

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, February 7, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today His Excellency Edward Ney, who is the Ambassador of the United States of America.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon, sir.

Also this afternoon we have from the Torah Academy, eight Grade 5 students and they are under the direction of Pamela Bell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Also we have from the University of Manitoba, 12 political studies students and they are under the direction of Michelle Scott and Sharon McLaughlan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Place Promenade Financial Discrepancies

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Over the weekend and on Monday, as a shareholder of the North Portage Development Corporation, the Minister took part in a decision to take over the operations of Place Promenade.

There have been a number of statistics put on the record which are on their face, contradictory. The Minister has said that they will suffer \$127,000 worth of losses in 1990, whereas Mr. Coop, the president of the corporation, has said within the last month that the loss would be substantially more than that, somewhere near \$500,000 a year, while others still say it may be as much as \$1,000,000.00. Could the Minister please explain the discrepancy?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): First of all, Mr. Speaker, the information that we received over the weekend, I will stay by that statement that I made. The shareholders did get together and they confirmed that it was in the best interest of the North of Portage to take over the particular building. I guess the final decision was based that the injection of the additional funds was required because of the necessity to control the parkade and the commercial components and ensuring the transition of that particular building to maybe a new owner and to protect their interest.

We feel that the project at large was very important. To protect the project at large, there will be other developments in regard to North of Portage, and there were business reasons to protect that particular complex.

Vacancy Rate

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I appreciate the Minister's answer. With a supplementary question, the vacancy rate is very important to determine the ongoing shortfall, which is now the responsibility of the North Portage Development Corporation, could the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) tell the House today what is the vacancy rate at Place Promenade?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when we discussed it over the weekend, in regard to the vacancy rate, the figures that were given that would show that the turnaround of Place Promenade would be three years and take five years to get your money back. The vacancy rate that was used to bring on those figures was 20 percent.

* (1335)

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister is telling us is that the current vacancy rate is 20 percent at Place Promenade. Will he please make the rent rolls public so that the people of Manitoba can get that kind of assurance that the figure of 20 percent is in fact the accurate one?

Mr. Ducharme: The existing vacancy rate is not the important factor when you determine what you are going to get back on your investment over five years. The Member is still bringing forward questions before the House, and I wish he would get his information correct.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to maybe mention that he did mention the other day about an affidavit statement decreasing the value of buildings made by Mr. Gary Julius. Maybe I could mention that the value basis that he did put on was cash flow.

Obviously, if the project was not producing enough revenue to support the mortgage, some potential investors could offer less at the auction sale than the mortgage value. That was the case at the time of that statement when the mortgage was 18.5.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, with a new question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, I have with me a sworn affidavit from a former security guard at Place Promenade who gives a detailed account of the vacancy rate at Place Promenade as of January 1, 1990, and may I quote from it: I was informed and verily believed that as of January 1, 1990, the vacancy rate at Place Promenade, the housing component of the North Portage project, was 30.4 percent. I was informed and verily believed that on January 1, 1990, of the 355

rental units available for residential housing, 247 were occupied, 108 were vacant.

Mr. Speaker, given this new information, would the Minister of Urban Affairs immediately contact the North Portage Development Corporation, have the rent rolls made public so we can be assured that 20 percent, the rate given by Mr. Coop and by the Minister is accurate?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, to make that information on the floor when I just told him a few minutes ago that our figures are based on a 20 percent vacancy rate over that period of time to make back that, no. I mentioned that is what they used as a guideline, an average of 20 percent vacancy rate. What difference does it make at this time -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ducharme: —what the vacancy rate is? We have a building there. The building is finished, and it would be up to the North of Portage to market that building and bring it along so we can either sell it or keep it as part of a very important project of North of Portage.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, the difference between 30 percent and 20 percent is a 50 percent difference in the revenue to the operations. If the Minister needed any quick calculation, he has got it.

With a supplementary question to him, and I read again from the sworn affidavit, it says: sometime in the latter part of December 1989, at a meeting of Place Promenade security guards, we were told by the property manager of Place Promenade that if anyone should ask, they should be told that the vacancy rate is 20 percent.

* (1340)

Will the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) immediately get to the bottom of this discrepancy and report tomorrow the truth to the House?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, again, the instructions that were given to us from North of Portage were that the average vacancy rate over the three years would be 20 percent. That would bring it on line. That is exactly what I said.

Provincial Auditor North Portage Development Corp.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) seems anxious to get to his feet. He now will have the opportunity.

Given this information, will the Minister of Finance contact the Provincial Auditor and request of him that these questions that have been raised over the last two days be part of his comprehensive audit of the financial operations of the North Portage Development Corporation?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I took several questions as notice yesterday on behalf of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme).

Let me say first with respect to the question just asked, as the Member knows, as he was interviewed, in part because of my encouragement to the Provincial Auditor, by the Provincial Auditor I believe this morning and asked to lay all of his claims, his allegations and his questions before the Provincial Auditor, indeed as we encouraged the Provincial Auditor to interview the Member for Fort Rouge, I would expect that he would know the answer to that question. The question is of course, the Provincial Auditor has complete leeway to look into a number of these matters. Furthermore, we will encourage him to do so.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would also like to indicate to the Member opposite, particularly after I heard yesterday that he made an allegation to the effect that this Government somehow was holding back the Provincial Auditor from looking at certain things, somehow trying to protect the third Party, I say to the Member opposite, he is impugning the motives of the Provincial Auditor. What he wants to say about the Government is fine within the political arena, but when he wants to say something about the Provincial Auditor I think he owes some type of an apology to him.

Varta Batteries Ltd. Closure

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a very serious matter yesterday, we learned again another plant has closed down. There is a bit of a discrepancy on the number of actual jobs lost in Manitoba and Winnipeg but certainly in the 140 to 160 range. Hopefully, if part of the warehouse component of Varta Batteries is able to stay we can retain some jobs in Manitoba.

This is becoming in our opinion a disturbing trend in our province with plants closing down and jobs and families being sacrificed. My question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology is, when he became aware of this issue some six week ago, did he explore any other options for keeping that plant open, not just with the company, but by the employees and their families that would be most directly affected by the corporate decision?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, first so that the facts are available, we were approached in the middle of December by Investment Canada who had indicated that Johnson Controls had made an offer to purchase Varta Batteries. At that time the original information filed by Johnson Controls did not contemplate the closing of the plant. I believe two or three days later a subsequent application was provided indicating that Johnson Controls did now because of new information related to the upwards of \$10 million of losses incurred by the company over a four-year period, that in fact they would not make the offer unless they could downsize the operation of the company. In that case, Mr. Speaker, that was the proposition put forward by Johnson Controls.

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

Subsequently, I faxed the Minister of ISTC, Honourable Harvie Andre, in Ottawa asking him not to proceed until I have had an opportunity to meet with the presidents of both companies. I did meet with them a couple of days after that. We did discuss a wide variety of issues and—Mr. Speaker, I see you giving me the time signal. I will answer further at the next question.

Mr. Doer: Well, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister explore any options of keeping the Manitoba firm open, a place where there is higher unemployment than southern Ontario? Why would we let the federal Government allow the company to take over this firm and close down the western Canadian, the Winnipeg-based operation, and leave open the southern Ontario-based operation? Why would the federal Government even allow that or even think about that with the growing disparity in terms of unemployment rates between the golden triangle of Canada that is getting everything in terms of our federal Government and the west that is being left out in the cold by the federal Government?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, those very questions were in fact put to the Honourable Harvie Andre, No. 1, and to the presidents of both companies, No. 2.

When we met with the presidents of both companies they indicated what their financial position was, they had lost \$10 million. That is a significant amount of money.

My honourable friend from across the way has indicated in the past some of his social democratic economics that would have seen the taxpayers foot a \$10 million bill. I do not think that is what anybody wants in this province. We regret the loss of jobs.

