

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Friday, 13 March, 1981

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to introduce 27 students of Grade 9 standing from the Ken Seaford Junior High School, under the direction of Roberta Cairns. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. Pursuant to the answers provided by the Minister of Economic Development yesterday in this Chamber, I would ask the Minister of Economic Development if, in respect to the helicopter plant, whether he will assure this Chamber today, after now having some opportunity to review his files, that all information requested by the company has indeed been provided to the company so they can complete their application to the Federal Government, same as requested by the Federal Government in order to finalize DREE application and other applications required by the Federal Government, in order to permit the helicopter company to proceed with its plans. Can the Minister assure us that all information has been provided, that there is no information that is awaiting response from his Department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I said in the House yesterday if there was

any further information the lawyer for the company wanted, that it would be provided if we were able to provide it. The instructions from myself went out yesterday and this morning and there will be somebody contact Mr. Gunn today and say, look if you want more information please put it in writing, we will certainly do our best to provide it. If he hasn't got it all, if he's got some problems, have him come to us and the instructions have already gone out to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I might say that the reason that I mentioned yesterday, I quote the Member for Brandon East, January 24th, where he says it's funny, it's really unbelievable, Evans said, vowing an NDP government would never repeat the Saunders experience. This government won't either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we certainly commend the Minister on his change in approach, that he is now prepared to sit down and to discuss and to ensure that there is some better communication. The Minister has made reference to funding; the First Minister has heehawed from his seat in that respect. Can the Minister advise us, in fact can the Minister assure us, that indeed it has been the fact that since February of 1980 there has been no request for any funding from this company, from the Province of Manitoba. The Minister keeps referring to funding, if there has been a request for funding would the Minister detail the nature of that request for funding from the helicopter company.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I wouldn't be able to detail it all right now, Mr. Speaker. I said there was a request for funding made in February of last year. Our department has other records on file where there's other discussions with them that would mean funding from the Provincial Government. I can't detail them right now. Mr. Speaker, I assure the House there was a request for funding.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister took as notice a question pertaining to original discussion re a funding request of some \$3 million to \$5 million, which apparently had originated as a result of a discussion involving representatives in his department indicating such money was available. It was later discovered that there was no such money available. That was cleared as of February of last year.

A question again to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is whether the Minister can confirm, as a result of this review which he undertook to do yesterday, that indeed there has been no request for funding except for the moneys which mistakenly were represented to be available from his own department.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the statement by the Leader of the Opposition is hogwash. Mr. Speaker, I took that and had discussions with my department. Nobody discussed a \$3.5 million slush fund as far as they are concerned.

The request for funding came in a much different form than that. The figures that he's quoting are absolutely wrong and if he can mislead this House or the people of Manitoba that seems to be what he wants to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what action the Minister is prepared to take against those landlords who abuse the rights of tenants, according to the law as set out by the Province of Manitoba? My question is based on the following circumstance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has asked her question.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Member that my department will provide the full protection of the law for all tenants under the Landlord and Tenant Act and take whatever action is necessary against landlords who violate any of the provisions of the Act.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise what action then he would take against a landlord who, having converted an apartment building to condominium and sold an apartment to which the purchaser has access for necessary measuring and so on; then advises the tenant, without either consent of either the purchaser or the tenant, that her apartment will be open in an Open House on both Saturday and Sunday for four consecutive hours; what action would the Minister take against this landlord who is violating the rights of the tenant under the law, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the member for having given me notice of those circumstances last evening and say that, in reviewing the Legislation, I can confirm for her that a landlord only has the right to show the premises to prospective tenants at reasonable hours after the termination of the tenancy has been given. In these circumstances, if the suite has already been sold to someone else, then obviously those people who would be shown that suite could not be prospective tenants and so it appears to be in violation of the intent of the Act. I can also say that, under these circumstances, there is provision for the matter to be referred to the Rentalman for his determination for both parties and I would recommend she pass that information along to the particular tenant involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

MS. WESTBURY: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is then saying there is no penalty against the landlord who has abused the Legislation. In view of that, would the Minister at least be prepared to issue a directive to landlords reminding them that this behaviour is in violation of the laws of the Province?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, under Subsection 95(3) of the Act, if a party fails to comply with the legislation, the party is guilty of an offence and I would certainly ensure that through my department, landlords are made aware of this provision or the particular landlord involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and deferring to his superior knowledge in the area of strikes. As a citizen of Manitoba, can the Minister of Labour inform me as to how I can effectively show my public support for the position of the employees who are being unfairly treated by the gas company in that the gas company is requiring consumers, of whom I am one, to pay for services to private contractors, which used to be provided as a normal part of my service from the gas company? Can the Minister, who knows public support is important, advise the public how they can support the position of the employees without freezing to death?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I think, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is doing a good enough job just by raising the questions in the House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his support for my services in terms of the questions. Can I expect any support from the Minister of Labour and/or the Minister of Consumer Affairs to whom the Public Utilities Board reports, in seeing to it that the support that he says should be forthcoming is also forthcoming from responsible government agencies?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a work stoppage situation, I don't think it's responsible for governments to take sides. I think the Member for Inkster, being one of the most credible ones that sit opposite, is doing his job well enough.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the Honourable Minister. May I ask with respect, — (Interjection)— They don't have a caucus. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest that the government is taking sides and may I ask whether it is not a fact that the government is taking sides by not using its power to require a public utility . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member is not seeking information by a question of that nature. The honourable member may rephrase.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Labour, in the capacity of one who is knowledgeable in labour disputes, whether it is not the case that the government is taking sides by not requiring a public utility with a monopoly franchise providing an essential service to continue to provide that service, which the government has authorized them exclusively to provide.

MR. MacMASTER: No, I don't think we are, Mr. Speaker, and I think for the respect that I have for

Friday, 13 March, 1981

the Member for Inkster, I think should correct probably a misleading statement that he just made when he said that the NDP doesn't have a caucus. It's my understanding they have four of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

HON. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Labour and it relates today being Friday the 13th, where some people they won't walk under ladders, some will refuse to cross the path of a black cat. Seemly, the unemployment and employment statistics that were released today to the House I wonder, is the Minister of Labour superstitious about these statistics that were released today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if Manitobans on Friday the 13th were to receive the kind of unemployment figures and the increased number of employed people in Manitoba, if there were to receive those numbers, I would like to believe that we would all join unanimously in trying to make a Friday the 13th, the second and third Friday of every month.

The figures are very interesting and very encouraging, but not to be taken . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Minister normally — and I'm not saying he is required to do this — but he normally issues a statement on unemployment figures. He has not done so and I respect his right not to do so. He has distributed the statement. I think it is an abuse of the privileges of the House for him now to turn a Ministerial Statement into a question, which is put to him by a backbencher.

He is now going to make a statement on unemployment figures, which the Opposition will not be permitted to reply to and, Mr. Speaker, if it is obvious that the question requires a statement which has been distributed today, then I would request that we immediately revert to Ministerial Statements and let the Minister make a statement in the usual way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we found in the past, members of the Opposition would ask questions if the news was bad. —(Interjection)

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, when the news is good, certainly any member of the Chamber should be allowed to ask a question. The criteria should not be whether the news is bad or good.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I am not in any way suggesting that the honourable

members of the Opposition may not then ask questions or may keep quiet as is suggested by the House Leader. What I am suggesting is that a Ministerial Statement should not be made in the guise of answering a question, and thereby using a subterfuge to avoid the normal response, which I'm sure would be made by the Opposition whether congratulatory or otherwise, to a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour on the point of order.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think the Member for Inkster may be unintentionally misleading somewhat. It has not been an established practice for the Minister of Labour to make a statement. I have been chastized by the Opposition for not having the information in the House on the tables, which tells the story in itself, Mr. Speaker, that what I endeavoured to do on the days that the Stats come out is get the copies distributed. It has not been a practice to make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is prepared to revert back to Ministerial Statements if the Minister wishes to make a statement in view of the fact that the government doesn't caucus, and the backbenches don't know what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour on the point of order.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I leave it in your good hands as to whether answering a question is conceived to be making a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin on the point of order.

MR. McKENZIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have a second question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair was unaware that information had been distributed to members. If the question is relating to the information that is already distributed, I don't think it is absolutely necessary to . . .

Order please, order please. I am not aware of the information that is on the statement, I have no copy of such in my hands. Questions in this House should be for the purpose of seeking information, and if that information is already available, I would think that a question of that nature is abusing the privilege of the House at that time.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order relating to what you have just said because I think, Mr. Speaker, you had better reflect on what you just . . . You'd better reflect, Sir, on the effect of . . . —(Interjection)— . . . If the baying will stop for a moment, Mr. Speaker. If you will just reflect, Sir, on what you said, it was this; that if a statement is distributed in the House, then no member of the

House may ask a question upon it. If that is what your ruling is, Sir, and I doubt very much if that's what you meant because previous to this, Mr. Speaker, if statements or information is distributed in the House, members from all sides of the House are entitled to ask questions. That has been the tradition and practice of this House; I suggest it should continue to be the tradition and practice of this House. If you, Sir, are purporting to change that rule then we would like to hear what the change is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. In case some members of the Chamber did not hear what I said, the Question Period is for the purpose of seeking information, and if information is already in front of a person and has been distributed and I was not aware of it, I would think that questions pertaining to that information, unless it was for clarification of the information, I would think it would be an abuse of the question period.

I'm not saying anything about ministerial statements at all. We have constantly tried to use the question period for seeking information, and that is the purpose of a question period as I understand it.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I merely say to you, Sir, that if you are saying that every time a document is distributed in this House that members are not going to be permitted to ask questions upon it then, Sir, we're going to have to be in the position of enforcing that against the Opposition, as well; and we will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin with a question.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and confine myself to the guidelines that you have laid down. Mr. Speaker, I must refer to Manitoba having the second best employment rate in Canada, and I will rephrase my question then.

