

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 16 April, 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 . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. I wonder in view of the Deputy Premier's avid following of the Gong Show whether or not in view of the fact that the Gong Show wasn't on TV last night, according to my understanding, whether he ripped himself away long enough to take a look at the document which was forwarded to him by my colleague, the Member for St. Vital; examine that document so that he can advise us whether or not in his opinion it is the legal opinion which was submitted to the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro by one Steward Martin, former Chief Legal Counsel for Manitoba Hydro.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Deputy Premier.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Leader of the Opposition as I indicated what I would do yesterday, I referred the document or whatever it's called, the letter of some seven pages or the paper of some seven pages long, to Manitoba Hydro to ask them whether they could identify it; and secondly, pointed out that the House had recommended on Tuesday that it be referred to their legal advisers for a report. I'm advised by Manitoba Hydro that course of action is being taken today. I have not received any advice from them as to whether they have further identification from it in-house at Hydro but they have referred it and asked their legal advisers for a full report.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** A point of order. Mr. Speaker, surprisingly enough the Minister today said what he said yesterday that the House had requested that he do something in regard to Hydro, or recommend it. Yesterday I rose on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to point out that it's incorrect, that indeed it was the Minister on my prodding who agreed that he would do it. He said that if Hydro in its wisdom wished to release Mr. Steward Martin from the confidentiality of solicitor and client that he would go along with it. I haven't yet found the exact quotation but those words are not exact but fairly close. But he said again that the House asked for it and that's not true, Mr. Speaker, and I think he ought to correct himself.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, what the Member for St. Johns has said — I don't have the quotation here — but essentially what I said was that if Manitoba Hydro on that part of it made that determination it was certainly up to them to do so. What I am reporting to you is that I referred it to Manitoba Hydro to, first of all, ask them whether they could identify these papers as documents familiar to Manitoba Hydro which I would presume, from the report that was given at the Committee meeting when the Committee was sitting, that the legal counsel that is internal to Manitoba Hydro, who advised the President, who was not there at the time but the legal counsel was through this whole period, that his answer would be thorough. I said at the time I thought it probably was a very clear answer and since he was the one common piece through the whole thing would know.

I want to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that it might have been helpful and we may have had this thing cleared up long before now if the Member for St. Vital had had this seven-page paper, whatever it's technically referred to, and given it to Mr. Kristjanson when he asked for it. All I have done, as of yesterday, I did what Mr. Kristjanson asked for at the Committee Hearing because he offered to do all of this; Hydro offered it and I want to indicate to you that he said, "Mr. Kristjanson, just to facilitate the work, may I ask whether you know or don't know whether such a legal opinion was received?" The Member for St. Vital said that we received from time to time rumours, information, opinion from various people. Then Mr. Kristjanson said, "My simple question was, are you aware of that opinion?"

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Order please. I find it difficult to hear the words of the honourable member.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, in the answer to that and I think the Hydro Chairman was trying to be helpful, he was saying we will certainly chase it if you can give us some help. So he said my simple question was, are you aware of that opinion? The Member for St. Vital at that time said I have no personal knowledge of it. Well, that was after some considerable time of debate in the committee about this whole matter and then a few days later this 7-page paper arrived in here with no signature and no date. So now, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that what I had done yesterday was to take this document — or if I can use the right terminology maybe somebody will tell me what it really is — and I referred it to Hydro and said, can you now identify this thing, internally to Hydro, and secondly, will you give consideration following a recommendation that came out of the House to have your legal counsel examine this matter? I sent that to them yesterday. I indicated to the House that the chairman was away out of the province on both Monday and Tuesday — yesterday was the first day — they've told me this morning that they have sent it over or are sending it over this morning to their legal counsel to get a full report.

I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba Hydro would report on this. All through this piece I've said that in the legal matters, in the hiring, — (Interjection)— oh well, it's whatever the severance was, any of it, there was obviously three different lawyers that were involved with them. I've never talked to any of them; I've never had anything to do with them; I'm not going to tell Manitoba Hydro how to run their legal affairs because that's exactly what the opposition would like to have me do.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm continuing on the point of order. I thought the Honourable Minister was speaking to my point of order and I didn't want to interrupt. But I've now located the reference in Hansard to what I referred to this morning on my point of order and I tell the Minister page 2683. I'll quote just a couple of sentences of the Minister on page 2683 which was April 13th, last Monday, and in response to a question I asked about the release of Mr. Martin from his confidentiality undertaking the Minister said and I quote, "The position taken at the committee by the utility was that if there was a request from the lawyer in this case to apply to the Hydro Board for a release from the traditional client-solicitor relationship, that he would take it to the board and they would give it consideration".

I then asked the Minister a further question, whether he would be prepared to let the release go without a request being made by Mr. Steward Martin, and on the same page he said and I again quote — and I could quote extensively if he wants me to but I will quote selectively — that he said, "If Hydro took that position I certainly would have no objection to it — that was the position that if upon request they would do it — Mr. Speaker, if the Hydro Board decided they wanted to take the initiative on it I would completely endorse them taking that initiative".

The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister said he would send Hansard to them but he is now making it appear as if what he undertook to do was some sort of agreement arrived at by this House and on behalf of the House he was asking them to investigate some sort of a legal document. That was not the question I dealt with and that is not what he responded to.

He said and that's my point of order, Mr. Speaker, he said in response to an inquiry from me that if Hydro Board decided they wanted to take the initiative on it, on the release to Mr. Martin, I quote, "I would completely endorse them taking that initiative". Aside from the grammar that's clear what he had to say and that was not the House that wanted it done. It was that the Minister undertook to do it.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell the Member for St. Johns that the copy of Hansard then being available was sent to them.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister's response. He indicates that he is going to be awaiting a report from the lawyers for Manitoba Hydro. Now the Minister is shaking his head. When the Minister receives a report as to his enquiries from Manitoba Hydro, would the Minister then be prepared to recommend a reconvening of the committee dealing with Public Utilities so that the committee itself may receive the information in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the need for the committee being reconvened is due to the fact that there was inadequate and incomplete information provided when the committee was sitting; and because of that incomplete and inadequate information the committee now is required to sit again so that the matters which were not properly put, which were not properly explained in committee can be adequately and totally dealt with as they had not been done with earlier.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The question is hypothetical. The Minister has not yet received a report and the question the honourable member puts is anticipatory in that nature and I would suggest that the question is out of order.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour advise us whether there have been any developments relative to the work stoppage in a public utility, which has a franchise for the supply of natural gas to consumers, in greater Winnipeg?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've been informed that the parties are back at the negotiating table today.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, entirely apart from the negotiations that are taking place, does the Minister now after over two-and-a-half months see any need for considering as to whether an industrial inquiry commission should be set up for the purpose of determining some of the questions relating to consumer supply, the requirements of the gas company and other matters which would not in any way interfere with the right of free collective bargaining?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, there's always a variety of things that can be considered by a Minister of government regardless of who it is or at what time. Industrial inquiry, that particular proposal has been suggested on more than one occasion by the Member for Inkster. There are other options available to a Minister of Labour which I believe the Member for Inkster is aware of, they're always being given consideration, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that one of the options which is available is an Industrial Inquiry Commission and in view of the fact that, for instance, in the Brandon Packers strike, the

Industrial Inquiry Commission conducted its major proceedings after the strike had already been settled, would the Minister say that one of the options available which he is considering or will consider is the establishment of such a commission?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that I will give that any greater thought than I have at the moment which I have ruled it out before and I still rule it out today. To say that would not take place wouldn't be absolutely correct. You never know what circumstances would trigger off a person's desire to have such an inquiry.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister when he expects that the renewed Federal-Provincial Northern Development Agreement or the new Northern Development Agreement will be signed between the province and the Federal Government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, I can't give the honourable member a definite answer at this time but hopefully it would be signed in the first quarter of this year.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, in light of the fact that many of his colleagues, especially the Minister of Labour, indicated that the government would have a new agreement signed by the end of March, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what went wrong this time.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, we're ready to proceed any time on it.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then if the Minister could tell us, since they're ready to proceed any time, what is the hold up? Where did they go wrong and why isn't the agreement signed at this date?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, as members of this House know that it's an agreement between the province and the Government of Canada and it takes two signatures; we're ready to sign.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment and I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, if he has been informed that the City of Winnipeg officials have examined the information that is available regarding the proposed High Lake Mine and are convinced from the information available that the proposed waste treatment and monitoring system for the proposed mine and milling operation is

inadequate and that the risk of contamination of the City of Winnipeg's water supply in Shoal Lake is unacceptable to the city? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg requests this development not be allowed to proceed unless the best available technology is used in the waste treatment process. Further, they are concerned that seepage and run-off from the tailing cells could cause long-term problems for all surface and groundwaters in the area. I would ask the Minister if he's aware of that and what he intends to do about that particular request from the city.