In fact we did discuss the potential for other activity with respect to Varta Batteries, other activity with respect to Johnson Terminals, Mr. Speaker, Government incentives to operate other branches of Johnson Controls Limited in their varying operations. They are a huge company. We pursued many, many different avenues. The only avenue that we came up with, after that pursuit, was a promise by the company, an undertaking by the company, to Investment Canada that they would pursue a feasibility study for the continuation of the plant here on a reduced scale.

Modernization

* (1345)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered the question. Did he ask and receive the consent from the federal Government to stop the closing of the Winnipeg plant, which was a condition of the sale? Why were we not able to negotiate with the federal Government and our provincial Government the ability to keep the Manitoba plant open as opposed to the St. Thomas southern Ontario plant open, and look at options for modernizing the Manitoba plant so the value-added jobs could be here in western Canada and Winnipeg rather than staying in Ontario where all the preference

has been given in terms of federal procurement and in federal modernization right now?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade.—(interjection)— Order, please. Order. The Honourable Minister.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, we —(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, those exact issues were pursued with the company, with both companies as a matter of fact, to determine what we could do. The fact of the matter is the Winnipeg plant was built in 1958, had not been modernized and is dealing with old technology. The plant in Ontario was built in 1981 and it was dealing with more modern technology and is in fact located adjacent to the OAM, the automobile market, which is the largest customer of the plant.

So in those terms we were not able to convince them that the Winnipeg plant should have remained open in that respect. Notwithstanding that we wrote to the Minister on December 22, 1989, indicating—and I wish to indicate strongly object to this acquisition, unless there are commitments to maintain or to enhance the Manitoba employment base.

Mr. Doer: My question then to the Minister is, why did the federal Government reject your letter and your advice for the provincial Government? Why did we not look at modernizing our manufacturing plant in Manitoba with the federal Government rather than closing the Manitoba plant down? Under the Minister's logic, we would have no manufacturing base in Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is improper and probably runs against all the Rules of this House to ask a Minister of this Government why some Minister from some other Government has made some decision or rejected this or that or the other.

The Honourable Member ought not to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism what was in the mind of a federal Minister.

Mr. Doer: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, on the same point of order.

Mr. Doer: Given the fact that the decision of the federal Government closed down 160 jobs in Winnipeg—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member did not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Trade.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, as indicated by my House Leader, I have no idea what went through the mind of the Minister in Ottawa with respect to making that decision. We had communication with him on a regular basis. We had a number—my honourable friend from Concordia says it is the easiest place in Canada to close a plant.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the NDP years; 1984 to 1987, 21 plant closures, 2,275 jobs lost. That is their record.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Older Workers Labour Adjustment

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday when I asked about training for older workers the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) told me to ask the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). When I asked the Minister of Family Services on Monday, she said, talk to the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). When the Minister talked about possible retraining for older workers, she mentioned a federal-provincial agreement that is signed although it is not yet in operation.

My question is to the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). Given that this federal-provincial agreement does not apply to older workers until the expiry of UIC benefits, can the Minister outline her Government's specific plans to assist older workers to find employment, to retrain before their UIC benefits run out? What are the provincial plans?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the criteria for the older worker agreement, the POWA Agreement as it is called, is to deal with workers who are not going to be employable.

What the Member is talking about is retraining. The retraining part of it is a component of Education and Training. We actively work with older workers to see if they can be retrained, and then they go right into a program.

Older Workers Program Responsibility

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): My supplementary question then is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). When I asked the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) what retraining does he have in place for older workers, he said talk to Family Services. Family Services says talk to Labour.

I would ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) if he could advise me who is in fact in charge and responsible for retraining older workers, and that is going to involve some of these people out of the Varta Batteries plant.—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable First Minister.—Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the training of workers and retraining of workers is a multifaceted responsibility. Obviously training programs—the Program for Older Worker Adjustment involves assisting workers who, because of age and circumstance, may not be able easily to re-enter the work force. It involves a variety of safety-net programs in support of it.

With respect to training and retraining, there are obviously facilities available and programs available under Canada Employment. They sponsor people in a variety of post-secondary and secondary educational institutions throughout this province. I am sure the Member may be familiar with those programs.

Educational institutions at the post-secondary level have a variety of programs that are available to people of all ages for retraining them, for providing them with the skills necessary to compete in the job market if they are in a position to do so.

The difficulty with many older workers is that because of age and circumstance, retraining may not be the best option for them. POWA has been set up to provide a safety net of other program supports, financial supports, for them obviously if they are not served well by the existing programming.

Mr. Minenko: It is obvious then, from the Premier's response, and him turning to some of his Ministers to find out what the answer is, that he is not even sure.

Older Workers Labour Adjustment

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): My question then is to the Minister responsible for Seniors.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable First Minister, on a point of order.

Mr. Filmon: The Member for St.—where are you from? The Member for Seven Oaks—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: You see how easy it is, Mr. Speaker, for me to need to ask a little bit of assistance in responding to a question. The fact of the matter is that when the Member asks a question, I am sure that he wants as much information as I can possibly give. If I need to turn to a Minister to ask for a certain bit of information

to assist me in responding to him I will be happy to do that anytime, anywhere—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable the First Minister does not have a point of order.—(interjection)— Order, please. The Honourable the First Minister did not have a point of order, but I would like to caution the Honourable Member that it is out of order to comment on the answer previously given.

Mr. Minenko: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question, seeing the Education Minister (Mr. Derkach) does not know who is in charge, Family Services, Labour, does not, I would like to ask the Minister of Seniors if there are going to be workers who are going to be unemployed as a result of this recent plant closing and workers who have been unemployed as a result of Canada Packers, and many of the other closings, under the previous administration, what direction would he point a senior worker to find employment if someone were to call his Seniors Directorate and ask, I am an older worker and I would like to find some retraining. Who would he direct them to?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, the Member asks I am sure a very serious question, and I am sure his colleagues would like a serious response.

I would first of all like to point out—and he did make reference to the very unfortunate situation of the layoff of individuals at Canada Packers, which was closed under the previous administration, the fact that there is no leadership or any agricultural policy coming from the Liberal Party as it pertains to the sale of hogs to eastern Canada, again re-entry into a major packing house contract that would provide opportunities for people in the packing house industry, and I would suggest that my colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), who is very qualified, I am sure can deal very fully with the concerns of the Member.

Family Violence Case Review

* (1355)

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): My question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member.

Mr. Edwards: Women and children in our society tragically continue to be the victims of abuse in alarming numbers. We acknowledge the recent efforts being made by this Government to raise awareness of this problem through TV ads.

However, we were distressed today to learn that a man who was found guilty of beating and terrorizing his wife and attempting to run over his son, was given a six-month sentence with eligibility for parole after two months. That is not an acceptable message to be

sending to Manitoba women and children, and it is inconsistent with what we all in this Chamber are attempting to achieve. Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) review this case personally, with a view to appealing it?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I certainly associate myself wholeheartedly with the preamble of the Honourable Member's question. The review has already been done even though this morning is a Cabinet day; that review has been done and an appeal will be launched.

Mr. Edwards: I thank the Minister for that response.

Victim Assistance Committee Family Violence

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, after repeated demands from this side of the House, this Party in fact, the Minister finally rescinded the Treasury Board edict with respect to payments out of the Victims Assistance Fund, yet the Minister still appears unfortunately to be trifling with the Victims Assistance Committee.

My question is: why, when the recommendation for funding was made to this Minister for funding to the Selkirk Committee on Abuse against Women, in November, has the Minister not had the time to deal with it?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Among other grants in this fiscal year—and I should correct the Honourable Member, there never was a ban on grants recommended by the Victims Assistance Committee, the Honourable Member is wrong again. We will begin with the Community Legal Education Association \$20,000 this fiscal year for domestic abuse publications, the Community Legal Education Association \$30,000 for the continuation of the Feeling Yes, Feeling No Program, Family Survivors of Homicide, I do not have the number available to me at this moment, but continuation of service delivery to survivors of victims of homicide, the Manitoba Association of Women and the Law exploring into gender equality in the criminal courts \$31,000 grant. That grant to the victims of Family Survivors of Homicide, by the way, was \$29,500.00. Perhaps the Honourable Member will ask another question so I can complete the list.