I wonder can the Minister of Labour tell me in this House if he expects this encouraging development in Manitoba's employment growth to continue for the rest of the year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in a time in our country when there are great difficulties last year we managed to remain third lowest within the country; and this year we're starting off the new year, I would think everybody would be somewhat excited about it, where we've gone from the third lowest in the country to the second lowest. It is a first time, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba has ranked lower than third in our nation since May of 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that at this point there should be no subterfuges. The member asked whether the rate that is established in that report is going to continue for the rest of the year, and the Minister merely went back to repeating what was in his distributed statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. It has been a well-accepted practice in this Chamber that any member can ask a Minister a question. The right of the Minister to reply is his prerogative. He does not have to reply in the manner in which the person that asks the question wants an answer. That has been traditional in this House for many years.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Labour is enthusiastic about answering questions which might be of a political nature, and since he has expressed concern about the strength of the NDP caucus, and hoping, as I do, that he will accept my assurance that the caucus is stronger than it ever was, especially in the last few weeks, a chain being as strong as its weakest links and when the weak links disappear it becomes stronger, then I would ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you. And the sooner one sloughs off weak links the stronger one gets. I would ask the Minister of Labour . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would come back to problems dealing with his own department and respond to an enquiry I have received dealing with compensation that is being paid to a person who is receiving half of the amount from Saskatchewan, and half from Manitoba, because of working in both provinces, and who informs me — and that is the clarification I'm asking of the Minister — that the Manitoba portion is reviewed every three years and with the current pace of inflation he's dropping back; whereas in Saskatchewan it is being reviewed annually. Would the Minister, please, confirm or correct the statement that the compensation is being reviewed only every three years, in spite of inflationary trends?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, just a little bit of a correction, the unemployment figures and stats in the province are of some concern to us on this side of the House and as myself, the Minister, reports for it then they are of concern of my department. Mr. Speaker, I'll endeavour to get the correct answer to the member's question as how we relate to our review of those rates between ourselves and Saskatchewan.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to infringe on the rules. I've another question of the Minister of Labour but it's not a supplementary, and if I may I'd like to ask him.

MR. SPEAKER: There were several members standing. The Honourable Member for Gladstone

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of

Labour. Could the Minister of Labour and Manpower indicate to the House if he has received any indication about job creation in Manitoba for this year and, if he has, could he please inform the House what these indicators project for the rest of 1981 in terms of employment growth for Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we know that during the course of the year we take a months gain over the previous year to get a correct figure and for the month of January there was just over 6,000 more people working in Manitoba than there was the previous year and for the month of February, I'm pleased to say, that there were 9,000 more people working in Manitoba than there was last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. He indicated last week in answer to a question of mine that he considered the people working for Trojan Security to be employees rather than independent contractors as they were purported to have become under a contract, I'm just wondering whether proceedings have now been initiated to ensure that all employees will receive benefits at least equal to the minimum amounts they would have received under employment legislation in Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, our department is proceeding generally along that line, I informed the Member for Rossmere last week that in fact it's our interpretation of the legislation that the people working for that particular company are, in fact, employees.

MR. SCHROEDER: That being the case, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. Could he inform the House as to what he is doing to advise former employees of this company that they do have a right, or they may have a right to collect wages and benefits in addition to what they had received from that employer?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, that's probably step 3, 4 or 5 down the road. We have notified the employer that that's our decision. The employer now has several things he may do, and I'm not going to suggest in this House what he might do.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, the employer may well have certain things that he can do, but I'm just wondering what the Minister of Labour is doing to ensure that those people who may have a right to collect at least minimum wages, which they weren't receiving, will be aware of the fact that they may be entitled to that so that they may also take appropriate steps to protect their interests.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have said that I thought we had a case and that we were proceeding with the case if I didn't believe we had one, but there are steps that the employer, the company, may take. They may challenge our decision in a variety of ways. I would ask the Member for Rossmere to be patient, let us establish the case that we believe to be as an authentic one and after that

we will deal with the present employees and the previous employees if at all possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, while addressing a question to the Minister of Labour in respect to the unemployment figures which were provided today, and we don't mean to take any credit away from those persons who are deserving of credit in respect to the one month bettering of the picture, but I would ask the Minister if he can indicate why it is, and if his department has examined why it is, that the participation rate in the Province of Manitoba went down on a seasonally adjusted basis for the period last month compared to this month?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the participation rate, if the member would check his statistics, flows upwards and downwards periodically from month to month, as do the unemployment stats. We are encouraged by the unemployment figures, as I would hope the Member for Churchill would be.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly we are encouraged by some of the unemployment figures, but the question to the Minister was in respect to the participation rate, a figure which he made a great ado about last time we discussed this during this question period.

I would also ask the Minister if he has directed his department to investigate why it is that Manitoba's growth in labour force, or growth in the number of employed over the last year, has been one-half of the national average?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, on the participation rate, of course it is better than it was a year ago. The member knows that. The employment force, the number in Manitoba, is better than it was a year ago. In fact the member was very quiet, as were his friends opposite last summer, when we set a provincial record for number of employed people in Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the record is clear that the employment growth rate is one-half the national average, and the second lowest in the country for this month, but I would ask the Minister if he can indicate if he has directed his department to determine why it is that we also have one of the lowest growths in labour force statistics in the country year over year, February of 1980 compared to February of 1981.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not totally satisfied with the fact that there were 30,000 extra jobs in the last three years, but I'm pleased with the fact that it's three times what it was the previous three years of the NDP government.

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

Friday, 13 March, 1981

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister reporting for the Student Employment Program. I'd like to ask the Minister whether there has been any policy change with regard to payment rates for students this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Not necessarily a policy change, Mr. Speaker, but I must admit that there has been some confusion in that area and we're correcting it presently.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can confirm that because payment is to be made on a different basis, it has happened in some cases where a student who has been employed under the program for several years in the past and is experienced in the job, can under the new payment rates, receive a drop in pay for this year of some 2.00 an hour or more.

MR. MacMASTER: That's exactly the situation that we're clearing up right now, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WALDING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to advise us as to the outcome of the review and perhaps he can assure us at that time that the matter has been resolved satisfactorily.

MR. MacMASTER: I can give the member that assurance right now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources, and I would ask him if he has had any communication with his Federal counterparts with respect to the Garrison Diversion project and the discussions that had taken place between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, we have not received any word about the discussions that we knew took place between the President and the Prime Minister. We anticipate receiving information from External Affairs very shortly as to any particular attitudes that the President may have expressed on that occasion.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. With respect to the Garrison project, and in particular with respect to the IJC, I wonder if the Minister has made any representations to the Federal Government with respect to the two vacancies on the IJC from the Canadian side, and in that regard to put pressure on the Federal Government to fill those vacancies as soon as possible in order that the IJC, at least from the Canadian side, is an effectively working body.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly accept the member's advice. As such I point out to him that currently there is no particular issue, no case before the Commission to deal with, so that the vacancies on the board don't particularly create a problem or any immediate delay in the consideration of any problem. However, I will certainly be concerned that the Commission be resurrected to its full strength. I am course, particularly interested that our American counterparts do likewise with respect to the appointments that they have to make to that Commission.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I don't share the Minister's attitude towards the IJC in this respect, and I ask him if he does not consider the Garrison Diversion project to be a very serious concern and one which the IJC should be monitoring on a regular basis because the Americans, Mr. Speaker, are looking at various aspects of the Garrison Diversion projects, in particular the screening process, which I believe should be a concern of the IJC and one which the IJC should be monitoring. Mr. Speaker, that's the only protection we have under . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable member is debating rather than seeking information.

The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. During the Minister's Estimates he promised to investigate and report back that if children who were selling popcorn, peanuts, other things at places like the Winnipeg Arena, the stadium, children peddling ice-cream on the streets, who are not covered under The Labour Relations Act, whether there was adequate accident insurance in place by the people who were using them as private contractors, had any insurance in place for the coverage of these young persons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've checked into that particular problem. It was quite an issue between the members opposite and myself, about regulations for those young people and I wasn't going to involve myself, I didn't think, in regulations for that particular group.

The precise question about whether there is coverage, there is a coverage.

MR. JENKINS: A supplementary question then to the Minister. Could the Minister advise if this is just strictly accident insurance? Is there any insurance in place because we've had a rash in the past of young children, on the tricycle type of machine, riding around the city selling ice-cream, does the insurance also cover losses, if a robbery takes place?

MR. MacMASTER: I can't answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I'll see if I can get the answer for it.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Natural Resources. Could the Minister

Friday, 13 March, 1981

of Natural Resources follow up on the questions of my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland? Could the Minister indicate whether he has made a decision or had any consultations as to whether an all-party committee will be going to Washington to deal with the various groups in Washington on the Garrison Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, no, that decision has not been made and I would want to remind the honourable member, that when that was referred to by myself last week, I was commenting on a suggestion made, I believe in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, that the Government of Canada would consider under certain circumstances such a visit to Washington and I would then assume and take it indeed for granted, that would include provincial people as well.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether he does support such a move and will he make representations to his Ottawa counterparts on that very suggestion that he made last week, that it should be done and that our views be known from Manitoba? Does he support that move?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, firstly I would want to make very sure that any representation that we make to the Capital and to the President of the United States, that we wouldn't be wearing armbands and carrying placards of some kind. We would want to make a responsible representation with responsible people. I must indicate to the honourable member that we are awaiting some word, some indication of how the talks progressed on the subject matter of Garrison between the Prime Minister and the President and we will then be making subsequent decisions with respect to the kind of action that we believe is necessary, to make it very clear to the new administration where Manitoba stands with respect to the Garrison.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't answer my question. Could I ask him again, whether he does support a move of an all-party committee, going together with our Federal counterparts, to Washington? Does he support such a move?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this government, this Premier, my predecessor as Minister of Natural Resources have demonstrated that we are prepared to do anything that will make it clear and that will prevent the kind of difficulties, that we envisage the Garrison can cause Manitobans. At the appropriate time an appropriate move will be taken by this government, to make that known whether it needs to be done in Ottawa, whether it needs to be done in Washington.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for Question Period having expired. Proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to revert to Tabling of Reports. I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation which has already been distributed. We were anxious to have the members in possession of this prior to consideration of MHRC Estimates on Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, first let me advise members, Private Bills Committee will meet next Wednesday morning at 10:00 a.m. to consider and report of Bill 15, which was passed yesterday in Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

It is the intention to deal with Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Committee will come to order.