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

**MR. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that series of comments and opinion occurred as a result of the meeting that was set up between my department and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment in which the City of Winnipeg was invited to participate and make known their views. They had an opportunity to evaluate the proposals that had been put forward by the proponents for the mine along with my department's officials and exchange of comments such as that have taken place and are continuing to take place.

The bottom line of course is the fact that the Ontario Ministry of the Environment have given us assurance in writing that non-degradation of the quality of water in High Lake, therefore the quality of water in Shoal Lake, is what they intend to provide in the way of protection for us and for the citizens of Winnipeg. So we are confident that it then becomes a matter of the proposal being altered so that the treatment of the tailings will be sufficiently extensive to prevent any pollution of that nature taking place. Therefore we're assured that non-degradation of the water supply will be the ultimate goal of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment for the protection of all of the citizens of Winnipeg.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, has the Minister been informed that it appears that the Ontario government is referring to this mine as only a little mine and therefore will not have much of an impact on the water supply in that area. I would ask the Minister if he's relying on the Ontario government in that respect because they do not have a good record of protecting the environment. Mr. Speaker, we have made the demand in this Legislature that there be a full and complete environmental impact study. I would ask the Minister if he's not been informed that the city has also demanded now that there be a full and complete environmental impact study done before there is any further work proceeding on this particular development and before any further approvals are given.

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, firstly, the member seems not to be aware of the fact that this is taking place in the Province of Ontario and that demands of this nature for an environmental impact study have to be made and understood by the people who have jurisdiction over those demands. The request for an environmental impact study was discussed at the

meeting amongst the various parties that I referred to. Further to that, I gave assurance in this House that as soon as a new Minister of the Environment is appointed in the Province of Ontario that I have invited the Mayor of Winnipeg, Mayor Norrie, to accompany me to visit personally with him to ensure that there is no misunderstanding, no lack of communication, no opportunity for anything to not be fully understood by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment with respect to our concerns for the protection of the City of Winnipeg's water supply. His reference to comments such as, just a small proposal, and that is a matter of hearsay, it's not official government ministry position and it's an exchange of information and comments that are made in any meeting and should not be taken out of context to indicate that there is any lack of concern on the part of any of the parties to this whole development.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister appears to be passing the buck in this matter and I would ask him specifically if he can tell us whether or not he and the Government of Manitoba are accepting the recommendations of the Opposition in this Legislature, and now the City of Winnipeg, to demand of the Ontario Government that there be a full and complete environmental impact study done before there is any further work proceeding on this mine. Because, Mr. Speaker, we are informed that the work is proceeding apace on this mine at the present time and that there has been no slackening off of the development of that mine, in fact, as far as the mine is concerned, they seem to be fully confident that they are going to get their approvals in short order.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition just a week ago about that same aspect of it. What I said before hold true now, they can construct certain aspects of the mine at their own risk. What they cannot do is enter into any procedure that would in any way violate the environmental standards that will be set for them by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. That means that no aspect of the mining that contributes any pollution or degradation to the water supply can occur and if they want to construct headframes or buildings on the site, or any of those things, that's at their risk. But what they cannot do is contribute to the pollution of the water quality in High Lake ergo the water quality at Shoal Lake.

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

**MR. JIM GALBRAITH:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. As a result of a meeting last night held in Dauphin, would the Minister consider re-establishing the Lake Dauphin Advisory Committee?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, this Committee that the honourable member refers

to had been in existence for a number of years. It is my understanding it disbanded in the last 10 or 12 years. The kind of problems that the Committee could deal with, the kind of problems that Lake Dauphin has may well be served by the re-establishment of that Committee and I would certainly be prepared to consider doing that.

**MR. GALBRAITH:** A question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider releasing a recent report on Lake Dauphin to the local town, municipalities and local interested groups?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm prepared to release the latest contour maps, reports. It's always easier to release it to some group that is formally or informally ready to receive it. It would be my recommendation that such a body or such a group be formalized or brought together at Dauphin.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House what he or his department are presently doing in respect to ameliorating the dispute between the Gas Utility and its workers?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Was the question relating to the gas company dispute here in the city? I answered that question with the Honourable Member for Inster about 15 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. FOX:** My question, Mr. Speaker, is what is the department or Minister specifically doing? I realize the two parties have got together but what is the Minister and his department doing to make sure the dispute will get settled?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, we're doing what responsible governments do. We are encouraging both to get back to the table and follow the recognized, in the free society of this world, process called free collective bargaining and our role in that is to suggest and encourage both parties to get back to the table, not to intervene.

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

**MR. FOX:** It's not the final supplementary because the first question wasn't answered. Mr. Speaker, — (Interjections)— when the chattering ceases I may be able to . . .

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

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question to the same Minister is, can he inform the House whether anyone in his department or anyone from the Treasury Bench's department has been monitoring to see whether the Utility is providing the services it has contracted to the City or to the people of Winnipeg?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, we've been in communication with a large number of people in the labour side of things. The member should maybe better direct his question to other Ministers but on the labour side of things I think that both parties have been talked to by our office and what we are talking about is really nobody's business but ours. The Member for Kildonan should understand that; he knows what I'm talking about. In these particular situations discussions do take place and I'm certainly not going to come in this House and tell him or anybody else what those discussions are. We are pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the parties are back at the negotiating table today and if the Member for Kildonan or his party thinks that anti-scab legislation or contract-imposed legislation would have helped this situation, then they are quite at liberty to talk about that kind of move; that's not my move or my intention.

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

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs. During discussion of her Estimates, the Minister told us that she expected the position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs which has been vacant for about a year would be filled before too long, could the Minister now tell us when an announcement will be made?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the position has been filled and the announcement will be made probably in about a week.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Still on the subject of the Minister's Estimates and assurances that were given the House, Mr. Speaker, the Minister stated that a report would be received from the 10-member working group established to advise Ministers on heritage policy very shortly and that it would be available for public perusal. Is that document now ready and will it be tabled in the House, Mr. Speaker?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the report has been completed. It hasn't reached my hands yet but I'm sure as soon as it does it will be available.

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** Yes. Still on the matter of questions asked during the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister now tell the House whether she is going to accept the recommendations of the report to the Manitoba Arts Council on Space and Capital Requirements of the Arts in Manitoba?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, that report is in the hands of the Manitoba Arts Council and I'm expecting it from them momentarily.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. On Wednesday, April 8th, the Minister of Labour in answer to a question of mine of Tuesday, April 7th, said that the Workplace, Safety and Health Division and his department were not made aware of cadmium poisoning problems at Motor Coach Industries until October 16, 1980. I'd ask the Minister if he is prepared to follow up on that statement and indicate where he was provided that information, that they had not been made aware of that problem till such a time.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I recited an answer to a question in this House. I asked my department several times to assure myself of the date. They informed me — and I don't have that documentation with me — but from memory it was mid-October when they were first informed of a potential problem. Investigations took place, an order was prepared. Before the order could be issued the company — and I'm going from memory now so I may be out on part of my sequences of thoughts here — but the order was prepared for some time in December after a number of tests had been taken. An order was felt to be necessary as it related to I believe a ventilation system, or part of, or portion of, or maybe the major ventilation system.

Before that order could be issued to the company, the company chose to change the product and the content of the product was changed that they were using, it was then felt not necessary to issue that order. Now I think that's close to what I answered before. I don't have that precise material with me.

**MR. COWAN:** A supplementary to the Minister is, Mr. Speaker, what action he is going to take in respect to documentation — the minutes of the Advisory Council on Workplace, Safety and Health which reports to him — for a meeting on February 27th in which the Director of the Division said, "The problems of workers using cadmium in the workplace soldering areas was brought to the Safety and Health Officer's attention about a year ago". As that directly contradicts what the Minister has just said, I'd ask him what action he is prepared to take to find out where the failure in communication or the failure on the part of the department in taking action exists?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll have to check through the documentation related, as mentioned. Has the Leader of the Opposition got another question? Have you got something to say?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. It's highly improper for Ministers of the Crown to start questioning members of the opposition.