Victim Assistance Funding Delays

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): This Minister knows about backlogs, and after a six-month edict banning it, there was a bit of a backlog. Again for the Minister of Justice, unfortunately that is not the only victims' group that he is holding up. When is he going to find the time to deal with the recommendation to fund the Mother Earth's Children group, also a recommendation sitting on his desk since November?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): In this fiscal year as well, Mr. Speaker, the

Government of Manitoba has supported the research program Childhood Victimization: antecedents to prostitution. That was a \$1,850 grant. Child and Family Services Research Group: Parent Support Project, \$15,249.00. Trevor Markestyn for a Break and Enter Victims' Research Program, \$17,000.00. The Brandon City Police Department, a matter raised previously by the Honourable Member, a three-year program, \$151,822, and a \$15,000 evaluation component. That was the only three-year program funded. The reason for it was that the Brandon City Police agreed that grant from the Victims' Assistance would be diminished over the three years down to zero after the three years. The remaining ones, multiyear ones, will be the subject of decisions soon after we have made our policy framework known to the—

* (1400)

Physically Disabled Program Funding

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): On this past Friday, I raised the issue of Conservative cutbacks to services for the mentally handicapped. Today I want to raise the issue of Conservative cutbacks to the physically disabled. All Members will have received today a letter from the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities calling on all of us to try and help stop the death by 1,000 minor cuts, by this Government, to services for the physically disabled, and particularly to an organization that has served this province well since the polio epidemic.

I want to ask the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), given that the SMD is not able to provide services for disabled persons in need, given that their organization and their tradition is in jeopardy, will this Minister agree to ensuring an increase to the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities that is in line with inflation and that is responsive to the unmet needs in our community?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I do associate myself with the remarks the Member has made about the worthwhile work that organization does. I would like to point out to her as well though that they did receive a 3.5 percent increase this year, making a total grant to that particular agency of \$4.8 million. There have been no cutbacks to that agency.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, this Government gives new meaning to Sterling Lyon cutbacks. They are prepared to turn the knife slowly, rather than do it all in one fell swoop. If the Minister does not believe this letter that was sent to all of us, I would ask her a question based on a letter that was sent from the president of the society to all of its clients, and I will table that letter which refers actually to a cutback of 2.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question here?

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: How can this Minister justify that kind of a cutback that runs for these past three years and justify the resulting service reductions while she underspends her department by millions of dollars?

Mrs. Oleson: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat again, for the information of the Member, there has been no cutback to the Society of Manitobans with Disabilities. They did not receive the funds that they requested; no organization, I believe, did. I have met with them to discuss their problems on many occasions. I have corresponded with them. There has been no cutback to that agency.

Pediatric Services

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): This Government has clearly cut back services to the physically disabled by not ensuring increases to the society that allows them to keep up with inflation and to meet the growing need on the part of the disabled in our community.

My question to the Minister is that, given that there are at least 100 disabled children in rural and northern Manitoba without the necessary pediatric services - (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Question, please. Will the Honourable Member kindly put her question now, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Will the Minister deal with the situation on a short-term emergency basis and ensure that funds are allocated to the society to deal with these over 100 children who are without physiotherapy and speech therapy?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Family Services.

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, during the process of the preparations for next year's budget all those matters will be taken under consideration.

Economic Growth Budget Request

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased yesterday to receive the support of my friend to my left here - (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Osborne. Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Osborne has the floor.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) if he would care to answer the question today about when he intends to bring down a budget in the new fiscal year, and will he bring it down as early as the end of April?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if I asked a question like that I would want to blame it on the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). I would like to vent my outrage, but it is such a humorous question I hardly can.

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

Mr. Speaker, we finished Estimates Review for 1989-90 yesterday, and by the way we did not quite finish it because there were eight departments of Government that were never reviewed because the Liberals cannot manage time.

But, Mr. Speaker, we still have not passed the main appropriation Act. We still have not at this point passed the main appropriation Act that gives effect to all of the Estimates that have been reviewed. So as everybody knows in this province, we as Government are not totally in control of the mechanism and the procedures of this House. Yet the Opposition ultimately, Opposition combined, ultimately will determine when it is this House rises, and if the Member is suggesting that indeed he now wants to leave the debate on final offer selection, if he wants to leave it as of today and therefore allow the Government quickly to move through the Estimates review for the next year, I would say then he should state his case.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing funny about what this province is facing right now. The Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) made that point yesterday and we have made it before in this House. When I wrote to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) last week I offered our complete co-operation to facilitate the business of the House to allow him the time to bring down an early budget because of the very serious problems that this province faces.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Honourable Member.

Mr. Alcock: Now, Mr. Speaker, corporate profits are now projected to be down 11 percent. Goods-producing industries are in decline. The Province of Manitoba needs to know, when will we see a budget from this Government?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance, which is mainly responsible for much of the fiscal policy that is directed in this province, did not receive one hour of consideration in the 200, as a matter of fact, not one minute. So let not the Member stand in his place and plead all of a sudden with the Government to try and do two months of Estimate review for the next year and guarantee to him that there will be a budget in place when he calls for it.

What is obvious here is that the Member opposite does not believe that there are major labour law disabilities to the enhancement of economy in this province, and he and his Party want to move away from final offer selection. They do not want to debate that issue.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Osborne, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, this Minister that is in such a rush to get—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Osborne, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the Estimates question on Monday. This Minister—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Alcock: —in his rush to get out of the House, is putting new legislation on the Order Paper today. We have offered to work with the Government to facilitate an early budget. When will we see it?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

* (1410)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's question is repeating in substance a question which was previously asked and, therefore, out of order. The Honourable Member, kindly rephrase his question, please.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, why will the Minister not give us a date?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, this Session began on May 18. We finished the Estimates review yesterday. How it is, if the Members opposite were so concerned about expediting the business of the House, the combined Opposition, they would have made sure this Government would be out, indeed, before Christmas last. So let not the Member stand in feigned indignation today and claim that somehow we have the control, the control to bring down a budget as quickly as he would wish.

Goods and Services Tax Government Position

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). The Alberta Minister of Finance has previously said that he has been putting the heat on Alberta MPs to oppose the proposed goods and services tax. Has this Minister of Finance pressured the Manitoba Tory MPs to stand up to Mulroney and oppose this unfair tax? In particular, has he registered his disgust with the federal Conservative Government for invoking closure in order to ram it through the House of Commons?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thought there would be more questions from the Liberal Finance Critic (Mr. Alcock) but he has wisely decided to hand off the rest of his questions, again, to the Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Speaker, let me say directly in response to his question that I have made strong representation to the

Member of Parliament from Winnipeg South, also to the Member of Parliament from the Interlake, and let me also indicate that I, again, have been in conversation with the Minister of Finance as recently as last week.

Let me also indicate that it is my intention to talk to Mr. Lee Clark as soon as possible. I have arranged for a conversation today, if possible. Let me also indicate that last night when there was a public rally held in Brandon, the Government was most ably represented by the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae).

Joint Collection System

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the Government is prepared to co-operate with Ottawa in the collection of the proposed goods and services tax. Can the Minister tell us at what stage his department is at in its negotiations and discussions with Ottawa in establishing a joint federal-provincial collection mechanism, and specifically can he tell us if Ottawa is going to pay Manitoba for its co-operation?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise particularly as the announcement by the federal Minister of Finance before Christmas that there was going to be an attempt made to see whether there was any common ground, any common ground whatsoever, to see whether or not some of the costs of collecting this tax again, which is federal in nature, whether or not there could be any sharing of human resources so that the impact on small businesses in particular could be minimized.