Interim Supply — Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$673,466,010, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for the department as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1982 — pass — the Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there was, I think it's fair to point out, some small amount of confusion the last time we dealt with this matter and, Mr. Chairman, I must congratulate you on the most wise decision you made in recognizing the Member for Brandon East on Wednesday of last week, because it gave me at the time — the Member for Inkster is quite correct, I was not particularly enamoured with it at the time — but it had a great deal of advantage, Mr. Chairman, in that not only did I get to listen to what the Leader of the Opposition said, I also got to read it and, Mr. Chairman, it is as silly and as foolish and as valueless in print as it was in word.

Mr. Chairman, Interim Supply gives us all an opportunity to present points of view before the Chamber and we have been waiting anxiously on this side of the House for the Leader of the Official

Friday, 13 March, 1981

Opposition, to show some of the leadership that his party hoped he might be able to engender; to show some leadership that the people of Manitoba expect from Leaders of the Opposition in Governments of Manitoba, that has been the tradition of the past but, Mr. Chairman, after the Throne Speech Debate of this current session, after a number of different presentations that the Leader of the Opposition has made, his lack of direction on the Constitution; his inability to keep his caucus working as a unit, as an effective Opposition unit, and again on Wednesday of this week, this Chamber and the people of Manitoba are still waiting for the Member for Selkirk to show the leadership which his office demands and requires.

I listened very carefully to what the Leader of the Opposition was saying on Wednesday. I listened very carefully, Mr. Chairman, and one of the things that he said, and I will quote it, because it was quite a profound statement. "Mr. Chairman," and I quote, "there are a number of areas that should be undertaken and I want to deal now with some of the positive features that a positive government would undertake in order to bring about some oxygen into the economy of this Province of Manitoba so we could ensure that there would be job creation and opportunity for our young people which we haven't seen for the past three-and-a-half years."

Now the Leader of the Opposition, by that statement, was laying the groundwork for all of us to listen to his proposal as to what he would do should he be the next Premier of this province, and we all waited very anxiously for that. We have waited for two years for the Leader of the Opposition to tell us what they would do as government in this province.

Mr. Chairman, we are still waiting, and that oxygen that the Leader of the Opposition promised us turned out to be nitrous oxide, Mr. Chairman, laughing gas, because that's exactly what we got was nitrous oxide instead of oxygen. He went on and he spent the next 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman, and what did he do, what did he tell us? He told us one thing, and one thing only. The problem is, Mr. Chairman, he didn't tell us definitively, he alluded to it. He let us believe that maybe they are going to do this, but this is the only thing that he came out with as a positive statement in the next 15 minutes, and I quote again, Mr. Chairman. He said, "One of the principle platforms of the next New Democratic Party Government will be to maximize public participation in mineral development in the Province of Manitoba."

This is the kind of policy, Mr. Chairman, that drove mining exploration out of this province in their eight years of socialism; that saw the decline in investment in mining in the province go down, down, and down. It has only now started to revise, Mr. Chairman, since we have changed the policies and the taxation principles in the mining industry to become more competitive with other jurisdictions. It is now starting to rise again. Employment in the mining industry is good. The mining industry in sales and production is good and that is the only policy that he identified in his 30 minutes on Wednesday of this week, is that they would go back to a policy of taking over the mining industry and removing it as an economic factor in the Province of Manitoba.

Thank you kindly, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that is a policy which we hope you tell all people of

Manitoba, particularly the people in the mining communities in northern Manitoba that are working at the expanded mining operations in northern Manitoba; tell them that you are going to go back to a policy to cut their jobs out, Mr. Chairman. I invite the Leader of the Opposition to take that policy to northern Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there was a number of other things that just has to be dealt with in the course of this. He made references in his 30 minute nitrous oxide speech of creating employment, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Party that governed this province for eight years, and the last three of those eight years with 60 percent of the jobs coming from taxpayer dollars, government spending managed to create 10,000 jobs in three years. In the three years that we've been in power, and I will say it again and again and again, there are 30,000 jobs, 1,000 of which are by taxpayers' support. And they want to tell us that the people of Manitoba are going to go back to their economic initiatives that give us that kind of a dismal record of job creation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important right now for Manitobans to sit back and take a nice quiet calm look at what is facing them as a prospect for the next government of this province, if and when the people have the opportunity. On that side of the House we have a leader who, to date in two years, has not given us one definitive policy of what they would do in government; not one definitive policy, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— That wasn't definitive. For the Member for Rossmere, it wasn't definitive. They alluded to the fact that they would have more government participation in mining. They are not going to go on the election platform, Mr. Chairman, and say that all mining ventures will be forced participation to 51 percent or 50 percent; they won't say definitively what they are going to do, they won't say it. They will allude to it, Mr. Chairman, but they won't tell the people of Manitoba the extent to which they are willing to go in taking over the mining industry in northern Manitoba; they won't say that. There will be no definitive policy come from that party over there prior to the next election; it won't be definitive. If they do tell the truth, Mr. Chairman, they will remain perpetually in opposition, and that is why there will be no definitive policy come from them, because we have waited three-and-one-half years for definitive policies to come from that Opposition, and there have been none. There have been the doom and gloom criticisms, Mr. Chairman. It's almost as if we are faced with an Opposition of paranoids, because everything is wrong in the Province of Manitoba. But what is right with it, Mr. Chairman, is that in terms of the investment of the Province of Manitoba, the private sector investment, which doesn't involve taking money from my pocket as a taxpayer or any Manitoban's pocket as a taxpayer, that that money in private investment has increased dramatically in the last three-and-a-half years in the Province of Manitoba and that is the reason why there are 30,000 jobs in the private sector today that were not there in 1977 when those people had their great incentives for small business, their great development policies that would help the enterprise and the business sector of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I saw in the newspaper here just this morning, that the economic wizard from Brandon

East — for, is it for or from? No, it's for Brandon East, because he doesn't live there, he lives in Transcona. It's the economic wizard for Brandon East — come up with policy that there should be more government spending. Mr. Chairman, I think it's interesting to point out right now that in 1975 the Federal Government, in an attempt to take the dip out of a recession that the North American continent was going through, went into substantial deficit financing and program creation and the very kind of government spending that the Member for Brandon East suggested yesterday.

Where did that get us, Mr. Chairman? That got us to a \$13 billion deficit and rising. It got us to the Federal Government backing themselves into the corner where now the programs that they are undertaking to reduce their expenditures are not reduction in the Civil Service; they are cutting away at highway funding, which they eliminated some year and a half ago, the Province of Manitoba gets no more highway funding from the Federal Government; they are now trying to eliminate the infrastructure provision to our communities, the sewer — I forget the exact name of the program under Municipal Affairs — they're eliminating that; they are trying to foister on the province 90 percent of the costs of the RCMP. Those are the kinds of methods that the Federal Government are now using because they used in 1975 the system of stimulating the economy that the Member for Brandon East is suggesting that they would do as government.

It was wrong in 1975; it will be wrong in 1981; it will be wrong in 1982, because it leads the government, as it did with the Federal Government, to the inevitable position of cutting out worthwhile infrastructure programs which can help to develop the economy of this province and the business sector of this province.

So that, Mr. Chairman, what we got inadvertently from the Member for Brandon East in his newspaper article yesterday, was the declaration that under their government they are going to reduce the spending on road construction in Manitoba; they are going to reduce the spending on job creation, such as we have done; and they're going to go into the great willy-nilly programs of the mid-70s which caused us, as a province, to create 3,000 jobs per year on average.

Now, the other thing that's interesting with the Leader of the Opposition and his economic adviser for Brandon East, is they talk about what all they're going to do for the business sector. And this is one that I like to always get into, Mr. Chairman, what that party is going to do for the business sector and the small business sector. One thing that they had, Mr. Chairman, that we are all familiar with on this side of the House and all Manitobans are familiar with, they had gift taxes, and they had succession duties. The most penalty-laden gift tax and succession duty system in Canada. That is what they did for the small business sector. And who were the small business sector that were affected by succession duties and gift tax? Well, it was that very important part of the business sector, the small family farms, they were directly affected; and what did that government do to help them? Nothing. It affects every store owner, garage keeper, small manufacturer in the Province of Manitoba, will that party bring in succession duties

and gift taxes as the next government to help the small business community as they did up until 1977?

They talk about helping the small business community. Would they reduce, as we did, another 2 percent from the small business tax rate? We don't know, they haven't told us. Mr. Chairman, they won't tell us, they won't tell us. The other thing that they had in their glorious years was the corporate capital tax. Once again, who did that help? Did that really help the small business community, Mr. Chairman? No, no. It was a direct detriment to the small business community and we are expeditiously chiseling away at that one and removing it as a burden to the small business community. Are they going to bring that one back in?

You know, they're in difficult spot, Mr. Chairman, they're in the classic position of being caught between a rock and a hard spot, because the people of Manitoba know what they did for eight years did not work. Their economic policies; their method of spending; their cost control; their growth of the Civil Service; all of those issues defeated them in 1977. In 3 1/2 years, Mr. Chairman, we have not heard one single new idea from the Opposition. We can only assume, Mr. Chairman, that that party will propose to the people of Manitoba the identical things that got them defeated in 1977. They will go back into the purchase of farm land in the Province of Manitoba, as the Minister of Agriculture of the day promoted as the only way to keep small farmers in business and get new people into the farming business. That policy was wrong in 1973, Mr. Chairman, and it is wrong in 1981, and it is wrong in 1982 and it will be wrong forever because, Mr. Chairman, there are more farmers coming into the family farm business today under the loan program that this government reinstated, that our Minister of Agriculture reinstated, than ever came in under the NDP's land-lease program where they went out and bought the productive resource of the land. And bearing in mind, Mr. Chairman, that unholy coalition between NDP and Liberals in Ottawa — I just have to put this in front of my gentlemen opposite, because we're going to be in the Constitutional debate on the resolution shortly — this country was settled by people from Europe who could not own their own land. They left an oppressive regime in which they could not own the land and the tool of production as farmers. They moved to Canada to own their own land.