The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** It's too bad that the Minister chose not to finish his statement because I think what is point out here is a very serious deficiency within the department or within the Minister's responsibility as to taking action on problems such as this.

I'd ask the Minister as he has indicated that there is no need to follow through on the orders which

provided for proper ventilation in that area, if he is now saying that regardless of whether or not cadmium is being used in that particular silver soldering area, that there is no need for proper ventilation on the parts of employers in this province to ensure the health and safety of their employees when working in silver soldering areas, because that's what the Minister is indirectly and directly implying by his statement.

So I'd ask him if he's prepared to comment as to whether or not there has been a change of policy on the part of the government in respect to providing proper ventilation for workers who have to work in unsafe and unhealthy conditions in this province.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, that was a fair amount of words. The Member for Churchill has good opportunity to put his own opinions on record. I'd rather he didn't try and quote me as my opinion. —(Interjection)— You'll have to excuse me, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition always does better from his seat than he does on his feet, as we've found out in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Minister it's highly improper to make comments about the conduct of members in this Chamber.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll get back to the question then if the member wants an answer. The member's relating to some document that apparently my director said he was aware of a situation approximately a year ago. That same director is the one that told me he was aware of the situation in October. I can talk to that particular individual and attempt to find out where the discrepancy is, Mr. Speaker.

The ventilation that we were talking about, the system was required precisely because of a particular type of material that was being used. There's no change in policy. In fact we're probably the first government that's implemented a policy because there was no regard given for safety in the workplace under the previous government, so you're right, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Churchill is right, there is a change in policy. We are concerned about ventilation and we are concerned about safety in the workplace for people, as we have demonstrated and as the record demonstrates, the members in opposition when in government were not concerned.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of either the Minister of Resources who is preoccupied for the moment or the Minister of Hydro and it could be both that wish to answer this question, Mr. Speaker.

It has to do with the regulation of Lake Winnipeg and given the fact that for a long period of time the government of Manitoba maintained a policy of restricting cottage-lot development below 722 above sea level; and given the fact that we have now had the experience of Lake Winnipeg regulation the question is whether or not it would now be prudent to reconsider that level and perhaps allow cottage-lot development below that level, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. ENNS:** I'd be well advised to take that question as notice. I appreciate the tenure of the member's remarks, that is, namely, that the lake now has a control structure on it that has been regulated in a particular fashion for the last number of years. Whether or not that would allow a reconsideration of the policy is something that we would certainly look into.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he is prepared to inform the House about the difficulties that he must be having within his department in order to comply with an Order for Return which he accepted on May 16, 1979, some 23 years ago, —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Speaker, looking at the Honourable Minister and waiting for his reaction to undertakings he made it should be clear that it seemed like 23 years, although true it's only 23 months. But in view of the fact that it's taken 23 months and we don't have it yet, would the Minister inform the House what problem he has in his department in order to be frustrated in complying with an Order of this House to which he agreed, an Order asked for by the Member for Lac du Bonnet dealing with MACC Land Sales Details.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** The main problem, Mr. Speaker, that we're having is that we're having quite a difficult time sorting through the mess that was left by the New Democratic party who were responsible for MACC prior to our entry to government.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** In view of the fact that this Honourable Minister rolled into this House in a flood of entreaties to help the efficient good management of a Conservative government to create chaos out of what they found, which is what they apparently did, does he tell us that in three-and-a-half years he still can't find his way through documents and papers where he can report on his actions — and this relates to his actions in his time — and has to find that old excuse of blaming the past for his present inadequacies? Is that his problem?

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some misunderstanding as normal by the Member for St. Johns. As I indicated there is some information that has to be provided; there seems to be some past difficulties with the appraisal systems, some inconsistencies with the way in which some of the appraisals were taking place and, Mr. Speaker, we're still trying to sort out exactly what, in fact, was being done.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The time for question period having expired.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, is it not the practice that there are two supplementaries allowed and that after that you call the time, or is that not the practice or do you wish . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for question period is set by our rules in that respect.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time I would like to introduce to the honourable members 68 students of Grade 6 standing from Stonewall Centennial School under the direction of Mrs. B. Carter. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed with Orders of the Day, yesterday I took a matter of privilege under advisement. I would ask the indulgence of the House to set this matter over. It does involve allegations of words attributed to a member who is not presently in the House and I would ask the indulgence of the House to wait until that member is in the Chamber before I hand down that ruling.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the question as to whether the member is present or not present I indicate to you is really not relevant to the motion because Hansard contains the references which, from my memory, were there and indeed they are compounded. On Page 2751, the Honourable Sterling R. Lyon is quoted as saying, "The House, Mr. Speaker, has been treated to a barrage of triple hearsay, unsigned letters and the like over the last two or three days on a kind of a trumped-up issue that my honourable friend thinks is the biggest thing that's happened to him." Then, Mr. Speaker, later on, "I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that this House, in accordance with your ruling, should not be acting on the basis of unsigned letter or things of that sort. Now, if my honourable friends can document anything of substance with respect to this issue of fabrications that have been put forward so far in the House I'm sure I would be prepared to give it another look." Then, in addition, Mr. Speaker, on Page 2752, the same member saying, "In the meantime the House would be acting, I suggest, very irresponsible to react to the kind of triple hearsay; to react to the kind of non-evidence that my honourable friends are trumping up in order that they can avail themselves of some sort of fishing expedition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion deals clearly with remarks which were made by two members; one remark being a half-hoax which was made outside of the House but which is documented; and the other remark suggesting fabrication which was made by a member of the House and is now documented in Hansard. It seems to me that the issue should be resolved on the basis of whether or not the Member for St. Vital has trumped up or participated in a half-hoax or presented fabrication. That is a matter of privilege and is easily ascertainable by the Committee of Privileges and Elections, so I don't

know why we have to wait for somebody to be here to deal with it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I point out to the honourable members the rules that apply to a Matter of Privilege.

The role of the Speaker in a Matter of Privilege is not to rule the privilege in or out, it is to rule whether or not a prima facie case can be made and if the Chair rules that there is some then the motion is a debatable motion. If that is the case and it involves members I think it is a courtesy that should be — (Interjection)— order please, order please.

I would hope that members understand the rules of this Chamber. When the Speaker is on his feet, no member of this Chamber speaks. I have asked the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand until the members involved are present in the House. Do I have that agreement? (Agreed) We'll then proceed with Orders of the Day.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### BUDGET DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

**MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I look forward each year to two debates in the House, the Throne Speech Debate and the Budget Speech Debate and this year in participating in this Finance and Budget Debate I take a great deal of pleasure in participating. This is the fourth consecutive Budget, Mr. Speaker, in which this government has not raised personal income tax or sales tax. In fact over the past four Budgets we have indeed lowered them, something which was not seen in the Province of Manitoba during the whole decade of the Seventies until our administration took power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot of comment via the news media from members in the opposition, particularly from the Leader of the Official Opposition and in yesterday's remarks I noted that the Leader of the Opposition indicated that this Budget Address was a failure. Now I would think that after eight years of administration and government that the Member for Selkirk would have a little better comprehension of what indeed was a failure and he should have been able to recognize that, Mr. Speaker, from the introduction to the Budget Speech given by the Minister of Finance.

Those 40 some-odd pages that the Leader of the Opposition referred to as a failure, was not that. What it was, was a description of a failure and that description of a failure in the first 40 pages of the Budget Address on Tuesday night was a description of a failure in which the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Treasury Board. It was a description of the failure of the NDP government to come to grips with the fiscal management of the Province of Manitoba. He didn't recognize a failure that he created in eight years and he still doesn't have a recognition of a failure when he indicated that the Budget introduced on Tuesday night was a

failure. It proves adequately and completely that his lack of understanding does not recommend him well to be a leader of a party in opposition, let alone a Premier of the Province of Manitoba. The people deserve something much better than the Member for Selkirk has to offer.

There's a standard saying in times like this when the opposition is in a great deal of distress over a document that was delivered on Tuesday night. It's a very simple saying and it's been used many many times by many many people, Mr. Speaker, and that saying is, that the truth hurts. That's what happened to the opposition on Tuesday night — the truth hurt them — hurt them very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just use a few figures and take us back into the history as the Minister of Finance in his introduction to his Budget on Tuesday night gave. In the late Sixties the financial position of the Province of Manitoba was good for several consecutive years, 1967, 1968 is when I have the first figures.