I can report to the House that last week officials of the federal Department of Revenue were in Winnipeg. They met with certain officials of the Department of Finance. I can also report that early outcome of that meeting would indicate there does not seem to be a lot of commonality as to how this tax might be collected in one place instead of two.

Mr. Leonard Evans: My last question, is the Minister of Finance still convinced, as he stated before, that benefits from the GST will show up by 1994 in the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would love to enter into debate with the Member. I wonder if he senses there is an election coming and he wants to use some information in his franking piece or something. I gather that is part of the reason for the question, either that or he is not going to be with us the rest of the week and he wants to get his question out for the Saturday Sun.

Let me indicate that any analysis that shows there may be potential economic growth as a result of the GST is that of the federal Government and indeed is that of the Conference Board of Canada. No part of it has been the provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call the Bills in the following order: Bill 31, and should Bill 31 pass into committee today, I have others to call—Bills 70, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57, 59 and 60.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): I previously indicated that we would like to see a number of Bills passed through to committee, Bill 84, Bill 35 and Bill 19. I notice the Government House Leader did not call that in the order as set, even though it was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I have told the Honourable House Leaders these types of discussions can take place outside of this Chamber.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson, on a point of order then.

Mr. Ashton: It has been a time-honoured tradition in this House to ask questions of House business. I have raised these matters with the House Leader. There has been no agreement, no indication from the House Leader when these matters—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member of our Rule 20(2), "When government business has precedence, the government orders and private members' orders may be called in such sequence as the government determines."

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging that Rule. I recognize that is the Rule. I was simply asking a question of the Government House Leader as has been standard practice in this Legislature—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) will take his chair, now.- (interjection)- Order. You will take your chair, now.

I have warned the Honourable Member in the past where discussions such as you are referring to today can be done outside of this Chamber. I have indicated that to the House Leaders on previous occasions.

An Honourable Member: It is not in order to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker: I did not say they were not in order. I have simply said, I have indicated in the past that these discussions can take place outside of this Chamber.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Ashton: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, then for clarification.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order, for clarification.

Mr. Ashton: Is it your ruling that we are no longer, as Opposition House Leaders, able to ask questions of House business in the Legislature, because that has been the practice?

I am not attempting to question the Government's right to set the agenda, nor am I attempting to make it more difficult for you. I am just attempting to ask a number of questions, as has been standard practice in this House, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask if that is your ruling, we are no longer able to ask questions—

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member has asked for clarification. I have simply stated to him of our Rule 20(2), "When the government business has precedence, the government orders and private members' orders may be called in such sequence as the government determines."

I do not have a problem with the Honourable Opposition House Leaders asking the Government House Leader for clarification of committees which may or may not be sitting, but as the Bills that are coming before the House during the Orders of the Day that is the right of the Government House Leader to call them in such an order as he sees fit. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, once again I am asking whether Opposition House Leaders are entitled, as has been the past practice, to ask questions. I am not questioning the right of the Government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) will take his chair. I am not about to get in a debate with the Honourable Member for Thompson. I have told the Honourable Member for Thompson that the Government House Leader calls the business of the day. The questions that the Honourable Member for Thompson is asking, or that I would allow on the floor, are questions to do with which committees are going to sit tonight, next week or whatever. The discussions that will take place with the House Leaders as per which Bills will come forward can take place outside of this Chamber. They do not have any business here on the floor.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, standing

in the name of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. Stand?

Is there leave that this matter remain standing? No? No leave?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): I believe it has been standard tradition in this House, we have a Member who is willing to speak. Could I obtain some clarification? Is the Government attempting to prevent the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) from speaking, because by denying leave, what they do is prevent the Member for Rupertsland from having the right to participate in this debate? Mr. Speaker - (interjection)- I am being interrupted by—

Mr. Speaker: Order please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Thompson, I would simply remind the Honourable Member for Thompson and all of the Members of his caucus, to whom we have extended exceedingly abundant amounts of co-operation with respect to Bill No. 31 and other house business since this May 18 when this Session began, that Bill No. 31 has been on the Order Paper I understand since June 15 of last year. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland and all Honourable Members have had ample time to engage in debate on Bill No. 31. They will have ample time as well to debate Bill No. 31 to whatever extent they please. The point is, Mr. Speaker, we would like to get Bill No. 31 off and into committee so we can deal with other important Government Bills that need to be dealt with as well.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Based on the long-standing practices and precedents of this House and on Madam Speaker's Ruling of May 27, 1987, I must rule that when a matter is standing in a particular Member's name, if that Member does not wish to speak, any other Member may speak without requiring leave of the House to do so.

I must also rule that in such circumstances leave of the House is required for the matter to continue to stand in the name of the Member in whose name it was standing when called. If such leave is not granted, that Member will lose his or her right to speak.

Therefore, there was no leave granted to allow the matter to remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper)—

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Therefore, the

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

question before the House is: shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour, please say yea. All those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion, the yeas have it.

* (1520)

Mr. Ashton: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members. The question before the House is: shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour of the motion will please rise. Order, please.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Alcock, Angus, Burrell, Carr, Carstairs, Charles, Cheema, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger (Emerson), Driedger (Niakwa), Ducharme, Edwards, Enns, Filmon, Findlay, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Gray, Hammond, Helwer, Kozak, Lamoureux, Mandrake, Manness, McCrae, Minenko, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Patterson, Praznik, Roch, Taylor, Yeo.

NAYS

Ashton, Doer, Evans (Brandon East), Harapiak, Hemphill, Maloway, Plohman, Storie, Uruski.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas, 38; Nays, 9.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT (Cont'd)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I appreciate the opportunity to speak on Bill 31. I will say that I have never seen in my nine years in this Legislature the kind of action taken by Members of the Liberal Party in this Government.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Dauphin, and the question before the House is Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act. I would ask the Honourable Member to keep his remarks relevant. The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on Bill 31. I said that at the beginning and I will continue to speak on Bill 31, but

as I indicated to you at the outset of my remarks, I am pleased to speak on Bill 31 and I intend to speak on Bill 31. Let me just say that we have the combined Government and Liberals voting against the right of the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) to speak in this House and the privileges of that Member to represent his constituents. That is what we have here by this Conservative Government and by the Liberals because they will not support the right of an individual —(interjection)—

(Mr. Neil Gaudry, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Order, please.

Mr. Plohman: —an MLA, to speak on behalf of his constituents.— (interjection)—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Dauphin has been recognized and we would like to hear his comments.— (interjection)— Order, please.

Mr. Plohman: I will have my 40 minutes, Mr. Acting Speaker, to address the issues related to Bill 31. I will tell the Members of this Government at this particular time that when I stand and speak on this Bill on behalf of my constituents, I can tell you they feel as I do that any action taken by Government in legislation to reduce the incidents of labour disputes, labour management disputes and strikes in this province is a positive thing, any Government who changes that legislation which can cause greater strife, and supported by the Liberals in this House to cause greater labour management strife, contrary to what this Conservative Party has said in this House year after year when labour legislation was brought in, that they did not want to see discord created, and that was their argument. Now they are taking a hypocritical position and a contrary position to what they have said in this House over the years.

* (1530)

In 1972 when the debates on labour legislation were taking place, in 1984 through various Bills that the New Democratic Governments brought in this House, Members of the Conservative Party stood up, and there were no Liberals at that time until River Heights was represented in this House in the latter times in 1986. During those years the Conservatives time after time said that changes in labour legislation were liable to upset the delicate balance of labour management that existed in the province and they said that they could not support those kinds of changes because in fact what it would lead to is greater strife, greater labour-management strife, more strikes in this province, more discord. The harmony that was there would be lost.