The Federal Government in Ottawa right now, backed by the socialists in Ottawa, do not want to entrench the right to land ownership in the new Bill of Rights in the Constitution. The government, from 1969 to 1977 in the Province of Manitoba, showed their complete disregard for the ownership of land by removing, Mr. Chairman, the first mortgage money availability to young farmers starting up in the business of farming in Manitoba, and replaced it with a program whereby they, as the government, would own the land and the resource, not the people, but the government. That's exactly the kind of regime that built this country because the pioneers, our forefathers, indeed their own forefathers, left regimes where they could not own their own land. And here we had it for eight years in Manitoba, a regime that wanted to revert back to the kind of landhold tenure system that prevented farmers from owning their own land.

Friday, 13 March, 1981

Mr. Chairman, if they tell the truth, that will be another one of their policy platforms for the next election, in which they will say, if they're truthful, that they will revert back to buying land, eliminate the long-term mortgages that get young farmers into the business of agriculture; if they tell the truth. But, Mr. Chairman, I tell you today, and I tell all Manitobans, those people will not tell the truth on the next election platform. They are going to hope to pull the silent Sam routine, say nothing, and hope that they can get away with it.

That will not happen, Mr. Chairman, because Manitobans in 1977 were placed by this government, who was then in Opposition, they indicated in 1977 what they would do to change the Province of Manitoba to bring in new policies, to bring in new direction. We did that and the people accepted that and it is working for the people of Manitoba today. They will not, Mr. Chairman, be able to say, and come up with concrete policy and platform positions for the next election. They will not, Mr. Chairman, because they cannot agree, No. 1, on how they should go about it, they have difficulty agreeing over there, and as we heard from the Member for St. Johns, they strengthened their chain by getting rid of some weak links, I believe is what he said today. I hope they don't get rid of the weakest link, which is their leader —(Interjection)— well, we won't ask that question. I hope that they don't strengthen their chain with the final move of replacing their leader, because he is the weakest link because he cannot and will not be able to develop the kind of policies that the people of Manitoba want for the next election. They will be devoid of concrete policy direction going into this next election. And if they aren't, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you and to all Manitobans that they will not be telling the truth going into the next election, that they will be trying to hide truly what they will do.

We have adequate demonstration over the past six months of what truth means to the Leader of the Opposition. We have seen the pamphlets go out, and the Minister of Economic Development in the Throne Speech debate in December, pointed out the errors in that document that went out as a mailer prior to the session starting. He pointed it out to the Leader of the Opposition, and not once, Mr. Chairman, but twice, the identical uncorrected false information went out, once under the signature of the Leader of the Opposition. His total regard for presenting Manitobans with the truth is now being documented in this House in question periods.

Bata Shoes, Glenella Creamery, the Member for Ste. Rose must be truly embarrassed to have a piece of information go out with the Glenella Creamery mentioned in it as being closed down, Mr. Chairman. He must be totally embarrassed and that kind of disregard for the truth, Mr. Chairman, is what will not elect them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes you do.

MR. ADAM: The member says that I should be embarrassed because my report indicated that the

Glenella Creamery had closed down. It did close down. They no longer make butter there, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, they have closed down the butter making, it's only a depot now. It's a receiving depot for cream and the cream is transferred to Brandon and that's where it's processed. So he had better eat his words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate that the member did not have a point of order or a point of privilege or anything in fact, because the Glenella Creamery still is operating and that's just exactly what he told us, and that is what we are telling the people of Manitoba. If he'd like to talk about Bata Shoes, if he'd like to go into the lie number 27, the lie number 28, we'll do that and we're going to do that on the next election platform, because you haven't developed policy direction, you haven't told the people of Manitoba what you will do as an alternate to this government, you cannot and you won't.

Mr. Chairman, we challenge you in this debate on Interim Supply; we challenge you in the Budget Speech Debate and we will challenge you on the public platform in the next election campaign, to come up with the policy directions that you would undertake as the next government of this province.

We will debate those in this forum and in the public forum, and if you have policies that you are truly going to implement and intend to implement, the people of Manitoba will not accept them because the people of Manitoba are not as far left wing as your backroom planning boys are. The people of Manitoba will not accept a party with no alternatives, with no policies and with no leadership, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I got so excited after hearing that address that I spilled my coffee on my notes. I just want to say the normal expression, Mr. Chairman, is that it's a hard act to follow, but I must say that that is an easy act to follow, and every time I hear the young Minister of Highways speak, I'm always amazed at how insulated his mind is. I really don't know whether other than coming to Winnipeg for the Legislative sessions, he has ever been outside his own area, because he really speaks with a fortress mentality of a rural south-western Manitoba member. He just does not appreciate the fact that Manitoba is bigger than his own back yard, or bigger than his own riding.

He has no appreciation for the problems of the people of Winnipeg, which I think is a hallmark of the Lyon administration. They have no interest in anything north or east of south-western Manitoba. They're not interested in the people of Winnipeg. They certainly have no interest in Northern Manitoba where we have four out of five members and they're not doing very well in Brandon, Mr. Chairman. My information is that the New Democratic Party will take both seats at the next provincial election so I don't know where the Minister went. He was upset

Friday, 13 March, 1981

when my Leader left when he was speaking; now I'm upset that he isn't here to hear my response and the response of my colleague. This is the old one-two urban-rural punch in regard to that particular address.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give some concrete examples today, from personal experience in my own riding and of people I've talked to in the north-eastern part of Winnipeg, the Elmwood-East Kildonan area, of some of the hardships that people are faced with that have nothing to do with these wondrous statistics that we heard from today. We have a battle of statistics going on between the two sides and we have the government trying to put the best light on the situation with numbers and the Opposition giving another side of the picture and in between the clash of those statistics are some real human casualties and I'm going to illustrate that in a few moments, some people that I've talked, who are suffering under the Conservative administration of Sterling Lyon, and have particularly been suffering in the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to read off reams of statistics. I simply say in regard to the joyous news about Manitoba continuing to have the second lowest unemployment rate in Canada, what do we have in terms of out-migration? Maybe we have the second highest rate of out-migration and that's the other part of the picture, that's the thing that always bothers me. I know exactly what's happening because the young people that I'm talking to and the people who are looking for employment, are looking outside of our borders, and I want to give you an example of several cases that have come to my attention in the last ten days, Mr. Chairman.

I'll give you an example. I had to have my car repaired the other day and I went into a garage and talked to the fellow who operates the garage. He normally has two mechanics working for him and a woman on the cash register. He said to me business is so bad, that he's considering closing up his operation. Now here's a man who came from Holland a number of years ago, set up a garage and has been successfully operating as an individual operator for five years and the economy is so bad that he's considering closing. —(Interjection)— How are things in Holland? I don't know, I haven't been there since 1960. But I imagine that things are better in other provinces in Canada than they are in the Province of Manitoba.

This man turned to me in desperation and said, what do you think I should do? He said, I'm considering closing my garage, and he said I'm considering going to work for somebody else, and that's what everybody is thinking. That's what everybody is thinking in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, but do you know what happens? It doesn't work. If that man lays off his cashier and if he lets go his other mechanic and if he closes his operation, there are three jobs gone and then he's going to go to somebody else and say, do you have employment for me? Well what happens is there's a whole cycle at work here and when people start closing, it becomes increasingly difficult for other people to absorb them in the labour force.

Okay, that's one example of a man and I said to him, surely to god, at this point in time, with used car sales being down, with the fact that people are

probably retaining their old cars, surely, — and I talk now partly to the Minister of Fitness who knows something about the car business — I said to him surely at this point in time, when people are reluctant to buying new cars because they don't have the money, they must be repairing their old cars. Business must be good. I mean, I was really taken aback when I talked to this man, and he said that isn't happening, so I'm not sure what's happening. He thinks that people are taking their cars to people who are moonlighting and are getting their repairs done by people on the side. But whatever is happening, whether we're driving less or running our cars down more or going to little friends and acquaintances who do the work at night, it's having a hit on the economy and a very bad one.

I talked to a fellow earlier this week who is an Elmwood resident; he is a carpenter; he is fortunate in that he said he's working across the street at the Great-West Life project, but he said last year he spent \$2,000 in plane tickets flying up and down the country to get employment and he said after the Great-West job finishes, Mr. Chairman, he said he's packing up his family and he's going to Vancouver. I said to him, stick around, stick around, we're going to win the election and we're going to get the economy moving again, so wait until the fall. I said wait until the October Election, or the May Election, the May Election or the October Election. I said things may turn around, —(Interjection)—

I also warned him, Mr. Chairman, that if he went to Vancouver he is going to be confronted with a \$200,000 house. That's going to be a problem. That's one of the reasons more people aren't leaving Manitoba. The boom is taking place elsewhere and it's creating a problem for people in terms of moving. Mr. Chairman, that was another example.

I met a carpenter and the carpenter told me that he cannot practice his trade so he's working in some other type of operation because of the sad state of the construction industry in Manitoba.

Last night I talked to a chap who was also a carpenter and he said that in the last five years, he said this is the worst winter and he's been unemployed most of the winter; he's waiting for the spring.