The Manitoba government was running a Budget surplus in excess of \$20 million. That is the kind of fiscal position, Mr. Speaker, that our socialist friends inherited in 1969 — a government which was operating on a budgetary surplus, capital account included — a surplus. Now I will give the members of the opposition full credit for the first full year that they had budgetary control over the province. I cannot give them credit in '69 and '70 because they did inherit a Budget that year.

They did in fact achieve a surplus position for fiscal year 1970-71. But from thereafter, Mr. Speaker, as was adequately pointed out in the preamble of the body of the Budget Address on Tuesday night from 1970-71 fiscal year on, that government took the Province of Manitoba to consistently higher and higher budgetary deficits in the Province of Manitoba and there once again the one notable exception, Mr. Speaker, is 1973-74. I dealt with that some two-and-a-half years ago in the Budget Address Speech. That was the only year that they came close in their administration to balancing the combined Budget and they did it in '73-'74 because that was a year of windfall price increases in our agricultural community — that was the year I remember very well because fortunately it was the year I started farming — my budget for my farm operations that I drew up in the fall of 1972, I had budgeted for \$3.00 a bushel rapeseed. In fact in that fiscal year I sold it for an average price of \$7.50, something I had never expected to take place. That caught a lot of farmers in a position where they were paying income tax for the first time in a number of years. Farmers contribute taxes in a myriad of ways but not all that often are they in the fortunate fiscal position to contribute income tax and that's what happened in 1973-74. It was a quirk of the marketplace — the marketplace that the socialist parties throughout the world abhor and hate — gave them their closest attempt at a balanced budget in the Province of Manitoba during their fiscal reign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, much to-do has been made by the Member for Inkster — and he no doubt will go after it today — he will mention the \$219 million-projected budgetary deficit. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster and others on that side of the House decry that and they say that, oh this is

terrible, this is terrible. I want to take them into just a wee amount of history on that, Mr. Speaker. This year we are budgeting a \$219 million deficit, that's our projected deficit. Now let's take some immediate history, Mr. Speaker, and let's put it into perspective.

In our last fiscal year we started out at this time of the year, budget time, projecting \$140 million deficit, combined deficit, Mr. Speaker, capital and current. With the advent of the drought, the forest fires, we had to increase that through Supplementary Supply to a projected deficit position of \$190 million. Included in that was a water bomber that I purchased about the 15th of April last year for a sum of \$4 million — to do what — to protect the forest resource in the Member for the Pas' constituency, the Member for Rupertsland's constituency and that government consistently will stand up on their hind legs and say this government doesn't care about their constituency, about Northern Manitoba and about the resource base of this province. That adequately demonstrates how wrong they are and how wrong they always will be.

We spent \$4 million and we didn't take very long to make that decision, Mr. Speaker. We made it in a matter of days and it was a proposition of finding a plane that we could purchase and that was the hardest thing to do — not making the decision to commit \$4 million additional taxpayer dollars — and then of course we had additional fire-fighting costs of some \$10 million, drought relief of \$20 million to our farm community; all of those added to the initial projected deficit of \$140 million, to bring us up to \$190 million. But, Mr. Speaker, the important thing to recognize is where the deficit is going to be. It is going to be at \$100 million, not at the projected figure of \$190 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Inkster says it's projected to be. We happen to know in this government what our projections will be and how accurate they are because this government brought in quarterly financial reports to tell the administration of the day where the financial position of the province was on a quarterly basis; something those people refused to do because they didn't have fiscal management in this province and the Member for Inkster was one of the kingpins in that government and he sit there now and decies a projection; a projection that will be correct and one that he couldn't make in the fall of 1977 when they were going to the people telling us all kinds of distorted facts on the deficit position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that reduction from \$190 million represents a 47 percent reduction in the deficit position of the province as projected in the Budget, 47 percent reduction in the last fiscal year. Let's take the 1979 Budget Address, let's go back two years. That year we projected \$122 million deficit, \$122 million combined deficit, Mr. Speaker. Now that is the year that members opposite will remember, will remember that we brought in the hydro rate freeze and that hydro rate freeze cost the taxpayers of Manitoba some \$31 million that year, so that was part of the projected deficit of \$122 million. But what did the deficit end up at, Mr. Speaker? \$45 million, a reduction of 63 percent from the projection at the time the Budget was tabled, 63 percent reduction, Mr. Speaker. Add in or deduct the hydro rate freeze, if we hadn't undertaken that to the

benefit of all Manitobans it would have been an 88 percent reduction in the projected deficit and only an \$11 million deficit on a combined account in a year in which we, if we had accounted on the methods that they used, we would have ran \$100 million budgetary surplus on the current account if we had eliminated the capital and not at a combined account. That is a 63 percent reduction in what we projected and what we actually ended up with.

Let's go to the 1978 Budget Address, Mr. Speaker, three years ago. The projected deficit, \$114 million, Mr. Speaker. The actual deficit that year, \$84 million. Once again, all of it attributable towards the Capital account so, if we were accounting in the methods that the NDP were using, we would have had a balanced Current Account Budget. That was a 26 percent reduction from the budgeted amount to the actual amount.

Now let us, Mr. Speaker, go to 1977, the last year that our Socialist friends drew up a Budget in the Province of Manitoba. During the election campaign in September of 1977, six months after the fiscal year started, after the last fiscal year that they budgeted for, six months after, they were telling the people of Manitoba that the projection of \$8.6 million deficit on the current account — because bear in mind, capital was completely separated — that they on the current account were speculating that there might be an \$8.6 million deficit. Six months into their spending program they were still saying that during the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, and I admit that either they didn't know or they were trying to hide the facts. Now hiding the facts is bad; ignorance of the facts is worse in government. I suggest it was a combination of both because they didn't have quarterly reports because they didn't want the people of Manitoba to know the kind of fiscal management they were using in this province.

So that, Mr. Speaker, what did the fiscal year of 1977 end up with? Bear in mind that when they tabled the Budget they estimated an \$8.6 million current account deficit. By the end of the fiscal year with six months of a Conservative administration that brought spending under control, they ended up with \$113 million current account deficit by their accounting methods. Mr. Speaker, rather than a reduction from what was projected, they had a 1,300 percent increase. That's the kind of fiscal management that they were giving the people of Manitoba, and the Member for Inkster says "nonsense". He says nonsense because he was fiscally irresponsible in his position in that former government and he purports to lead a party that has the ability to lead the province. Wrong, wrong, Mr. Speaker, 1,300 percent increase over the amount that they budgeted for. Now that either represents, Mr. Speaker, a dishonest group of people who wouldn't tell the people during the election campaign what the true fiscal position of the province was or one that were ignorant of the facts. Either one is bad, I don't which is worse but the people of Manitoba decided that both were bad and that they had to rid themselves of the NDP administration in that year and that's what they did.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when I said earlier that the reason for the upset people on that side of the House as a result of the Budget Address by the Minister of Finance, is that the truth hurts. Honesty

was what the people of Manitoba received in the Budget Address on Tuesday night. I suggest it was dishonesty that the members of Manitoba received in 1977 in the Budget Address and in the election campaign where they were telling the people that the province was in good shape.

Now, that's honesty today, and I contend that it was less than honest back in their years but they didn't quite tell the people the truth about the financial management and the fiscal position of the province. So that we would expect that under new leadership, the leadership of the Member for Selkirk, that the NDP would have turned a new leaf and would be now presenting their honest face for the people of Manitoba. Well, what have we seen from the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk, in terms of his honesty? We would expect to see a great improvement, for instance — and I'll go back to the election campaign in 1977 — I believe a decision was made in July of 1977 to stop Hydro development on the Nelson River. Did we hear about that during the election campaign of 1977 in October, some five months later? Did we hear about that? No, no we didn't hear about that. Was that honesty in the election campaign of 1977? I suggest it was not honesty. I suggest that they were trying to fool the people of Manitoba.

So that we would expect a change from that position under this new bright leadership. "The Schreyer days are behind us", the Member for Selkirk said when he received his crown at the NDP leadership convention some year-and-a-half ago. Now he said that those days are behind us, so we would assume that we are in for days of honesty from the NDP party, that they wouldn't neglect to tell the people for four months that they had cancelled Hydro development on the Nelson River; we would think that we would get that honesty.