That, Mr. Acting Speaker, is contrary to what they are doing today because they are not concerned about working people in this province. They are not concerned about labour-management peace and harmony in this province and that is why they bring in legislation. We know why they do that. We know why the Liberal Party supports them because they need the corporate donors. They need the money in their coffers to fight an election

and they have to prove to their corporate friends that they are really what they said in their rhetoric in this House. They were against labour legislation, against final offer selection, against first contract legislation, against plant closure legislation and now they are going to prove it so that the money continues to roll into their coffers so they can fight an election. That is the only reason. Why they are bringing this in is a payoff to the corporate donors that support Liberals and Conservatives in this country and in this province. That is a payoff, only a payoff, and the Liberals will have to live with that reality.

I ask those Members to search their conscience when they vote for this legislation against final offer selection in this province. They will have to face that reality, because they are going to prove true what the leadership candidates of the Liberal Party at the national level are finding at the present time. If they do not support the big corporations in the country, they will not get any money and they cannot even run for the Liberal leadership. Just ask Lloyd Axworthy, ask Sheila Copps, Paul Martin and Jean Chretien where they are getting their money from, from the corporations. They now have to support free trade to do it. They always have supported free trade.

They had to put up with John Turner's language, Mr. Acting Speaker, during the last election simply for political survival. That is why they opposed the free trade deal, but now the truth comes out on the Liberals, the truth comes out where they stand on free trade. They are beholden to the corporations just like the Conservatives are. They are willing to prostitute themselves in order to get their money. That is what they are willing to do in this House. That is what they continue to do, the Conservatives and the Liberals. That is why they bring this legislation in that will lead to discord in this province. We have had relative peace.

We have had example after example of final offer selection working in this province. We have a sunset clause that will end this legislation if it has not been working, as put in by our Government in 1987, a five-year working period, a sunset clause.

They still persist in coming in with something that is not needed in the middle of that period of time, during a time when we have considerable evidence to demonstrate, as I will show and my colleagues have shown in speaking to this Bill, and as my colleague the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) would have liked to have shown if he had an opportunity to speak on this Bill in this House, an opportunity that was taken away by the Liberals, and they will live to regret that, an opportunity that was taken away by the Conservatives in this House, an opportunity for him to speak on this Bill and put the views of his constituents on that Bill.

Let them, if they want to argue that he should not be in his constituency. Why do I challenge any one of them to represent his constituency, a huge part of Manitoba with many remote and isolated communities that have no other voice, only that one voice in this legislature? That has been taken away by the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Order, please; order, please.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): The Honourable Member for Inkster, on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Acting Speaker, it should be well aware that we did not deny leave to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Lamoureux: It was a ruling that the Speaker previously admitted.

Mr. Plozman: The fact is the vote told the story, it will continue to tell the story and there will probably be other votes that will tell the story. The Liberals will tell their position and make their position clearer. Even though they do not want to make it clearer, they will be making it clearer over the next number of months. That will be guaranteed in this House.

It is clear that the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) wanted to speak. That is why he took the adjournment on the debate. He wanted to have an opportunity to speak, and that was denied. We have as a standard practice granted leave to individuals in this House to have the Bill stand in their name while another person speaks and leave it standing in the name of the Member. That has been done through convention time after time after time. In this particular case the Liberals would not grant leave, and the Conservatives would not grant leave. They would not grant leave by their vote, they demonstrated that by their vote.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we can go into so many Bills in Private Members' Hour, as well as in other business of the House, where Bills have remained standing in the names of other Members while others spoke. You know that happens during the time that you have been here.

Here we have a case—in some cases we have had Bills stand in another Member's name on a number of occasions, when they were not able to be here. In this case, the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) had on only one occasion today, just this day, had this Bill, asked for this Bill to be standing in his name, and they have refused to allow that to happen.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I feel that the issue that we are dealing with is so important, Bill 31, that all Members should have an opportunity to speak. I feel that it is regrettable that Members of the Conservative Government and Members of the Liberal Opposition have seen fit not even to want to debate such an important piece of legislation as the repeal of final offer selection in this province and its impact on labour management, harmony and strife in this province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have Tories holding 14 Bills in their names, standing in their name—14 Bills standing in the name of the Tories, and the leave has always

been granted by the New Democrats, by the Liberals, and by the Conservatives. Yet, in this particular case, the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) was not able to have that courtesy in this House, was not able not even one day to have that Bill stand in his name.

Mr. Acting Speaker, let me say that the Liberals and the Conservatives are keeping their heads in the sand on the effectiveness of final offer selection, how well it has worked, and how it has avoided strikes. The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) refuses to acknowledge that there has been so many settlements, 69 applications have gone forward over the last two-year period, 48 have reached agreement, only five went to the selector stage. Out of those five, three were decided on the side of the proposal put forward by labour and two by management.

The Members try to hang their hats on other arguments that are totally irrelevant to the issues at hand that have no bearing on the effectiveness of final offer selection. That is that final offer selection has provided another opportunity, another avenue for labour and management to arrive at a solution to a difficult problem. It has provided them another avenue, conciliation, arbitration, they had no alternative in many cases but to go to lockouts or strikes.

Now there is, and there has been, over the last two years, another alternative. The Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) understands that, he knows that is the case. He knows that it has worked well, even the RM of Springfield or the village of Springfield used this as a—the Rural Municipality of Springfield as a matter of fact was one of those who applied for the final offer selection. It worked in their particular case, and in many different cases in settling disputes, in stopping strikes, and avoiding strikes.

That is what the people of Dauphin, that is what the people of the Parkland region of this province, that is what the people of rural Manitoba, the farmers in this country, in this province, want to see happen; they want to avoid strikes. They want to see strikes averted so that there are no shutdowns of plants and operations that affect their livelihood, such as lockouts at the Lakehead in the elevator handling facilities. They do not want to see that. They want to see instead solutions worked out through joint discussion and arbitration, so they do not have to resort to the ultimate solution, the "death penalty," the kind of thing that hurts so many people and that being strikes and lockouts. They do not want to see that happen.

* (1540)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Order, please. If you want to debate, there is room outside for debate. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. Plohan: The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) is feeling very sensitive about his position, Mr. Acting Speaker, because he does not have a position, he finds that he is on the wrong side of the fence. He has thrown something up in the air and found the wind blowing

the other way, he found the parade moving the other way, now he does not know what he is going to do.

They are in a real dilemma, they do not know where they should stand on this issue and that is why they are barking from their seats. They are confused, there is total confusion in that caucus, and they know that, they do not know what side they are on, on this issue, and that is the problem they have.

They will not recognize the reality of what I am saying on this issue and that is the fact that it is avoided, it has avoided strikes and there is no real reason why the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province, his Cabinet and his caucus have brought forward this legislation except as an election payoff so that they will be able to fill their coffers with money from corporations who like to see this kind of action on behalf of Conservative Governments and supported by the Liberals.

We do not have to see the Liberals saying they work on behalf of working people. We see where they get their money. As a matter of fact the Manitoba candidate could not even run because he did not support the free trade, he criticized the Free Trade Agreement. The other leadership candidates are now one by one getting on the bandwagon, even as we see plant closures all around us, and jobs being lost, jumping on the bandwagon, saying, well, we will kind of support free trade so that they can now get those corporate donations into their coffers, into their war chest, so they can run a leadership campaign.

It is just like the Conservatives have traditionally done in this province. It is not because they believe there is anything wrong with final offer selection and how it is working. As a matter of fact, I think if they went in a room by themselves and soul searched, they would admit, each of them individually, one by one to themselves, with no one listening, that in fact final offer selection has worked, it is working and it will continue to work.

They know they have to put on this front for the benefit of their Chamber of Commerce and their corporate donors, and they know that, therefore, they are going to have to bring something in, look tough, stand up and take on those socialists, the New Democrats with their labour legislation. That is what they want to do and we know that.—(interjection)—The Premier (Mr. Filmon) now says, get real. He knows when it is hitting close to home. He knows that is exactly why he is bringing it forward, because he wants the money to roll in. That is precisely it.