A couple of days ago, I talked to a young woman who is a Commerce graduate and I said to her, how is the job market, how are you doing in terms of finding a job? She said to me, I have a job. I said, that's good, where? She said she has a job with Shell Oil in Edmonton, so she's leaving for Edmonton. Then she said this, Mr. Chairman, the students that she knows who are graduating in Manitoba this year who are staying in Manitoba, are unemployed. They don't have jobs. She said, the ones who have jobs are the ones who are leaving the province. So that's the breakdown. If you want a job, Mr. Chairman, you go out of Manitoba. If you want to stay home and hang on and manage and get by, you're going to have to live at home, work part-time or be unemployed. Now I'm telling you, the Minister of Finance, he thinks this isn't so. He thinks that things are good in Manitoba. I'm telling him these are concrete examples of people that I've talked to in the past week or 10 days. I'd like to hear your examples, let's throw away the statistics. You tell me, you give me some examples of people who are doing

well in Manitoba because I don't find any evidence of that, Mr. Chairman.

I also want to tell the Minister of Highways, and he's not going to like this statistic, but the New Democratic Party has never had a higher membership than it has today, 20,000 members, and I predict that by the fall that figure is going to rise to 25,000 or 30,000 members which will be a record high and is going to auger very poorly for the present government because that is going to be the base from which we will move, and that will be the basis of a New Democratic Party victory, because people are so turned off by this government that they are desperately looking for an alternative and there are two people who antagonize them to no end and I'll tell you who they are. They are the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliot Trudeau and the Premier of Manitoba, Sterling Lyon. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, when I talk to people and I raise those names to them, I can see a visible difference in their appearance. When I see the face on people when you mention the word Trudeau, I'll tell you I have seen twisted hatred. —(Interjection)— And when I mention the name of Sterling Lyon, the reaction is that they want Lyon out. That's all that people say. When I mention the name of my leader, they like my leader. Yes, sir, they do.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you what Allan Fotheringham has to say about your leader, maybe you read his article. On March 2nd, only a week ago he said this, in Manitoba there is great anticipation as to the big question, what will leave first, the entire Manitoba population or Sterling Lyon's government? That's a question, isn't it? What's going first? Is everybody going to leave or are we going to get the government first? It's got to be one or the other. One or the other. And, then Mr. Fotheringham says that Mr. Lyon is the only living politician on earth who is to the right of Ronnie Reagan and then he says the heavy rumour around is that his next tax will be aimed at the rubber tips on crutches. But, he stands up for Sterling in this regard, he stands up for the Premier. He says, it is not true that he kicks small children as he leaves the Legislature, he merely shoves them into snow drifts. So at least that alleged rumour about the Premier beating up on little kids has been proved to be inaccurate.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not surprised at the concern of the Minister. I found it amusing. The Minister is worried, he wants to see the NDP platform. He's concerned that the NDP is scoring on their platform, so he says put up your platform so that the government can spend its time criticizing our election platform. Isn't that right? They are afraid of defending their own platform, they want us to put up ours. —(Interjection)— Well, they have potholes, that's what they have. They've got potholes. They want the two platforms up so that we can play criss-cross. We'll hit their platform and they'll hit our platform. Mr. Chairman, they forgot one thing, they're the government. They are the ones who are doing things. They are doing things, Mr. Chairman, and we are looking at what they are doing, and they are not doing very well, so they want to deal with promises.

They want to promise for the 1980s and they want us to promise for the 1980s and then we will look at each others promises and then we will decide, Mr.

Chairman, as to what is pro and what is con about the various promises. Well, Mr. Chairman, we looked at their promises. We remember what they promised the people of Manitoba in 1977 and they haven't delivered. They have failed to deliver. They have failed to deliver. They said they will sit back and let the private sector generate the economy and boom away and increase output, well, that's what they said. They said we'll lay it on the private sector and they'll come through. Well, we have seen in the last three or four years what's happened, we've seen the restraint program. The Government has continued to run deficits. What happened to your lack of deficits? What happened to your balanced budget? We're going to talk of that at Budget time. Yes, sir, we're going to talk about that and I'll bet you that the Minister of Finance is going to have a face that's as red as the Minister of Economic Development when he brings in probably the biggest deficit in modern times in Manitoba and we're going to have a very interesting look at that. We're going to look at the old combined capital and combined current and see how it compares to the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, what is the sense of both of us releasing our election platforms now? Call the election and we'll give you our platform, and we will look at your platform, because we'll then be talking about the future, 1981 to 1986, that's what we'll be talking about. But in the meantime, don't ask us to sit back and just watch while the economy is being ruined by your government. You're putting up the policies and we're examining them and that is the procedure. That is the procedure. The people will decide whether they want five more years of this government or whether they want to throw — I hesitate to say this, Mr. Chairman, because it may be unparliamentary — but I say, it's either retain the government for another five years or throw the bums out. That's the alternative. I tell you, when I go to people and I'm talking to a lot of people these days and asking them what they think and so on, they say automatically, I'm telling you it's as scripted as these questions are every day from the backbenchers in the House.

People say, we've got to get rid of Lyon. I'm telling you that's all that they want. That's all they want. Get rid of this guy, he's blown the ball game. Get rid of the government. That's what people have on their minds and I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman, that they are not saying we're going to give Lyon five more years of prosperity, or we never had it so good, or we're going to give him a second chance. They are not saying that. Mr. Chairman, I advise you as the person who is running in Radisson, to ask your people what they think of the performance of the government and your leader and I suggest to you that the overwhelming percentage is against the Lyon Government. I don't care what you do at the Budget time, and I don't care what you promise to the people of Manitoba in 1981, they are not buying. They are not buying what you are saying. They are being deluged, Mr. Chairman, with a lot of negative impressions that are emanating from the government.

I've said to the Minister of Economic Development that doom and gloom in Manitoba doesn't come from the Opposition. There's no way. There is no way that we can generate doom and gloom, it's

impossible. The doom and gloom is coming from the public reaction to government policies. — (Interjection)— Right, and the government's response to countering and coming up with new initiatives to stimulate the economy, is that they spend money on hiring a bunch of P.R. men, and spending money on ads which are running every day of the week on Manitoba television, to say that everything is all right. Well, that's not how you win elections, Mr. Chairman, that is not how you win them.

To say to people every day, we hear in the House how the media isn't accurately reflecting the government, I'm waiting for a government announcement which you would expect from a left wing government, that they are going to set up their own newspaper. I mean, isn't that logical? Don't you think the Conservatives should have their own newspaper about my blue heaven and true blue skies and blue skies and all that sort of stuff? The good news boys, you know, nothing but blue skies. I don't know what the new Finance Minister is going to promise us but I know, I know that he's not going to be able to deliver.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got 10 minutes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the problems are real. The solutions of course are more difficult and there are a number of options. I want to mention some of the recent headlines that have appeared in the Winnipeg Press — the Free Press to be specific — in the last couple of months. Housing starts hit 20-year low in city.

Well, what's the counter to that? Are we going to get one of the Ministers stand up and say that housing starts are at an all-time high? You know, the Minister got up the other day, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who is still here, and he read about how there was a terrific boom in terms of housing starts. That's only for a month or two. We want to look at the record. And to counter that, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the other side of those statistics, you'll see the following figures: a \$42 million drop in building permits in the City of Winnipeg; \$42 million down. Never mind the percentages; there are the hard figures. An increase in demolitions. That's not a very good statistic, that demolitions are up. Building permits drop, February 3rd. (Interjection)— Well, they are going to get demolished. Manitoba's economy slips below zero growth mark, January 24th, mentioning that we may have the lowest growth rate in 20 years and perhaps the lowest since the depression.

Well, you know what the effect of these articles is, Mr. Chairman? Doom and gloom; doom and gloom. But I mean, what is the source of these articles? City of Winnipeg turns out these statistics. Housing starts come from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; they're spreading doom and gloom. Professor Ruben Bellan, an economist, "Manitoba builders are cautious". The newly elected President of the Housing and Urban Development Association, Guy Hobman. He's spreading doom and gloom, and he's a free enterpriser.

And the tradesmen themselves, 4,000 out of 29,000 construction workers are jobless. I talked to this one fellow, he said there were 4,500 guys in his

union, and he said 3,500 aren't around anymore. He said they're down to 1,000, but he said if there's an upswing in the economy, Mr. Chairman, he said, they'll come back to Manitoba; at least that's what he hoped. But they're not working in Manitoba and that's one of the reasons why our outmigration figures are so high, because people are going where the action is; and the action isn't here. — (Interjection)— Well, some of my colleagues say they may never come back and that is the problem; that is going to be the problem confronted by the government, namely, will they come back.

One fellow here who's quoted, a Mr. Dobbie, from the construction labourers' union, he said that 450 of his union's 700 members are unemployed. That's incredible, Mr. Chairman. That's probably 60-something percent, 65 percent unemployed, and he said it's going up every day. I'm reading from mid-January. He says, some are on welfare, some have left the province, and some are on UIC. — (Interjection)— well, that is the problem.

Then we get figures like this coming from the government side, where Deputy Premier Don Craik was quoted as saying in January, he said there was a 9.8 percent increase in the gross national product. You know, I remember hearing that on the radio, and I thought gee whiz, that's really good; almost a 10 percent increase. And then out came the real facts; the real facts as opposed to what Mr. Craik had attempted to do, namely, that the real value of the province's total output has declined by 3/4 of a percent. So when you look at real dollars we're down; it's a minus. A government minus after taking inflation into account.

So Mr. Chairman, I think that covers most of what I have said. I am amused and I don't know whether the remarks of the Minister of Highways, whether they were heard by my leader, but the government is nervous. The government is nervous, they want us to give them our election platform now. They would like it now, in advance of the election, so they could look at it. And they don't want to run on their record; they want to run against our proposed policies, because they are nervous. They are nervous, Mr. Chairman, about defending their record and so what they are looking for is some way out. And the only way out they can come up with, is the Minister of Highways was attacking the record of the Schreyer administration. — (Interjection)— Yes, he was. He said the only way for them to get re-elected is to attack the policies of the Schreyer administration in the '70s. I have to tell him — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, when the election is called we will lay down our platform and you will lay down your platform. Right? That's right. We'll both show our hands and the people of Manitoba will decide.