But what have we seen from the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk, as recently as three months ago? He's turning out literature saying that the Tories cancelled development on the Nelson River. He is still perpetrating the lie of 1977. Is that the kind of honesty that Manitobans are going to have to face with him as a leader of a party? Is that the change in direction from the Schreyer years, is that the new honesty that we're going to see from members of the socialist party? I hardly think that's a very honest position for him to be telling the people of Manitoba yet. And he will still do it, Mr. Speaker; he will be dishonest with the people of Manitoba, and he'll still tell the people of Manitoba, even up to the election campaign, that we cancelled Hydro development when we got into government, when they did it five months before that and didn't tell the people, didn't have the constitutional fortitude to tell the people of Manitoba and they still lost the election. Hiding the truth and they still lost the election, Mr. Speaker.

What's another example of the kind of honesty that the Member for Selkirk is going to give us? In a recent issue of Business Week his honesty and integrity told the interviewer that in 1969 they inherited Saunders Aircraft, and that they inherited Flyer. That's what the Leader of the Opposition said in an interview to Business Week Magazine, Mr. Speaker. That is a blatant lie, Mr. Speaker, and that is the kind of dishonesty that we have from the

current Leader of the Opposition. The people of Manitoba do not want a leader who cannot be truthful with them and the Member for Selkirk still has not been truthful with them on major issues and, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— the Minister of Finance asks, has he apologized? No, no, he hasn't apologized, he hasn't retracted that statement from Business Week. It goes on as a blatant example of the kind of honesty that the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts in the NDP party represent in political terms today. That is the kind of honesty we can expect from them, and Mr. Speaker, the classic one in honesty from the Leader of the Opposition is in the pamphlet where we have his smiling face on this pamphlet, "A Time To Turn Things Around". And he says in here, "rebuilding the economy", the first task for an NDP government will be to start "rebuilding Manitoba's shattered economy". Mr. Speaker, he shouldn't be called the Leader of the Opposition, he should be called the Mother of the Opposition, because that is a motherhood statement. And we have heard and I have decried him, and I have challenged him, and I have provoked him to tell us what his policies are going to be; that is a motherhood statement, that's a motherhood statement. We want to hear some positive policies from the NDP but we are not going to hear them. He alluded yesterday to more participation in the Mining Industry by the people of Manitoba. What does he mean? Does he mean like Michael Cassidy meant in Ontario that they were going to nationalize Inco, is that what his policy is? Let us be specific and let us hear from them what their policies are. Motherhood will not win elections, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba want to identify positive policies from the NDP, we know that the Member for Inkster has a positive policy on a number of the initiatives we took. He summed it up, he summed it up in 1978 when he said the road to Toronto is a two-way road and anybody who came to Manitoba from Toronto under this freebie government that he considers we to be, the road is two way, the road is two way, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has knowingly, I suggest, misquoted me. He said that I said that anybody who comes from Toronto, the road from Toronto to Winnipeg is the same road from Winnipeg to Toronto, I referred to the insurance industry that wanted to repossess Autopac from our people. And I said then, and the Conservatives apparently agree that the road from Toronto to Winnipeg is also the road from Winnipeg to Toronto, I never said it about the mining industry. Mr. Speaker, I said it about the insurance industry and I can find my remarks to the insurance industry.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I accept the full weight of the terrible error that I have made. He referred it only to the insurance company but I am going to say he implied it to the mining industry and everything else and he will not stand up and deny that he would not kick the mining companies out of Manitoba because his policies were working towards that end when he had the ministerial responsibility for them.

But getting back to the honesty of the Leader of the Opposition in the socialist party over there, this

pamphlet has a number of errors in it. They were corrected by the Minister of Economic Development in December; they were corrected by several of us on several different occasions and this pamphlet still went out to the Member for Dauphin's constituency in February, I believe, February of this year. The Leader of the Opposition is still spreading untruths to the people of Manitoba. Now, is that the kind of new direction that we can expect from him? Is this what he means by putting the Schreyer years behind us, we are now going to never tell the truth, is that what he is saying? Is that the new direction that our socialist friends are going to take? We want to see leadership over there. Good parliamentary democracy needs effective opposition, Mr. Speaker, and we are not getting it from the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk.

Bata Shoes is one of the businesses that is closed in Manitoba; the Glenella Creamery is closed. I don't have to repeat those untruths, Mr. Speaker, they are here and the Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts in that party still perpetrate them. That is why the Budget on Tuesday night riled them up so much, because the truth hurts. They would prefer to live in their dishonest, illusionary world that they could still perpetrate the kind of untruths that we've seen them fared for in the last year, Mr. Speaker, and the truth hurt in the Budget of Manitoba because the Minister of Finance adequately pointed out where the economy has gone in Manitoba, Canada and the world, in the last decade; and how they, in their term of government, refused to look to the signs that were staring them in the face every single day and that they should address themselves to the need, but they were not fiscal managers, they were not planners, they were ideologues and they in fact crippled the Manitoba economy. They distorted the amount of their projected deficit in 1977 by 1300 percent, that's how far, 1300 percent over what they budgeted for, Mr. Speaker. That is the ultimate act of dishonesty by that Schreyer administration and we thought it would change, we thought it would change but it hasn't.

Now, I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss some of the thrusts in the Budget. I have taken my time talking about the Leader of the Opposition and his questionable abilities, although we could, Mr. Speaker, I could for a couple of minutes deal with leadership and competence, because that Budget represented a competent Budget, a realistic Budget and a Budget of Leadership.

Speaking of leadership, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Selkirk started out with a full caucus, he now has a split caucus, he has a caucus that cannot come to a common position on the constitution. You know, this reminds me of a statement that the Member of Selkirk — I've got to thank the Member for Inkster on this — the Member for Selkirk yesterday said that our Premier was trailing the coat trail of the Premier of Alberta on the oil issue. I thought that was kind of an interesting analogy for him to make. But on Tuesday we had that venerable support, the tower of support and strength for the NDP, the National Farmers Union, in town and they were talking to us about the Crow rate and we thought we would be meeting with a farm group on the Crow rate but when we got there we found the Manitoba

Federation of Labour there and the president was there representing the Manitoba Federation of Labour, in support of the NFU position, as was the Manitoba Metis Federation, were there in support of the NFU position which our socialist friends agree with. It was a cold day and I was sort of glad it was a cold day on Tuesday because I wanted to see the President of the Manitoba Federation's overcoat. I wanted to see how big the pocket was so I'd know whether Howard was comfortable when he was riding around in his pocket. But unfortunately I never got to see the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour's overcoat to see how big the pocket was that the Leader of the Opposition has been fit in for the last year and a half.

But, Mr. Speaker, talk about competence. Now, I maintain that one of the major issues in the next provincial election is going to be leadership and we, any day, will compare the leadership that we have enjoyed with Premier Lyon, with our Premier, and we will contrast it any day with any leadership that either party or any party on the Opposition has available to the people of Manitoba. And of particular note is the kind of leadership that the Member for Selkirk has provided the NDP party. His competence is so overwhelming that last year in December in the Throne Speech Debate he sat down, had to be reminded by the Member for Morris to move the amendment to the Throne Speech Debate. At that point in time Manitobans weren't talking about "Joe who" they were talking about "Howard why". Why is he Leader of the Opposition when he can't move the amendment to the Throne Speech Debate?

Just last month we found out that the Leader of the Opposition did not know when the fiscal year in the Province of Manitoba ended. He didn't know it was the 31st of March. The people of Manitoba were saying "Howard when", because he didn't know what time of the day it was or what day of the month it was. Then on Monday and Tuesday of this week we saw the ultimate example of the Member for Selkirk in his competence bringing in — I believe it was a matter of privilege — and on Monday he forgot to identify it as such and was ruled out-of-order. On Tuesday he brought it in correctly, he identified it, but he forgot to give notice, that's the kind of competence he has in the parliamentary procedure that he has been part of for 14 years. We'll stack that kind of competence and leadership, Mr. Speaker, any day of the week against the kind of leadership and competence that we have in the leader of our party in the Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Now we have a diametrically opposing philosophy — this side of the House versus that side of the House — on economic development. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the Budget did not provide any leadership to the economy, did not provide any stimulation to the economy. He didn't indicate in his two-hour discussion yesterday as to what kind of leadership he would suggest. He didn't tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether he wanted us to build another garage in Winnipeg; he didn't tell us whether in housing he wanted us to build another Bell Avenue in the Pas where 48 houses sat for well over a year without anybody to live in them; he didn't tell us whether that was the kind of stimulation for the economy that he would undertake, in other words

taking taxpayer dollars and wasting them is what we're talking about. If that's the kind of stimulation that the N.D. party wants to tell Manitobans is good for them I beg them to do it because in eight years Manitobans saw that that kind of stimulation did nothing but drive private enterprise out of the province, decrease the capability of the private sector to create the jobs and decrease the ability of Manitoba to cope with its long-term development role and the problems that are inherently going to from time to time, impact on the Manitoba economy.