I want to talk a little bit about the way that the Bill has worked over the last period of time. I have mentioned that 69 applications were received, 48 reached agreement even before they got to the selector, which demonstrates that process in and of itself has assisted the negotiating process. That is an important aspect of it and it is something that has been recognized.

In a number of studies by various people over the years, Professor Hugh Grant, the Economics Professor at the University of Winnipeg, even though he was not a proponent of this legislation, felt that it was an effective

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

way to promote the negotiations to avoid strikes and lockouts.

There was a number of other people who have found the same thing over the last number of years. As a matter of fact, Mr. Bellam indicated in a statement when referring to the situation in Ontario, where final offer selection existed for a number of years, that under various circumstances in various jurisdictions—Mr. S. A. Bellam, in the Osgoode Hall Law Journal entitled Final Offer Selection, two Canadian case studies and an American digression, said: both parties reported considerable pressure. It was generated by the FOS deadline after mediation. Each preferred to reach agreement through negotiation rather than risk a complete loss in arbitration. Obviously, the pressure of final offer selection keeps good negotiations at the bargaining table rather than forcing them or even enticing them away.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Bellam was examining in that article Canadian examples of final offer selection which took place in the mid-'70s in Ontario—(interjection)—here we have the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) saying, learn the issue.

He did not even realize that was happening in Ontario in the mid 70s, because he has not researched this issue to find out whether in fact it works, because again he has his ideological blinders on. He has to satisfy his friends and the corporate donors who he is expecting to throw some money into his campaign and into that of his Leader and the Liberal Party in this province. He does not care what the facts are about it and how it has worked. He has not studied to see whether it is effective or whether it has not been effective over the last number of years.

I find it so discouraging that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) even—in statements in an article that was carried in the Free Press dated June 30, 1984, Opposition Leader Gary Filmon said: the Bill has shattered harmony in labour management relations in this province. That is what it was entitled. It went on to say: Gary Filmon summarized his Party's position, and they could not understand why the Government was attempting to destroy the fragile balance between labour and business.

Now after this has worked—and we have seen that final offer selection has worked in this province over the last two years, and there was no fragile balance that was destroyed. As a matter of fact, it has contributed to less strife in the last couple of years.

The Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) even indicated only six strikes over 50 days in this province during the time that they have been in Government, or since final offer selection has been in place, which is not quite synonymous because that final offer selection came in a little bit before—only six strikes over 50 days, the second best time lost due to labour management disputes anywhere in the country except for Prince Edward Island, an excellent atmosphere that has existed built up over the last number of years under New Democratic Governments and now carrying on for

at least a short period of time into this Conservative Government.

Now they persist in upsetting that delicate balance that they referred to. They totally contradict the position that they took. They did not want to see legislation brought in that would upset this balance. Now they themselves are bringing in legislation that could very well upset this balance. They are taking away one of the possible avenues of settlement between labour and management, a method that has worked well over the last couple of years. It has worked. It is working, and they want to take that lever, that opportunity, that one avenue, away from labour and management to reach decisions.

I want to say I know that putting these arguments on the table is futile, because the Conservative Government, as I said, has made up their mind. They do not want to listen to reason and arguments about the way that this works. What they have done is simply said, we want to get rid of this because the New Democratic Party brought it in. It will send a nice signal to our corporate donors that we mean business, and they are going to loosen up on the purse strings and start the money rolling in.

Of course, the Liberals are not interested in listening to reason on this issue and how well it is working, how it should be given a chance to work for only three years, less than three years. Then there is a sunset clause and the Government of the Day could determine at that point, on the basis of an objective evaluation. The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) does not seem to understand even that. After a five-year period—(interjection)—Look, he is prejudging. He says there are more strikes, long strikes. It is all garbage. The fact is, he will not wait until a five-year period has gone by in this province so that an objective analysis can be done over the five-year period. He will not even wait that long. He wants to prejudge it after two years.

* (1550)

He is speaking for those he hopes will fill the Liberal war chest. That is all. He is competing with the Tories for the same dollars, so they want to send a message out. I know this is going to undercut the votes because it is not the dollars that are going to do the voting in the next election, it is the voters. Those voters know that what this Liberal Party is voting for and supporting here, and this Conservative Party is doing, is voting for and supporting labour management strife. They are encouraging strikes and lockouts in this province. That is what they are doing through this action. That is not very hard for people to understand. As a matter of fact, it is very easy for people to understand. They will get that message very clearly, repeatedly I might add, from New Democrats in this province.

This will not be interpreted as pro-labour legislation or anti-business legislation, but simply, Mr. Speaker, we interpret it by the public as an attempt by Liberals and Conservatives to disrupt a harmonious atmosphere that exists between labour and management in this province, and one that we are very proud of, and has existed over the years.

I would not doubt the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) will try to get the nomination for the Tories in the next election. I would not doubt that. He may very well decide to do that, but if he paints himself into a corner here, he will not be able to. But certainly in supporting this legislation, he leaves all the doors open. He may very well, if he wants to see which way the wind is blowing, say, well, gee, maybe I would be better off over there. It would not hurt him at all insofar as his philosophy on anything because he could fit into any of those two Parties with no problem at all. They are all the same.

Do not let the Liberals ever tell you they are the Party of common sense. They are not the Party of common sense. They just look which way the wind is blowing and they flip-flop on every issue that is brought forward. That is what they do. They have -(interjection)- No, they do not have any principles. That is right. The Member for St. James is absolutely correct. He does not have any principles to stand on in terms of issues. He flip-flops from one side to the other, and on this one he took his position a little early.

He finds the evidence rolling in later on that demonstrates that FOS is indeed working, and he realizes there is going to be great opposition. He thought there was so much division in the labour movement, so many people opposed to this, but he is finding now that in fact it has worked and that people in the labour movement and a lot of voters, working families who are affected by this, feel that it is a good piece of legislation that should be given a chance to work for the full time.

Now he is getting a little antsy about it. He is getting a little bit concerned about his position. He does not really know where he should go and he may have to, if he loses the final battle in the Liberal Caucus, move over to the other side, because he spoke a little bit too soon. He did not think about what he was saying before he said it. That often happens with glib people who like to make remarks off the cuff because they think it is witty. They often say things they have not thought of yet, and that is what happened to the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). He made a few statements that he had not thought about before he said them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to some of the things that have been said by the Conservatives on the reasons that the New Democratic Government at the time brought in legislation, during the time that we did as Government bring in a number of progressive pieces of legislation, including pay equity legislation, which is opposed by the Liberals and by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs). In the private sector, she has clearly put her position on the record. She is against pay equity in the private sector. The Leader of the Opposition is against pay equity, and the Liberals opposed it.

You should have heard the debates when that was brought in. The Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) ranted and raved against this legislation at the time. Finally he succumbed during the vote and had to vote with his caucus because they had the Whip on. But, boy I will tell you, did that Member for Brandon West

ever come out with some speeches at that particular time against pay equity on how the Government was simply catering to big labour in this province. It had nothing to do with that, it had only to do with equity and equality for all people and workers in this province. That is what it had to do with.

Now of course we have that same Conservative Government at this time moving forward with their true agenda, and I think if they had a majority Government they would repeal it all. It would be very, very dangerous for this province, because it would be the fastest way to put the Conservatives out of the thoughts of voters for a very long time, to give them that kind of a mandate. We saw what happened when they had it with Sterling Lyon. They did not know how to handle it. Now they have had some voice of reason that has kept them in line for the last two years.

The New Democrats in this province have kept them from implementing, introducing in this province their true agenda. We know what their true agenda would be from the rhetoric that they gave during their Opposition days and for the little things that slip out from time to time even now. One of those would be that pay equity legislation would be gone for good in this province. Plant closure legislation, improvements and protection for workers would be rolled back, would be lost in this province. First contract legislation would be removed and rolled back in this province.