But I'll tell you what is against the Conservatives, Mr. Chairman, the fact that, in addition to putting down their platform, they are going to have to put down their record. They are going to put down their record, and their record is going to be the thing that the people of Manitoba focus on because they're not going to buy their promises anymore; they're not going to buy those promises anymore. They will compare the P.C. record with the suggestions and the platform of the New Democratic Party. That's the choice, and in particular, I'll narrow it down even further for my honourable friend, they will ultimately

make their decision on the basis of the P.C. record, that is going to be the real test of the voter. Has the Conservative government, have they done well or have they done poorly? And I tell you that 60 percent and more of Manitobans, maybe 70 percent, are down on the Conservative government.

Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a one-term government. They are going to have the unique distinction of being in office for a four-year term, and then out the door. Mr. Chairman, part of the problem has been the belief, the mistaken belief in a so-called free enterprise system. They have not used government as an instrument, they have not used government as an active force in the economy and in our society. I think the problem relates to the First Minister, who has been in the hip pockets of the big corporations for so long, Mr. Chairman, that he has lint on the brain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, over the last month of this past session we have heard many speeches from members of the Opposition, from both the present Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts and the new group which is just immediately to my right here.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, first of all, and deal briefly with the speech that was made by the Member for Elmwood. He used a number of examples of what was happening to the economy, unfortunately he hasn't had enough experience, I guess, in the field of business to know really what's happening, and when he talks about the problems in the service station business I can tell him that I am having the same problems, because it becomes very difficult to sell snow tires when there's no snow. It becomes very difficult to sell batteries when it's not cold outside; it becomes very difficult to sell tune-ups when it's not cold outside; it's very difficult to sell starters when it's not cold outside. So I will be the first to admit that the repair business in the Province of Manitoba, in the automobile sector, you can talk to any parts people or anybody, has been slow because we've had such a beautiful winter.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that benefit has gone to the consumer and the consumer has been better off because of the winter. Simple, simple solution to it. So a lot of these things have explanations to them which the member of course, doesn't want to see.

However, Mr. Chairman, the member touched on one point that I want to deal with today. He talked about leadership. Leadership, Mr. Chairman, and I want to talk today about leadership. He said that people in Manitoba aren't happy with our leader; they don't like him. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that one of the biggest and fundamental approaches to this party and the bringing together of all the whole caucus here, has been our leader because if you're going to control the caucus of 32 individuals who are all elected from their own constituency, I want to say to you that you need a man who can bring that whole group of people together and make them work as a unit, and our leader has done that.

I want to say I think that the people of Manitoba will realize that we have a leader that is taking this province in a direction which, in the short term,

causes certain problems in certain areas; but I want to tell you that in the long run, it is the right approach. One brief example on that is the stand that he took on the Constitution; he was one lonely voice, and now we've got up to eight governments in Canada agreeing with that and public opinion coming that way. So if we wanted to have taken the short-term political gain we would have done the same thing the Leader of the Opposition does, put up our finger and see where the wind was blowing from that day and gone that direction; but we didn't. There are principles involved and we have the leadership in this party which we are all happy with, and know that will bring us into the next election in a very very comfortable position.

But let's contrast that with what we've got over there. The question one really has to ask today is who leads the New Democratic Party in the Province of Manitoba and in what direction are they being led? Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of quotations here which I would like to read. Game shows are very popular these days, and maybe some of the members would like to tell me who said these different quotations.

Mr. Chairman, here's a quotation, "In the free world, of course, one has the right by law to actively associate oneself with any number of political parties, a freedom not available in Communist countries, therefore, I am opposed to anyone who in any way supports Communism or Fascism. It is my observation that these apologists for Communism, and their supporters, now run the machinery of the New Democratic Party". Mr. Chairman, who said that? —(Interjection)— Frank Syms. We have a winner here; Frank Syms. This wasn't some right-wing political adversary, as the honourable members opposite would have us believe, it was one of their own; one of their own, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, another one. "The policy was forced through the convention by union spokesmen, their camp followers and gutless politicians who privately admitted it was sheer lunacy, but lacking the courage to say that to the convention. Obviously the current crop of leaders of the New Democratic Party learned nothing from our eight years in office; fine, but let them not pretend all NDP members are as naive and misguided as they are". Who said that, Mr. Chairman? —(Interjection)— Herbie Schultz, you're right. Mr. Chairman, everybody knows who Mr. Schultz was. —(Interjection)— I won't go into that, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think he had some prominent position in the previous administration and was adviser to the Premier at that time.

Mr. Chairman, here's another interesting one. "My actions now are determined by two factors. I cannot support a position which is completely contrary to the fundamental principles of freedom; and No. 2, an atmosphere has been and is being created that makes it impossible to be effective in the party if one does not appreciate the position of one group within organized labour". Who said that? The Member for Inkster said that, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you, we heard a beautiful demonstration here today by the Member for St. Johns. He got up and said they got rid of the weak links in the party; the weak links.

Mr. Chairman, here we have the Member for Inkster and two of his colleagues, who I might add,

one was the Minister of Education, one was the Minister of Corrections in the previous administrations, are now called weak links. Mr. Chairman, if they were the strong ones, what's left over there. But, Mr. Chairman, let's see what the Member for St. Johns who says the weak links left; but what does he do, Mr. Chairman, where is his bent going? I have to quote another one, Mr. Chairman, "The threat of hell fire and damnation for communist supporters tipped the balance of voters in Reverend Donald Malinowski's favour last night as St. Johns NDP nominated him as the candidate".

Now, Mr. Chairman, who supported the attempt to dump Father Malinowski. Mr. Chairman, it was the Member for St. Johns who says the weak links have left, and he supported a certain individual who is known to have a bit of communist leanings for years.

Mr. Chairman, here we have a leader of the New Democratic Party who really, as the Member for City Centre put it, who really is leading this party, is having all these internal confrontations at a time when he doesn't have a policy. He's got a policy vacuum. Mr. Chairman, I can see somebody leaving a party when they have major differences with regard to exactly the direction they're going, but really what the Member for Burrows said the other day was really astounding. "It has become apparent to me that the New Democratic Party Conventions merely go through the motions of making policy decisions, but the subsequent prioritization or deprioritization thereof is in the hands of the President of the Federation of Labour".

Mr. Chairman, one has to ask oneself who is really leading that party. Which other policy positions of the party may be similarly precarious of being deprioritized by the same Federation of Labour. "It is my feeling," says the Member for Burrows, "that there are many Manitobans who would welcome a socialist movement beholden to no interest groups".

Mr. Chairman, this is not a member of the Conservative Party saying that there are problems, that the union leaders are controlling the New Democratic Party, it's one of their own people who has left because he was concerned about the direction that the present Leader of that Party, along with his cohorts, are taking this particular party. It's not us saying it, Mr. Chairman, it's not some rednecked Tory saying it, it's their own former people; the former Minister of Education, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it goes on. Mr. Chairman, here's another quotation. Is it vague that my concerns are echoed by an NDP member writing in a letter to the current edition of the New Democratic newspaper in condemning of two NDP Federal candidates in Winnipeg, not named, who endorsed the efforts of the communist formed Manitoba Peace Council, saying that the disarmament of Western Alliance, which says the writer, "no similar effort is evidenced in the Soviet Union or Warsaw Pact countries where military offensive capability is escalating at a furious rate. Mr. Chairman, this particular quotation again comes from our former candidate of the New Democratic Party, namely, Frank Syms.

Mr. Chairman, it isn't just that the particular problems that the New Democratic Party is facing is within the realms of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, one wonders really what direction is being moved by this

particular party at this time, and, Mr. Chairman, we just heard not too long ago that the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Nova Scotia resigned. Mr. Chairman, the thing one has to ask is why did he resign, what was his reason; was it personal, or what was it? Mr. Chairman, here is another member resigning, not in Manitoba, but somewhere else who is concerned about the policies and the direction that the New Democratic Party is taking. He says, Mr. Chairman, that one factor in the rift was that there was a minority within the party who subscribed to a type of communism.

Mr. Chairman, if the members opposite want to go into the next election, whether it be this year or next year, and talk about leadership, Mr. Chairman, we are proud to say that we are head and shoulders above anything that the honourable members can put up on the other side.

Let's deal a little further, Mr. Chairman. First of all, it's become very very clear from the different statements uttered by members, or former members, of the New Democratic Party that there is a real problem; that the Manitoba Federation of Labour and labour as a whole is exercising a very very strong influence in the New Democratic Party. We have heard today that the Member for St. Johns says that the weak links have left.

Mr. Chairman, I have to reiterate again, I came in here in 1973, one of the members that has been the strongest, in this particular Legislature for the New Democratic Party, is the Member for Inkster, and I don't think anybody on this side of the House will deny that. Now he's called a weak link in that system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal briefly with some of the comments that the Leader of the Opposition has made over the last little while. It was brought up the other day that in a pamphlet that was distributed there were certain statements in that pamphlet that were misleading, and as the Minister of Agriculture points out, were totally untrue. That was pointed out several months ago, but the New Democratic Party persists in still mailing out that particular brochure. The Leader of the Opposition in an interview to one of the magazines here in Manitoba, says, and it's been quoted by the Minister of Economic Development, do you see a future for a resurrected Manitoba Development Corporation; and this is the Leader of the Opposition saying, "Possibly, but I feel the message on the various undertakings in this area wasn't too clear". The message on the various undertakings in this area wasn't too clear; the NDP inherited, Mr. Chairman, the NDP inherited Flyer, the Lord Selkirk and Saunders Aircraft. Mr. Chairman, they inherited the Lord Selkirk; the other two were gone into, started with by the Member for Brandon East who was replaced so that the Member for Inkster, the weak link, could clean it up. That's what happened, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Inkster realized the political downsides of doing what was happening at that time, and I am saying that is my opinion, but I think that they realized the problems that they were being faced with and how the whole thing was running out of control and they put him in place. Facts will verify that there was a slow tightening up of all policies by the Manitoba Development Corporation when the Member for Inkster took over to try and ease the problems that

were happening, and there were certain rationalizations that took place. But it wasn't the Member for Brandon East who is now, Mr. Chairman, the man who is studying the facts of decentralization and has done a great deal of work on this subject, as it goes on further in the article to say.

