and I guess it shows inexperience, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I have heard one Liberal after the other get up and say how they would dearly love to vote for many things in the Budget. They would dearly love to vote for tax reductions, maintenance of essential services, increase in health and education by over 7 percent, a Stabilization Fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think—and I am not going to make any personal attacks on the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs). After all, I do not have to because the most well-known Liberal journalist in Winnipeg is doing that for us. Frances Russell said it very well in Saturday's Free Press. I do not have to do that. Their own critics are doing it—I mean, their own friends are criticizing them and that hurts. That hurts the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Liberal Party far worse than me saying it. When their own supporters or their own known journalists clearly come out and criticize them the way that she has, that has a far bigger impact and you can see it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, and of course we know that the Free Press again today—

**An Honourable Member:** Give them a little more rope and they will hang themselves.

**Mr. Downey:** That is precisely what is happening. We have a pretty good understanding of our rural voters and our Conservative voters, our city and northern voters, where they are coming from, and I do not expect that to change a whole lot in the next few months or the next few years.

One cannot take anything for granted. One has to continue to produce policy, tax relief as we have done on farm land for the education taxes, reduce the personal income taxes as we have done, continue to introduce progressive policies as we have done to make sure that rural communities grow and develop. There has been a lot of, I would call, shallow criticism because I really believe the Liberal Party—as they are trying to and are going to entice rural voters to vote for them—have to be on side with rural development, with community development.

Of course one cannot expect a lot from them when the Agriculture Critic at their convention in Brandon holds up one sheet of paper and says, well, we have no policy, we will leave that up to the bureaucrats to develop. That is not the way it works in the Conservative Government and the Conservative Party. The elected officials truly provide the policy for Government. The Member who got slapped around pretty good on one of the urban housing projects here the last week said, what have we done over the last six years? We have provided some pretty good alternatives and we are now delivering them. I would invite the Member to read seriously the Budget document rather than to try and pick up on some small political activities that may encourage his voters to continue to vote for him.

One would want to read the Agriculture Critic's (Mr. Laurie Evans) speech today to truly see what a Liberal is because I think he truly demonstrated what it is. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I again do not want to take on a personal attack of that individual so I will leave the public to read that speech. He said, we are setting up committees to do certain things, whether it comes to the Red Meat Program or whether it comes to the rail

line, the payment of Crow subsidy. What are we doing setting up committees? We should have been doing that in Opposition, be ready for the day on which we would take over Government. I ask him, how many committees they have set up because they are in Opposition and say they are ready to govern? How many committees have they set up? I mean, completely contradictory.—(Interjection)— We go back to Brandon again. He does not have any policies, so he has not been consulting. I cannot understand it. When you get a flashing red light, that means the same as a solid red light. You have to stop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just say, in the few minutes that I have left or the minute or two that I have left, based on the maintenance of service, in fact increasing the expenditures in those critical areas that we said we would look after, based on deficit reduction, the development of a Stabilization Fund, which is maybe a little old fashioned —(Interjection)— no, it is not a Tory slush fund, it is a taxpayers' reserve. It is not a Tory slush fund, it is a taxpayers' reserve which gives us somewhat of a bounce to the operations of public finance. I am disappointed the Liberals, for political sake, cannot understand it. So when we look at the deficit reduction, the Stabilization Fund development, lower taxation, the removal of some more payroll tax, the lowering of personal income tax, I for the life of me cannot understand why the Liberal Party will not come to their senses and support a document that is good for Manitoba and public policy that is good for them.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hour being ten o'clock, I interrupt proceedings according to the rules. When this motion is back again in the House, the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) will have 25 minutes remaining.

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