Of course the only one that they proceeded with, and there are many other pieces of labour legislation that the Chamber of Commerce and the corporations want repealed in this province, the only one they have proceeded with is the final offer selection, just as a little bit of a token to let those corporations know that they are alive and well and still kicking and that they are going to do much more. It is a promise for the future for them. We are willing to do this, the minority Government, can you imagine what we are willing to do if we get a majority? They are chomping at the bit and rubbing their hands together because they are hoping that might happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to do our best to ensure that that does not happen in this province and we have to fight -(interjection)- It will, and it will continue to be very good. It has been pretty good over—the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said it has not been good enough. What was it, 16 or 17 years out of 20 where the New Democrats were in Government in this province? I think that was pretty effective.

An Honourable Member: Is that right? That was pretty offensive.

Mr. Plozman: The Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) has a very difficult time in accepting that is part of our history in this province. It is part of our history. As a matter of fact, our history will have social democratic Governments in this province in the future, many times in the future. We will probably have them within this decade very certainly. They will have to accept this fact. That in fact social democratic Governments have been the voice of reason and contributed to a fairer society in this province over the last number of years and have

kept a check on this kind of thinking by this Premier (Mr. Filmon) and Members of his front bench.

If they were let loose, they would soon give a straight message to the people of Manitoba. They would not be returned in the very near future after that, once they have been let loose in this province. Very similar to how Grant Devine is perceived in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time. Those people there understand his true agenda. It was ideological, motivated only based on the greed of corporations and not on the betterment of working people and families in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We would see the same kind of actions, unfair labour legislation as has been put in place in Alberta in many cases, unfair labour legislation changes that would revert us back to a period of time some 50 years ago in this province. If we have a Conservative Government with what they would think would be their mandate to do that, even though that would not be their mandate. Their mandate would be to govern if they were to have a majority. They would consider it their mandate to bring in their right wing agenda as would be advocated by the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness).

I suggest to the Government that we know, and the people of Manitoba know, why they have brought forward this legislation. It is not because of concerns that they have for working people, contrary to what the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) said in her speeches in 1989 about this legislation that they were concerned about working people, it is not in the best interest of working people. That is not the reason. They cannot sell that to anyone. Nobody is going to believe that nonsense.

* (1600)

When they are opposed to all of these pieces of legislation that we brought forward in the 1980s, that were progressive pieces of legislation, no one will ever believe the Minister of Labour when she says that the reason they want to repeal final offer selection is because they are concerned about its impact on working people.

The reality is, as I have said earlier on—and that is why they brought it in, the people of Manitoba know that. I am not even going to ask them to take a second thought on this. I think that the Liberals, who have been waffling in their position on this, and who have been on all sides of the issue, should take a very close look at their position on this issue and realize that legislation is put in place for a five-year period to see if it will improve labour management relations in this province.

In fact, when you see in the beginning two years that happening and working in this province, then you would think that the Liberals would take another look at their promise and throw the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) out. Even though he made his statements earlier, they do not have to go and protect him now and the statements that he made without thinking in this House, just indicate to him that he was wrong, that he in fact made a very big mistake and a political blunder for them and that they will have to reverse their stand.

I am sure that the Government's ill-conceived legislation is conceived only on the basis of how much support it is going to get them from the corporate community, that it is wrong and that it will not pass. They can ensure that. I would hope that the Liberals will take another view, another look at the position they have taken.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, as we deal with Bill No. 31 and a very important issue, a very important Bill before the people of Manitoba, that it is unfortunate that the Members of this Legislature, each one who wants their rights protected and their privileges in this House protected, would choose to collectively deny the right of expression to speak on this particular issue to the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) while he is out on important business in his huge constituency talking to his constituents, talking to people in the North.

The Member for Rupertsland only yesterday adjourned debate on this issue and at the time - (interjection)- The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) disagrees with this. Well, let him speak to the Member for Rupertsland face to face directly and tell him why he did not want him to speak on this Bill because we have speakers today. We have myself who is willing to speak on this Bill today and leave the Bill standing in the Member for Rupertsland's name in this House as is our convention and our tradition and yet they have refused to let that happen. I think the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) should reflect on that, as to how that might apply to him sometime. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) should reflect, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) should reflect on how that affects their privileges in this House, the fact that they are denying a Member from speaking.

Now I do not expect the Minister of Finance to be too concerned about that because he does not have a great deal of respect for parliamentary tradition. He walked out of a committee and he is being censured for that already, so he does not really—

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin and myself have exchanged a lot of needling and barbing over the years, but he asserts that I do not have respect for the parliamentary tradition. I do very much. I am sitting in my place showing respect for the parliamentary procedure.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister does not have a point of order.

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, you know as we deal with these important issues, it is more than just words that speak to respect for parliamentary tradition, it is actions. Actions speak much louder than those words. We have seen this Member demonstrate his so-called respect for the parliamentary tradition before and we saw him demonstrate that today when he stood with the Conservatives, with the Liberals to vote against the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) having an opportunity to speak in this House and to put his feelings and those of his constituency on the record on Bill No. 31, a denial that he will not be able to disassociate himself with in the future, a denial that he will regret.

Mr. Plohman: The Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) was right in there. He is still chirping from his seat because he knows he got himself into hot water when he did it, Mr. Speaker.- (interjection)- He continues to chirp from his seat because he is sensitive.

Mr. Speaker, my light is flashing here. Can the Speaker indicate to me how much time I have left? I see my light flashing here. My time is up, five seconds.

I would, Mr. Speaker, in just tying up and closing, concluding my words here on this issue, say that the people of my constituency want to avoid labour-management discord in this province. They want harmony, they want negotiations, they want peaceful settlement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Logan.

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that debate be adjourned. Agreed? No? The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Are you indicating that the adjournment motion did not pass? In which case if that is the case I would ask for Yeas and Nays.

Mr. Speaker: There has been no leave granted, no.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is a motion—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just wait a minute.

There was a motion before the House, and the question was moved by the Honourable Member for Logan, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson. Was it agreed? No. It was not agreed. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Ashton: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

An Honourable Member: No, no, no, it is a motion.

Mr. Speaker: The motion.

Mr. Ashton: The motion that you said was defeated.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the Members. A voice vote? All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it. The Member for Thompson.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, was it your opinion it was the nays?

Mr. Speaker: The nays have it.

Mr. Ashton: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members. The question before the House is on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) that debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 31 be adjourned.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Doer, Evans (Brandon East), Harapiak, Hemphill, Maloway, Plohman, Storie, Uruski, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

Alcock, Burrell, Carr, Carstairs, Charles, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger (Emerson), Driedger (Niakwa), Ducharme, Edwards, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Gray, Hammond, Helwer, Lamoureux, Manness, McCrae, Minenko, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Patterson, Praznik, Roch, Taylor, Yeo.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas, 10; Nays, 36.

Mr. Speaker: The motion to adjourn the debate is defeated. Accordingly, the motion for second reading on Bill 31 will remain open.

* (1700)

The hour being after 5 p.m., the House will now proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS
ORDERS FOR RETURN, ADDRESSES
FOR PAPERS REFERRED FOR DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill that an address for papers do issue praying for: (1) Copy of the Report on the Churchill Rocket Range, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): I would like to address a few comments with respect to this matter before us on the Order Paper today. We on all sides of the House are indeed concerned with the devastation to our province happening almost on a weekly basis, if not even more often, by the decisions coming from the federal Government. Indeed, it is of grave concern on all sides of this House, and this whole issue of the Churchill Rocket Range fits well within the rubrics of that issue. Here is an opportunity to expand on Manitoba's important and developing aerospace industry.

I have had the opportunity of touring some of the aerospace industries in our province, both larger companies and some of the smaller ones. In the case of many smaller companies, Mr. Speaker, where it would appear initially that the company would have really no involvement in the aerospace industry, indeed they have quite a large share of their revenues coming from that particular industry.