Let's deal with Flyer Industries. Mr. Chairman, the first loan to Flyer went out with the New Democratic Party. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition has the gall to say that the New Democratic Party inherited Flyer. Mr. Chairman, that's an untruth. Then he goes on, as the Member for Inkster has pointed out, the Lord Selkirk was there, the loan was in place, and there were difficulties with that one, but then he goes on to say that the New Democratic Party inherited Saunders Aircraft. Mr. Chairman, that's a direct falsehood. Here is a press release that went out on September 23rd, 1970, and it says in there and I quote from there. "Mr. Evans said Saunders Aircraft officials have been negotiating with the Manitoba Government since April on this project". Mr. Chairman, that was September 23rd, 1970. If you go back to April 1970, who was in power, Mr. Chairman? It wasn't the Conservative Government, Mr. Chairman. Here he is now trying to claim that it was our doing or the previous administration's doing, and what does he say, Mr. Chairman, — it's a beautiful line — "The NDP inherited but I feel the message on various undertakings in this area wasn't too clearly told".

Mr. Chairman, I am telling the people of Manitoba it was them, the group, the bunch led by the Member for Selkirk, that did those two projects, and I would challenge him to not go around the province giving this kind of misleading information to the people.

Mr. Chairman, that's only one example. Mr. Chairman, last year I got up in the Legislature on May 16th, and I made a speech at that time and referred to the problem that the NDP were sowing at that time throughout Manitoba, and that was one in which they said it was the Conservative Government that had closed down Limestone. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into my speech. This was May 16th, 1980, about a year ago, a little less than a year ago. Mr. Chairman, the other day in this House it was reported on a New Democratic Party letterhead that the Leader of the Opposition said — what did he say, Mr. Chairman, — He said; "the overall economic growth and energy saving would have been aided in orderly development of Hydro, if orderly development of Hydro wasn't cancelled in 1978".

Mr. Chairman, a year after I made a speech in the Legislature, the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Treasury Benches in 1977 when this happened, but the Hydro was shut down, the decision to close Limestone was made before this government took office. Mr. Chairman, we then went ahead and told the Leader of the Opposition that there was a misstatement in that release, but what happens? The Member for St. Rose, in his paper, the Dauphin Herald, what does he say, after we've corrected it, he perpetrates the lie. He says overall economic growth and energy saving would have been aided in orderly development of Hydro if orderly development of Hydro was not cancelled in 1978.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Rose just indicated the kind of heavy weight he is in this whole thing; the strong link in the chain. He claps when somebody points out that he has made an erroneous misleading statement to the people in his constituency, and I think that's a serious problem in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined today, the type of problems that the New Democratic Party have, and I really have to ask, and I know what the answer is going to be from the people of Manitoba when they see the problems that the New Democratic Party is having; not being run by a leader but being run by the Manitoba Labour Federation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, and that again, I reiterate, doesn't come from this side of the House, it comes from their own people; their ex-own people, I should say. Mr. Chairman, we realize that the Leader of the Opposition is going to enunciate certain policies. I suggest to you, and the Member for Pembina, the Minister of Highways, has outlined a number very very well in the last little while when he spoke, there will be a return to succession duties if they are elected; they'll reinstate the capital asset tax to the small businessman, Mr. Chairman; they're going to continue to develop their state farm policy. All Crown land sale programs will be stopped. We know that.

But, Mr. Chairman, more importantly, what will they do? Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the Leader of the Opposition, if elected, would increase sales tax and he would increase personal income tax, and, Mr. Chairman, I say that because he has stated publicly, that he will review the financing of it for education and that he believes it should be funded from a larger share of the growth taxes, such as income tax and sales tax. So, Mr. Chairman, I say to you today, that the NDP party stands for increased sales tax and increased income tax, if ever elected.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the people of Manitoba will see precisely the things that I have enunciated here today, will see the problems that the New Democratic Party have, will realize that the weak links aren't the ones that left. Mr. Chairman, it reminds of a little story in my particular area.

There was a certain church that was having internal difficulties, Mr. Chairman, and what happened is two or three broke away from that church and formed their own group. Out of that whole group, out of maybe the 100 families that were involved in that, left the others behind and said that they were the new group and what they really did was kick everybody else out. So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that's really what's happening here, that there are a number of people over here that have seen what is happening to the New Democratic Party, were not happy with it and, Mr. Chairman, are trying to do something about it; and the people of Manitoba will see what the New Democratic Party is really all about.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say we've got a tremendous Leader. There is party solidarity on this side. He is a man of principle, a man who is not scared to enunciate policy. But, Mr. Chairman, over there we have a group of individuals who are having the guts torn out of them and as one of these particular letters from a certain individual that worked for the previous administration says, the

policy was forced through the convention by the union spokesman, their camp followers and gutless politicians, who privately admitted, it was sheer lunacy but lacking the courage to say that to the convention.

Mr. Chairman, they've got big problems over there. I'm not complaining about those problems, because I think the people of Manitoba will really see, the next time they're asked to mark their X, where they will really put it, where there is leadership, where there is some direction in this country, in a time, Mr. Chairman, when I believe that we need strong leadership. We aren't in the expansion area economy of the late Sixties, early Seventies and, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba people are fortunate to have at this time of history, a person who is a strong individual, a principled individual who will lead this party to another election and another victory next time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has referred to the fact that they have unity in their group. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that unity in the group is not always a positive asset. I can tell you that until two weeks ago, I had unity in my group. There is now a change in that situation, Mr. Chairman, and I welcome the change, I do not reject it.

I do, Mr. Chairman, want to say a few things particularly — and I'm going to try to be brief about the personality questions that have been raised — from time to time, Mr. Chairman, there have been jibes which have referred to personalities in this House and those jibes have taken place as between former colleagues. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, I would ask every other member in this House, and I would ask my friends in the New Democratic Party to watch and see whether I am not correct in saying, that I have never made a jibe except in answer to something that has come from over there and that is what will continue to happen. When the other fellows, and interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, they now try to associate me as a friend of the Conservatives, the very same people who in 1969, in 1968, said that I would not be a good Leader for the New Democratic Party because I was too left-winged and without having changed a single view, those same people now call me a right-wing Conservative.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to stay away from it. I am going to stay away from it, but I will give as good as I have to take, and I ask you to note — I ask you to note in each case when that type of thing happens, and it will happen — that it will not be initiated by myself, it will be a response, and I hope that the response will be better than what is initiated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has referred to the fact that the New Democratic Party has problems. I'm not going to deal with that extensively — but I do want to refer back to Richard II in Shakespeare, when Richard II was being deposed and somebody came and said that they had terrible problems — Richard II said on the verge of being deposed — and I hope I'm right about the II, maybe there are some Shakespeareans here who can correct me — he said that my problem is losing

problems. He had lots of problems, which the people were going to remove from him and that was his problem.

The New Democratic Party problem is not their problem. The New Democratic Party problem is that they insist they have no problem. They insist that the weak links have been removed. They insist that everything that has happened has made them better and they compare their group to a chain and they say that the chain is as strong as its weakest link. Well, Mr. Chairman, then you have to survey which is the weakest link. Now I am not going to identify it. I am not going to but, Mr. Chairman, I consider what does the St. Johns constituency say about their member? They have gone to the public. They have gone to the public and they have said that their member is a bad individual, is a person who does horrible things and I certainly would not confirm that. But if the chain, the whole of them are as strong as the weakest link and St. Johns says that their member is such a terrible person, then one must consider the whole to be as strong as the Member for St. Johns.

That's what the Member for St. Johns said. That the chain is as strong as its weakest link and the Member for St. Johns doesn't have much regard — or at least he did not have the same regard for the Member for St. Johns, the present Member for Point Douglas — as he did for the person who is opposing him.

I don't think that a caucus is a chain and that one identifies the strength of the caucus by picking out the weakest member and saying, you are all reduced to that level, but that's the Member for St. Johns' identification of the New Democratic Party caucus. That puts them in a pretty bad position if they have to gauge their member by what St. Johns has said about their own present candidate and I don't know how they are going to be able to rationalize that.

So their problem is not that they have problems, because I have, and my friend the Member for Burrows, and my friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I can tell you that I have problems with the Member for Burrows and the Member for Winnipeg Centre, and the Member for Burrows has problems with the Member for Winnipeg Centre and with me, and the Member for Winnipeg Centre has problems with the Member for Burrows and myself. We, Mr. Chairman, accept the fact, that when there is a group of people together the interrelationship creates problems and that people are strong when they are able to deal with their problems and the weakness of the New Democratic Party is that insist they have no problems. They will have to live with that situation, Mr. Chairman. They are now they say, more unified than ever and I suppose if they lose another member that will make them stronger still in their minds and that is their problem. That is their problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina, the Minister of Highways, got up and said that the New Democratic Party is going to lose the election, but they're going to be unfair and they are not going to enunciate certain positions; they're going to hide them. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to you that the positions indicated by the Member for Pembina, that I hope there is a party in the Province of Manitoba that will enunciate those positions and the party that enunciates those positions will win the

next election. Mr. Chairman, all of those positions — and I am going to deal with them — and it's not because they enunciated those positions that they lost the election, the New Democrats, it's because they backed off them or hid them under a bushel.

Now those positions, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Pembina says are so reprehensible to the people of the Province of Manitoba are; number one, that the people of this province use their initiative, use their power, use their economic sense to say that from now on we are going to see that our mineral resources are developed by ourselves in conjunction with anybody else who wishes to go along with us and that by doing that, we will not be in a position later of saying to the owners of our mining companies upon whom we are dependent, that you make it and we'll take it, which is the policies of the Conservatives and the Liberals which never succeed, because the company say if you take it, we won't make it.