So we do have a different opposing political philosophy. There is an interventionist one, where the government is the only vehicle by which investment should be made, which should stimulate the economy and they want to stimulate it, Mr. Speaker, by spending money. We prefer to stimulate it by reducing the take that government has on individuals and businesses in the Manitoba community. We want to leave more money with the people that earn it by their blood and their sweat and their tears and their investment. They want to take it from them and decide where to put it. They want to build to build the garages; they want to build the Bell Avenue housings; they want to create planes; they want to process foods; those are the kinds of economic directions that in their wisdom they want to undertake.

We don't believe — and it's been demonstrated clearly in their eight years — we don't believe that governments have the ability and the intelligence to direct an economy in Manitoba. We believe that the private sector with the proper motivation can, will and has been in the last three years. Diametrically opposite, Mr. Speaker. They believe in taxing the people in the businesses of the Province of Manitoba to get more money to spend on foolish things on behalf of the people of Manitoba. We believe in leaving the money with the people, let them make their decisions as to where they are spent and that is the way the province can better grow.

Now that attitude towards business that the Socialist party from 1969-1977 had, did wonderful things for the economic development of the Province of Manitoba. Under the leadership of the Member for Brandon East, Industry and Commerce turned down Kraft Foods in Brandon because it was a multinational; because it was going to make what group of their support angry? The National Farmers Union would not like it. Now isn't that a wonderful reason for turning down the employment opportunities, the investment, the productivity and the further processing of agricultural products in Manitoba, because the National Farmers Union had a lobby against — and what do you call it where they don't buy their foods — a boycott.

The National Farmers Union had a boycott against Kraft Foods at that time so the Member for Brandon East in his usual forthright, steady, dedicated leadership decided we don't want you. It's much easier to tell the National Farmers Union, we looked after you, we didn't let Kraft come to Brandon and provide jobs and investment in the Province of Manitoba but we like you National Farmers Union and we enjoy your boycott; we won't let Kraft Foods come to Manitoba. That's the kind of economic development thrust that we enjoyed with the Member for Brandon East, the economist, the economist from Transcona.

Now we don't have those kinds of hangups in this government, Mr. Speaker. For instance, when we change the royalty rates and the incentive rates for the drilling of oil in western Manitoba, which is proceeding now at unprecedented rates, did we say that it can only be private-enterprise companies? No. Saskoil bought a lease in western Manitoba; our ideology did not prevent them from bidding. But good heavens had the previous administration, our Socialist friends been in, they would have said only Sask-Oil or Man-Oil would have been able to drill in western Manitoba. No one else. That's what they would have Manitobans do; that's what they believe in, Mr. Speaker — and the Member for Inkster says that's ridiculous — but he knows that given four years after 1977 that's where the Province of Manitoba would have been at, completely under the clutch of a Socialist regime that did not want any more development by free enterprise in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, one of the really good issues that the Member for Brandon West, is it for or from Brandon West? Which is it? Brandon East, sorry. Is it for Brandon East? Yes, the Member for Brandon East, he gets on the issue of job creation, Mr. Speaker, and he talks about what a wonderful record they had in job creation and how we are doing nothing to stimulate job creation. That was what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, we do nothing to stimulate job creation.

Well, we've pointed this statistic out to them time and time again, three years, third administration, the last three years, 10,000 jobs, 6,000 in government; three years our administration, 30,000 jobs, 2,000 in government. How they could have the gall and the audacity to continue to stand up and say that this government doesn't have job-creation policies. What gave us those jobs in Manitoba? It was making our industrial potential competitive in the Province of Manitoba; it was making our mineral development competitive in the Province of Manitoba; it was bringing oil royalties in line so that oil exploration could go on in western Manitoba; it was bringing the business tax down so that businesses could afford to expand in the Province of Manitoba; that's what did it. Those are the programs that we've had and they are working, Mr. Speaker, they're working in the Province of Manitoba.

Those people in the Socialist Opposition from time to time drag their head out of the sand and blurr, we're not doing anything for job creation in the Province of Manitoba. They don't listen to the figures; they don't listen to the facts; they refuse to admit of the vastly superior job that this government has done — not by hiring people directly — but by putting the incentive in place in the private-enterprise industry in the Province of Manitoba so that they will create the jobs and they will employ the people. New fresh jobs for the Manitoba public, that's what our policies have given us. Theirs give us 6,000 public service jobs out of 10,000 in three years — what a record — which we all paid for is correct.

Another one on job creation came up in my colleague the Minister of Labour and Manpower's Estimates. (Interjection)— I was going to mention the "Russion bellysuckers", but I thought I would leave the Member for Brandon West alone today. Brandon East, I'm sorry, I keep getting that wrong. I'm very very sorry. I apologize profusely.

But in the Minister of Labour's Estimates we got talking about student employment. I remember the wonderful years of the Socialist government and their student-employment program. They had the students of Manitoba under a program where the government of Manitoba paid all their wages; the government of Manitoba hired supervisors to supervise the crews; the government of Manitoba hired a number of supervisors for the supervisors to supervise the crews, where the Government of Manitoba had a king bureaucrat ruling it all.

Mr. Speaker, there's some interesting statistics came out and the Member for Inkster should be very interested in knowing this. In 1976 our Socialist friends spent \$4.1 million on student employment — \$4.1 million in 1976 — there were 5,300 jobs as a result of that \$4.1 million expenditure. The jobs were 100 percent paid for by taxpayer dollars and what were the jobs?

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you kindly. They were painting barns, I got some buildings painted on my farms, I got buildings painted. Now the contrast, Mr. Speaker, to their program and ours is that in 1980 this Minister of Labour spent \$6.5 million dollars — in terms of the inflated dollar not significantly greater than the \$4.1 million in 1976 — but how did we pay it? We said to the private sector in the Province of Manitoba, if you put up \$1.25 per hour, or \$1.50 per hour; pardon me, I'm sorry.

We said to the private sector, we will put up to \$1.50 per hour to contribute towards the employment of a student in your business, you put up the rest. Do you know how many jobs that \$6.5 million helped to create, helped students for employment? 13,800 jobs and our Socialist friends, the Member for Brandon East will say, we have done nothing for job creation in the Province of Manitoba. The same amount of money two and one-half times the jobs, that is the only time that I will agree with two-and-a-half times one, that Socialist formula for wages. With the same money we will create two-and-one-half times the jobs in the Province of Manitoba. We've done it, we've proven it, we've shown the example to Manitobans and those jobs, Mr. Speaker, those 13,800 jobs are not ones where a student will go in to a potential employer and say, hey, I'm a good guy, I painted a barn this summer. They will be able to go in and they can say that I operated machinery, I worked on an assembly line, I worked secretarial work, I worked on promotional work, I worked on tourism work; concrete, positive job recommendations they can come out with — with our program — not with their program.

Mr. Speaker, I at times envy the Leader of the Opposition because I would dearly love to have the time that he had. Two hours I would like to take pointing out the inadequacies of their government and the last hour-and-a-half pointing out what this government is going to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government of ours has undertaken changes in the taxation system to allow for development in the private sector. What has that given us, Mr. Speaker? That has given us three projects that I know of — and I'll mention two of them — Alcan Aluminum is a company that is

currently looking at Manitoba, to do what? To locate a smelter, to do what? To employ people. And what is more important, Mr. Speaker? To use our Hydro resource in Manitoba employing Manitobans. Not, as the Leader of the Opposition said where he said, I was disappointed that the government of the day did not develop more line hookups with the southern states to export the power and the jobs to the southern states in the U.S. We are working on Alcan Alumumin to get them here, to use the electricity here, to employ people here. That's the kind of direction this government has taken in the economic development base of this province.

The other area we've taken is in potash, Mr. Speaker. The potash did not magically appear in 1977, it was there, but their taxation rates, their attitude towards private investment in this province would prevent anyone from developing that potash resource. We've changed the attitude; we've changed the tax roles and what have we got? We've got the potential for one potash mine and we've got one firm extremely interested in locating in Manitoba; and those people over there will say that we are doing nothing for the economic development base of Manitoba.