That policy, Mr. Chairman, resulted in two years time — and I wish we would have had a little longer time — but in two years time we found the mine. We found the mine that will more than pay for, has already more than paid for, every cent that has been spent on exploration. The Minister of Finance is shaking his head. If Hudson Bay has to put up \$28 million to be equal to us, what is our share worth? \$28 million. We didn't spend \$28 million on exploration and they have to put \$28 million up to merely be equal to what we spent, which was perhaps \$1 million in exploration.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has just said something that scares the hell out of me. He says we haven't got a nickel. So what he's saying is that he'd sell our other share for a dime. We haven't got a nickel, he's saying it's not worth a nickel. He got \$28 million, equivalent. Mr. Chairman, it is such an unsophisticated nonsensical statement, that he is saying that our share in that mine is not worth a nickel, or we don't have a nickel. Can we get a nickel for it? We can get \$28 million for it if we get the equivalent of what the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company put up.

Mr. Chairman, the people who go to the public of Manitoba and say to the Member for Pembina, you do not know what you are talking about. You are going to sell our resources or put us in a position, whereby we will have no annual return but there is a party out there, and I believe it will be the Progressive Party that will say, that we are going to see to it that the public uses its good sense, not to sell out on our mineral resources, but to have a role in developing them ourselves so that we have an income, not merely from a royalty tax which is based only on profits and doesn't guarantee you a nickel if you really want to know, because if the company makes nothing, you get nothing despite the fact that they've taken the concentrate from the ground.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the Minister has indicated that the tax which seized the concentrate being taken from the ground and returning nothing, is a satisfactory situation. I say if it's going to return nothing, leave it in the ground until it will return something. But he says he can take it from the ground, sell it, don't get a nickel, if the company doesn't show a profit because of all the depletion allowances they got, because of all the

incentive allowances they got, let them take it out of the ground and get nothing. I say leave it in the ground and wait till it's worth something. Look what has happened to oil. Oil was selling in 1973 at \$2.75 a barrel. Now on the world market, it's over \$40.00 a barrel.

Mr. Chairman, the New Democratic Party didn't lose the election because of their land policy. They lost it because they backed off from their land policy. They said it was no good. They said at the beginning and it made a good deal of sense, that there will be a complete, free new option provided to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba. Nobody will be required to sell a foot of land; nobody will be required to buy a foot of land; nobody will be compelled to rent a foot of land, but those who wanted to sell it, if an agreement on price could be reached, there will be a public buyer as well as a private buyer. Not taking away one, but adding another. Those who want to rent it, there will be a place to rent from the public as well as from the private. So we are adding one landlord, not removing one. And those, Mr. Chairman, who for years had been saying that a farmer lives poor and dies rich, we are merely going to give them an option to live a little richer and die a little poorer. To live on his income, rather than have it all invested in farm lands, and not a single citizen of the Province of Manitoba would be required to do it.

But Mr. Chairman, the farmers that were on the land got greedy, and they said yes, we are tenants now, but we see that this land that we rented out, which was worth \$200 an acre when we rented it, is now worth \$500 an acre and we want an option to buy it so we want the state to have subsidized our ownership of land. And because there was tremendous pressure, and because it was spelled out that we were perceived, by the way, by, "gutless politicians" — and there weren't that many of them, but they can create fear in the hearts of others — that we had to go that way.

And therefore, Mr. Chairman, what we ended up with, which was a policy which could conceivably or which would have led to, if it wasn't that immediate step it would have led to the next step whereby we would have made it possible for a farmer to rent land until the price went up, and then gave him the option to buy. Which I would agree, Mr. Chairman, does not make any sense. And if we lost — we didn't lose in '73 with the land policy, we lost in '77, not in '73.

So, Mr. Chairman, I tell the Member for Pembina that there has to be a party in the Province of Manitoba which will enunciate a policy, that that policy will not be, as the Member for Elmwood said, laid down when the election campaign opens, unless it opens today, and that's possible. You know people say, how much time have you got, I say we've got 36 days, because the Premier can call an election on any day and then we've got 35 left.

If it's not called today or tomorrow, then I assure you that the Progressive Party of the Province of Manitoba intends. We have already indicated the skeleton of our policy, and there are some very significant features of it. The Member for La Verendrye has said, you're going to impose a 1 percent sales tax, Mr. Chairman.

The Conservative government this year is going to bring in a Budget of a \$200 million deficit, or an

increase in taxes, or both. My prediction is that they will bring in a \$200 million deficit, without an increase in taxes. That will load on the citizens of the Province of Manitoba a minimum of \$200 million; it is likely going to be more; it is likely going to be more. By the way, the deficits, the four deficits of the Conservative government, in four years in office, will be more, and if I was going to be extravagant but I've seen what can be done with extravagant statements and some of them are that we inherited Saunders. The Member for Brandon East said, we almost lost Saunders; it was going to go to Vancouver if we hadn't done such good work to attract it. So I don't know how it could be suggested that we inherited Saunders.

Flyer is a little different. Flyer was being negotiated by the MDC prior to us taking government, but I'm not saying that we are not responsible, and it was done by the MDC with Rex Grose still in charge and under a policy that certainly flowed from the Conservative business; but we did not inherit Flyer, it was our baby, it was a private enterprise corporation, it wasn't a socialist corporation; but we did not inherit it, it's ours. At one time I thought we inherited it but we did not.

But Mr. Chairman, \$200 million. That means that their four deficits may be in fact almost double the entire eight deficits of the previous administration, with the exception of the last one. And suddenly the Conservatives have found capital. Up until now they have been saying that there is no difference, you cannot separate the New Democratic Party deficit into \$100 million capital and 25 million operating, which subsequently went to 80 operating, which means that it was only \$50 million higher; they have suddenly now said that their deficits are all capital and they're not really deficits at all.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this proves that you can have it both ways if you're a Conservative. You can have it both ways but you won't get away with it. And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, the \$200 million deficit plus the other deficit will mean \$400 million; will mean that in the following year \$40 million a year, \$40 million, which is not the entire debt charges, but at least the debt charges on \$400 million will be added to the 1982 budget, without the citizens of Manitoba receiving anything at all.

And the Member for La Verendrye says that the New Democratic Party is going to impose a sales tax? Mr. Chairman, there isn't a government that will be elected in the next election that won't have to impose taxes to make up for the financial disaster which has been created by the Conservative Party, and that is whether it is a Conservative government, a New Democratic Party government, or a Progressive government. And anybody that goes to the public and tells them that there will not be needed revenues to clean up this mess, will be lying to the public of the Province of Manitoba and my party will not do that, Mr. Chairman. We will indicate the situation; we will indicate how much money is being spent on interest charges; and we will indicate that you cannot make expenditures without collecting revenue, which happens to be the view of the members of the New Democratic Party, and is the practice of the Conservative Party, although it is not Conservatism, but it has been their practice.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the Conservative Party is to be condemned for malperformance it's not because

of the Conservative position, it's because of the way in which they have bastardized Conservative philosophy, because they are not governing as Conservatives. The reason they are not governing as Conservatives is that Conservatism in this day and age and, as matter of fact, as long as one has known the philosophy, has been a total failure. Mr. Chairman, you can go back to the record, when I came into this side of the House after leaving government, I said I will criticize the Conservatives, not because they don't govern as we say they should govern, which is apparently what the New Democrats continually say that you should do what we say, I will criticize you because you don't do what you say. And the reason that you don't do what you say is because you've got the same gutless politicians over there. That's what's happening, Mr. Chairman, they will come in this year; we will see it; we will see whether the Minister of Finance, in bringing in his \$200 million deficit, will also show where the revenues are going to come from to keep pace with the expenditures of government; we will see it.

But the fact is that whatever heritage will be left to whomsoever, and it may be the New Democrats, although I doubt it; it may be the Progressives, and I hope it; and it may even be the Conservatives, and I dread it. I dread it, Mr. Chairman. No, it won't be the Liberals, that is the one prediction that I will make, that it won't be the Liberals.

Mr. Chairman, we will deal with this question more when it comes up in the Budget, and I'm now going to sound like a broken record. What I really got up to speak to, and which the Member for La Verendrye steered me away and the Member for Pembina steered me away, is false advertising. I can raise anything on the Estimates, I am going to deal with false advertising and again, I want the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate the false advertising of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company. The Greater Winnipeg Gas Company puts out a brochure in which they say, Mr. Chairman, "gas appliances give good service for many years and require very little maintenance. Trained and licenced gas company servicemen are on call 24 hours a day to provide a free inspection adjustment and advisory service". And Mr. Chairman, my argument with the Minister now relates to this false advertising because I don't say that anybody has to fulfill a promise to have servicemen on call 24 hours a day, there could be a problem whereby those men won't be there, and I understand that. But what it says is to provide a free inspection adjustment and advisory service, and I say that the company has to provide that service to the people whom it has advertised that it will provide them to.

Now I know that the Minister is not responsible for the misleading advertising legislation that is dealt with by the Federal Government. But the Minister is the Minister of Consumer Affairs and he knows that this is going on, and I would ask him, as Minister of Consumer Affairs, to refer this matter to the Federal Government for prosecution of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company because they are engaged in false advertising. They are now telling people that inspection, adjustment and advisory service is something that they have to pay for. Now surely, Mr. Chairman, if this was an Avon television store and they did that type of thing, they said that we will

Friday, 13 March, 1981

service your television set; let us assume that they advertise, we will service your television set for three months, and then their servicemen went on strike. And the company said, well we can't service them, you'll have to go out and pay for it, that they would be prosecuted for misleading advertising.

I am asking the Minister — these books are, How You Can Get More Information about Natural Gas; Facts about Natural Gas; Natural Gas is Clean; Natural Gas is Nature's Most Efficient Fuel, it provides a hot flame, burning cleanly and with no waste, etc. Mr. Chairman, the gas company has advertised this to the public, and I'm sure that a lot of people connect it in with gas. Now, the Minister of Labour has said that the publicity is going to affect the gas company, and maybe because I have done such a job in bringing it to public attention that the publicity will do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 12:30. Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is no disposition to proceed with Private Members' Hour today so I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2 o'clock, Monday.