Take away Alcan and take away IMC in the potash development and the manufacturing investment has been up consistently every year. Job creation and employment in manufacturing has been up consistently every year, and they can stand there with the gall and the audacity and say that this government has done nothing. Our record will stand the test of time as an honest government with integrity, with forthright people running this government, people who will do what is necessary, who will not try to disillusion and mislead the people of Manitoba; like projecting an \$8.6 million current account deficit in 1977 that ended up at \$113 million. We are the honest government; we have taken Manitoba great steps and we will continue to do that, Mr. Speaker.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I acknowledge the next speaker, I would like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 17 students from Morris Christian Day School in Morris, Manitoba, under the direction of Miss Linda Colombe. This school is in the district of the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

On behalf of the honourable member, we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, it's dangerous to follow the Member for Pembina, because one gets sidetracked. I'm going to try my very best not to be sidetracked by some of the obvious inaccuracies and problems that the member has. By honest conviction, Mr. Speaker, the member believes very much in his position and therefore is tempted to sieze facts or figures which he thinks support his position, but which are not really necessary to make the case that he's making and rather makes his case weaker because of their inaccuracies.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina has said that the budgeted deficit in 1977 was \$108 million.

What he is relying on, Mr. Speaker, but he won't say, is that on Budget night a Budget came in with a capital deficit of about \$100 million, a current deficit of about \$8 million, and an announcement that there would be immediate Supplementary Supply to deal with an employment situation which would add approximately \$25 million to the Budget, so that the Budget deficit announced on Budget night was roughly \$130 million. It ended up, Mr. Speaker, at about \$190 million, and the difference was composed of roughly a \$50 million shortfall in revenues and some \$20 million additional expenditures, and the kind of expenditures were the kind that the member has already excused.

So, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't have to let himself be trapped into making that kind of flamboyant statement that there has been \$113 million increase in the deficit in 1977. What he should do, Mr. Speaker, is look at his own figures. The cumulative deficit of the Conservative party while in office; and now, according to the Member for Pembina — so this is not according to the Leader of the Opposition, it's according to the Member for Pembina — are \$85 million, plus \$45 million, plus \$100 million, plus \$250 million budgeted this year. I use that figure advisedly, Mr. Speaker, because we only have it at \$219 million, by taking \$24 million in reserves and throwing it into the revenues. Anybody who knows accounting will say that if you take 20 more reserves and throw it into revenues then your actual operating deficit is increased by \$24 million. All you're doing is taking an asset and converting it into an operating revenue.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be \$250 million. There's already been \$3 million announced is going to be put into Supplementary Supply. The Minister of Mines has already indicated that he'll probably need more. I'm not complaining about this; if the drought situation stays as it is, and we have firefighting which is an uncontrollable expense, we are going to be no worse than \$250 million. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I can now speak as an authority, because two weeks ago, without seeing that Budget, I said there will be a minimum deficit of \$200 million. I was wrong by the \$20 million — really not wrong, I said a minimum deficit. I'm now saying that there will be a minimum deficit of not less than \$250 million, Mr. Speaker, and if you add up the figures you come to \$479 million, a half-billion dollar increase in provincial debt in less than four years of Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker. The amount which is required to make payment on that debt, interest and principal, will be no less than \$50 million a year for the next 20 years. A Saunders Aircraft every year without getting one penny in wages; without getting one penny in material supplied; without having any possibility of success; simply interest charges of \$50 million a year in four years of Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker. That means that for the next ten years 1 percent of sales tax will not buy the citizens of Manitoba any housing; any health care; any educational opportunities; any roads; anything that adds wealth to the Province of Manitoba will not be bought by virtue of the Conservative administration having foisted on this community \$50 million a year in debt retirement charges.

The Member for Emerson doesn't seem to think that is a problem. He doesn't seem to think that is a

problem. I tell him, Mr. Speaker, and I have travelled in south-east Manitoba and in south-west Manitoba, that the people in his constituency regard it as a problem, and Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a problem, and the Progressive party regards it as a problem.

(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says to me, would I raise taxes. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the next government, whichever it will be will have to raise taxes. I make no pretense about it, Mr. Speaker. The Progressive party, if it comes to power, will have to do something about the fact that the Conservative administration has not permitted its revenues to keep pace with its expenditures, and I do not think that its expenditures have been out of line. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in order to keep pace, revenues to expenditures, a Progressive party, yes, will see to it that the revenues of this province increase.

There are various ways of doing it. The best way would be to get a better share of our resource revenues. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make things any softer on the people of Manitoba than is necessary. If necessary — and I believe that it is necessary by virtue of the financial mess that we are in — a Progressive party government would go to the people of Manitoba and say, "Rather than you paying 1 percent of sales tax next year and getting nothing, we are going to put us in a position where we are paying more as we go, so that the taxes that you pay will buy goods and services and not be used to retire debt which is created by financial mismanagement". Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks me whether a Progressive party would raise taxes. Rather than raise taxes for future generations and buy nothing, a Progressive party would see to it that revenues kept pace with expenditures, and if that means that there has to be increased revenues in various forms of taxes, yes, our tax policy will be based on getting more out of our resource revenue. But it will if necessary — and I cannot avoid this and I cannot hide it — say that personal taxes of an income nature, perhaps sales taxes, would have to go up so that we do not continue to wallow in the financial quagmire that has been produced by the Conservative administration. Yes, I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever in saying that.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative administration, and we have noticed something nefarious in the House over the past two weeks because they are in trouble; there is no doubt that they are in trouble. But they believe, Mr. Speaker, believe incorrectly that that trouble will be evaporated by them trying to focus — in a rather rude way, may I say and it's something that's sad — on what they term to be the inadequacies of the Leader of the Opposition. Their standard response is to giggle, to shout, to taunt and to otherwise insult what they feel is a suitable target.

Now I want to remind the Conservative party, Mr. Speaker, that kind of politic has been tried before and it doesn't work. Trying to destroy a political feeling by attacking the inadequacies of a leader of a particular party is the facile thing to do, but it's been proven very very ineffective, Mr. Speaker. Probably the best example of it was between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee. Now there is no question that Mr. Churchill, in stature and capacity and probably the good will of the people of Britain, had much more

stature than Mr. Attlee, that Mr. Attlee was rather meek-looking; he was a very intellectual person, he was a very decent person, but the Conservatives of Britain thought that all they had to do was show Mr. Churchill as against Mr. Attlee. Churchill said it best, "What more ridicule can you give than to say that Mr. Attlee is a sheep in sheep's clothing?" I don't think I've heard anything as clever from the Conservative side with respect to the Leader of the Opposition. But the sheep in sheep's clothing, Mr. Speaker, beat Churchill at the next election, because the Labour party had conviction, stood for something, and was not depending on getting into power solely on the basis of an outstanding personality.

Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives will go back, if the members will go back to a situation which is probably closer to them they will probably more realize what I've said. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the present Governor General, the former Leader of the New Democratic party, the Honourable Ed Schreyer, had more popularity in the Province of Manitoba than did the Leader of the Conservative party. The New Democrats, in doing the same thing, by the way as the Conservatives are now doing, said that "All we have to do is show that we've got Schreyer, they've got Lyon. We'll go on the program, 'Leadership You Can Trust', and we'll win no matter what our conviction is, and no matter what our program is".

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it didn't work then and it won't work now, Mr. Speaker. If the New Democratic party is defeated in the next election, and I am certain that it will be, it's not because of the inadequacies of its leader, it's because of the inadequacies of the New Democratic party, Mr. Speaker, because they too, have suddenly realized their own problems and are pushing all kinds of positions which are completely unacceptable. It's something, Mr. Speaker, which they will have to recognize I was not prepared to do. I was not prepared to engage in double-talk. When I knew there was going to be a problem in the party I wanted to fight that problem on the grassroots floor and I went there and I fought it, hoping that there would be no split between the party and the caucus.

There is now an open declaration by the caucus that they will not follow the party. Mr. Speaker, they know that if I was in that party they know it would not have happened, that I would have been on the floor, that I would not say that we are going to let the trade unions get an anti-scab resolution through and then we will ignore it; they know that I would have been on the floor arguing that. Mr. Speaker, that has been my problem, that I have not wanted that kind of separation to take place but that separation has now taken place. If the New Democratic party has a problem, it hasn't to do with the personality of the leader, it's with the lack of conviction of the party and that lack of conviction was demonstrated in 1977 and it is now being demonstrated today. Mr. Speaker, that is why in the Province of Manitoba, there is room for a Progressive party, because the Conservative government is completely inadequate and disliked, the people cannot bring themselves to vote for New Democrats and they are seeking an alternative; the Progressive party is proposing that alternative and is proposing to fill that vacuum.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party I will say in the words of one of our candidates who said it better than I could, Mr. Dave Birchard, he said the Liberal party is a beached whale. (Interjection)— A beached whale. If you want to have an argument about that you'll have to take it up with Mr. Birchard, because it was he who made the statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get to the actual content of this so-called Budget Address, which was not a Budget Address at all. It was demonstrably not a Budget Address because a Budget Address is supposed to indicate that some type of philosophy has gone into preparing revenues, expenditures, how they will be dealt with, how they will ultimately come out. The Budget Address presented by the Minister of Finance this year was simply a calculation. There was a calculation of expenditures; there was a calculation of revenues; then they were put down, and what the Conservatives saw when those initial calculations were put down, was a horror story.

They saw expenditures — not limited to where they are now — they saw expenditures with another \$200 million added on; they saw revenues which showed that there would be a shortfall of revenues and expenditures which would amount to \$350 to \$400 million. They had to then try to pare those expenditures and they did, but they didn't have the guts to do anything about the revenues. So they took \$24 million out of a reserve account; they added some taxation with regard to tobacco and liquor; and they ended up by saying maybe there's some way in which we can fudge this. Maybe there is some way in which we could take attention —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wasn't here. He'll have to read in Hansard what I said about his inaccuracies of 1977 because I know the danger there, I'm going to use up another five minutes going back to repeat to him what he didn't hear.

But, Mr. Speaker, what they did is they added up the figures; they came out with what to them was a horror story and they said, "How can we undo this horror story?" They came to the conclusion that the way to do it. Mr. Speaker, is to use the best part of the Budget Address — I'm talking about the time — in lambasting the New Democratic party, in spouting doctrinaire ideological positions which had nothing to do with any reality, in the hope that the public and the media and the Opposition would be so intimidated by this plethora of vituperation against somebody else, that somehow they would not look at the Budget itself.

The Minister knows he has failed because the day after the Budget was announced the bottom line was the biggest deficit in the Province of Manitoba's history. That was the bottom line. You won't find, Mr. Speaker, anything printed in any of the media — and they are in my humble opinion correct in this regard — they didn't print anything about all the rubbish that spewed forth from the mouth of the Minister of Finance with regard to the last three years.

The Member for Morris has talked about the three envelopes. By god, Mr. Speaker, we had all three or four or five opened on the same night. Even the Member for Morris wasn't so imaginative in his story as to include blaming the international situation. He said, "Blame my predecessor; blame the Federal Government, and prepare three envelopes". But my friend the Minister of Finance has found people to

blame that nobody else ever dredged out because he is skilled at dredging out things.

So what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They added up; they calculated the figures; I'm sure they did some paring because I know that is the budgetary process; I'm sure they did some soul-searching; I'm sure they said, "Should we put on an increase in taxes?"; I'm sure they said, "We can't do that now. Let's go one more year. Let's hope this flies and we'll come back and then we'll do the necessary things that have to be done", because they've taken a lesson from Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. Crosbie went about the nation saying that if you tell the people the truth and you give them hard facts, they will digest those hard facts and they will vote for you. The Conservatives said, they didn't vote for them. Obviously the people can't accept the truth and therefore we're going to have to go to the public on a wing and a prayer and that's what this Budget is. It's a wing-and-a-prayer Budget. Add up the figures, do the best we can, spew vituperation on the heads of the Opposition, point out their weaknesses, laugh at their leader, go to the public, get elected and then we will become conservative, then we will become fiscally responsible. Mr. Speaker, that's what's happened. Everybody can see it. (Interjection)— I can't really hear what the Minister of Finance is saying. I'm sure that it is words of wisdom, that's right. Mr. Speaker, that's what they have done and that's what they hope to succeed with. I hope for the sake of the people of the Province of Manitoba they are not successful. They think obviously, this is a good strategy. I choose to think that it is not.

Mr. Speaker, there is proof. I have incontrovertible proof that what I am saying is true, I have incontrovertible proof. The reason I can prove that this is not a Budget, that it has none of the things that a Budget should contain, is that the Minister of Finance when he got up for an hour refused to talk about the Budget. He refused to say anything about the budgetary provisions. The reason that he did that is he didn't have a Budget. He had this mess, and really more in their eyes than in the eyes of my friends the New Democrats, because the New Democrats really don't think terribly about these deficits. They are Keynesian economists.

My problem, Mr. Speaker, with the Keynesians, is that the philosophy of Keynes is that in good years you raise taxation and you collect money, and in bad years you take the money that you've accumulated, you spend it and you run deficits. I've read that in Keynes and it makes sense. I've never seen a Keynesian philosopher be willing to increase taxation or be willing to reduce expenditures. They are always talking about it as if it's a bad year and you have to increase expenditure. That is the difficulty with Keynes, Mr. Speaker, and that's why in the eyes of the Conservatives, their Budget really isn't that bad in the eyes of the New Democrats.

It is bad in my eyes, Mr. Speaker, because I say you cannot operate that way. You have to in some way relate your revenue to your expenditure — and I'm not saying that you will never have a deficit — but a deficit has to be something that is planned and not something that comes about by merely adding up the figures on both sides. So the Minister refused to talk about it and instead he used a trick that he

thought would work. It is tantamount, Mr. Speaker, to a man with —(Interjection)— well the trick doesn't work but I'll explain the trick that he tried.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We can only have one speaker at a time. I hope the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources is not reading a newspaper in the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I will have to withdraw the remark because he says it's tricky. It was so patently false that it wasn't even a good trick and therefore he is not tricky. That's right.

Mr. Speaker, it is like a man who has a very very ugly face and he wants to appear beautiful so he makes a puppet, and the puppet is a Frankenstein-type visage. He puts that up beside his head and he says, look how beautiful I am, hoping that people will say that Frankenstein looks so terrible that the Minister looks beautiful. But the people look at that and they say, one is a puppet; one is a fake; one is a created thing; the other is real and the real thing, Mr. Speaker, is not made more beautiful or more handsome by the ugliness of the puppet.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that with this particular Minister who happens — I would think most people would say "handsome Brian" — but he couldn't get by on his own pleasant appearance because he knew that Budget would make him look ugly and that's why he picked up this Frankenstein, Mr. Speaker. But I tell the honourable members of the Conservative party that it will not work, that you are still — as a matter of fact more so — regarded as being an incompetent government, and that the people of Manitoba are looking desperately for somebody to vote for instead of the Conservative party. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson says, meaning us? We are certainly going to give them a chance to do that, and we will see what happens after the election votes are counted.

The fact is that I hope we give them a good alternative. I'm going to deal with that alternative right now, Mr. Speaker, because I've sat in this House and I've heard budgetary statistics poured forward about retail sales, gross national product, value of manufactured goods, mining production in terms of dollars without even reflecting it in terms of real production, statistics, Mr. Speaker, which each government of whatever stripe, has come in and tried to say that those statistics are meaningful in terms of how the people of the Province of Manitoba are living. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason governments use those statistics is that they aren't willing to test their performance by real statistics.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive party I say now that when we present a Budget we will have different criteria for statistics; we will put those criteria down in advance and we will say in advance to the extent that we are capable of improving the statistics, we will have been successful; and we will say in advance to the extent that we have been incapable of proving them, we are failures. We will be willing to accept the responsibility for achieving positive results on these sets of statistics, Mr. Speaker, which are entirely different than any set of statistics that have been used by previous governments.

I'm only going to give you a sample of them. I'm not going to be exhaustive because there are many

things, many measurements of the quality of life and the quality of human betterment that I will not have mentioned but we will mention them. We will try to detail as many of them as we can and then we will indicate to the people of the Province of Manitoba that to the extent we improve conditions, we ask for your support; to the extent that we fail to improve conditions, we accept responsibility.

Here are some, Mr. Speaker, of the criteria that we will use, as distinct from level of retail sales, inflow of citizens to the Province of Manitoba, outflow of citizens from the Province of Manitoba, gross national product; those are the ones that are used now, these are the ones we will use. Average income per family of five — an average is not a very good statistic, so we will add to that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I'm interrupting proceedings to return at 2 o'clock. The honourable member will have 12 minutes remaining.