It is important to recognize when we deal with matters like aerospace in Manitoba, we not only look to companies like Boeing, look to companies like Bristol Aerospace, Standard Aero and many other larger companies, but also some of the many smaller ones that produce either a plating that is required in the aerospace technology area, fasteners and many other segments.

What is indeed of concern to many people in the aerospace industry is that over the last number of years—and the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Ernst) could possibly confirm or suggest some other figure, but I have heard or understand that Manitoba has approximately 5 percent of Canada's aerospace industry. What has been happening for the last few years is British Columbia has been developing their aerospace industry, and Manitoba's share has been eroding. We feel that this certainly is an important aspect, the aerospace technology and development in Manitoba.

We also all appreciate the importance of research and development. Research and development provides us and our young people, who we hear are leaving Manitoba and have been leaving Manitoba for a number of years, with an opportunity of using their education to provide us, Manitobans, with a better standard of living. In the aerospace industry it is indeed a relatively high tech industry with very many high paying jobs. That is of concern where in the Free Trade Agreement

assessments there has been a determination that we are moving jobs from the manufacturing sector into the service sector.

My question for concurrence to the Minister of Industry and Trade is, has his department identified the service industries that are growing, and has this Government compared the salary in wages earned by people in manufacturing compared to people in the service industry? I think one could speculate, successfully so, that wages and salaries in the service industries are indeed less than in manufacturing in many situations, and especially in something that has a relatively high value-added aspect to it such as aerospace.

The Churchill Research Range was apparently developed around 1957, which also happened to be the year of the famous '57 Chevy and also the year that I happened to be born in as well. It was developed to the point of launching rockets on a regular basis, and Canada, over the last few years, since I believe it was 1984 or even a few years before that to allow for training of the astronauts, has gotten heavy into the NASA aerospace program. I understand also that a group of Manitoba scientists have recently gone down to the NASA facilities to do experiments in conditions of weightlessness with the NASA aircraft going up and down across the sky creating the necessary weightlessness for them to accomplish their experiments.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can also agree that space research involves many scientific disciplines including the physical, biological and social sciences. Again this is the previous example with respect to the scientists doing various research and weightlessness as it exactly fits well into that definition. I think if we are to grow as a province that has opportunities for young people, for our skilled young people, for our young people who have the education which they unfortunately have to go to other provinces to be able to find jobs at that particular level.

I think one of the concerns that the Government should be moving up slowly to the top of the agenda is the whole issue of underemployment. I think we can all agree that we know of people, friends, constituents, who find themselves underemployed. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is as much a danger as unemployment.

We feel that certainly the development and the continued expansion hopefully in the future of the Churchill Rocket Range could allow for many of our young people to not only stay in Winnipeg, stay in Manitoba, stay in Churchill, but that they will be able to reach their potential, that any experiments that may be required for people to do in order to write a Masters or a Ph.D thesis using some of this technology, that they would have ready access to that kind of research to allow them to take those opportunities.

There have indeed been many suggestions as to how exactly Churchill Rocket Range could be developed, and I would leave that to other speakers to perhaps deal with in relative importance.

Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems facing this Government, facing the previous Government and

indeed facing our Government in the near future is the whole issue of rural economic development. We feel that indeed this would —(interjection)— well, I see that many Members on the opposite side agree with my evaluation and indeed are listening attentively to my comments.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this would indeed be an important aspect of developing the opportunities outside the City of Winnipeg, because with many friends and colleagues in various parts of Manitoba and in fact relatives who have lived in some of the smaller centers telling me on many opportunities that people were moving out. People turn 18 and they move to Winnipeg, they move to Brandon. They move to another larger centre. They move out of the province to find employment. I certainly think that the solidification and the expansion of the Churchill Research Range can lead to that sort of development of employment possibilities and not just—and developing opportunities for people that are well-paying requires them to have a good education.

* (1710)

So, Mr. Speaker, there are many important aspects to it. Indeed I am concerned. I can appreciate that the Rural Development section was transferred from the responsibility of the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Ernst) to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner). I am indeed concerned when a Minister of Rural Development responded to a question in Estimates that for a rural economic development program we have to wait till the next budget.

I mentioned this in passing in a speech in debate last week, Mr. Speaker. When I stated that he did not necessarily object to it. He went on in a different diatribe but did not object to the incorrectness of that statement. I would certainly hope that the Government does not wait for the next budget, does not wait for the next throne speech, to develop an effective rural economic development strategy.

I see the Minister of Finance nodding, and I wonder if he was nodding in agreement to my comments or whether he was nodding to some discussions on the sides.

Mr. Speaker, another important aspect to the Churchill Research Range are some of the intangibles, the intangible of—the evaluation of this range and having this range in place amongst other world nations. I think this is an important aspect to this range as well. It would, I believe, elevate Canada's and specifically Manitoba's prestige and bring to the attention of people around the world that there is indeed a province called Manitoba. So you do not have to go to a conference in the States, or in some other country, and when they ask you where Manitoba is you have to sort of start from New York and work that way. I think this is an important aspect to our province.

(Mr. Parker Burrell, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Some of the other things, Mr. Acting Speaker, that we could perhaps look forward to with the re-establishment of the Churchill Research Range is it

certainly, as I mentioned, provides opportunities for the development of scientists and astronauts and many others who need to support the efforts of these people, because I think we can also agree that there are a couple of frontiers that we need to explore further, certainly underwater, that whole frontier has to be explored as well as space.

Recently we have seen, on television, the retrieval of a satellite that was in space for the last five years and the scientists reviewing the effect of being in space for such a period of time on the metals used, on the various fabrics and other elements used in creating this particular rocket that was allowed to stay in space for a while.

I think that is another important aspect, because again we are looking to develop and looking to space for opportunities of developing new ways of manufacture, new ways of dealing with various aspects that we have here on earth. For example, I would certainly be interested in knowing whether we could bake bread in space. Could that be done in a weightless environment?

The reason I suggest that, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that my father-in-law, who just passed away not too long ago, indeed, worked as a baker with the Grain Commission. He was often sent to Third World countries and other countries around the world to show people in other countries like Japan, like the Philippines how they can use Canadian grain, how they can use Canadian wheat. One of the problems that he noticed and dealt with was the problem that in some countries they do not necessarily have cold water, that is cold enough water required to make the kind of loaf that people are expecting to be able to make, and there are ways of dealing with that.

But that certainly would be an interesting aspect, especially when many nations around the world are looking to space for creating space stations, allow people to live up there.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, in conclusion we see that Churchill Research Range has very many important aspects to it. It has important aspects and would provide important opportunities for our youth by allowing us to provide opportunities for them in a high tech area of industry. What sometimes comes to mind is the whole issue of the Avro Arrow. What kind of aerospace industry would we have been able to make, develop in not only this province but right across Canada if the Avro Arrow was allowed to continue its research?

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, in conclusion, I would say that there are many important aspects to the Churchill Research Range, and we would certainly support the Government on addressing this important issue with their federal counterparts on a very vocal and strong basis.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Acting Speaker, may I have leave to speak on this resolution?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Burrell): Leave, go ahead.

Mrs. Charles: Mr. Acting Speaker, last weekend I believe it was I had the opportunity to attend the Wildlife

Federation's Annual General Meeting. At that time they had a slide show on Churchill and the wildlife that was present in the Churchill area. One of our favourite photographers was showing the wonders and beauties of the Churchill region. It had always been my wish and desire to have an opportunity to go to Churchill at some time and have never been so privileged.

I think often we do not realize the extent of Manitoba, the variety we have in Manitoba. It is certainly a tradition of most Canadians to live along the border territories and not to understand the extent to which Manitoba and all of Canada lies. Certainly we here in Winnipeg feel that Churchill is indeed almost a country away, and of course in many areas of the world the distance from here to Churchill would be several countries away. I think that it is a challenge to us as legislators and to ourselves as southern Manitobans, to understand that the distance that is between - (interjection) -

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Burrell): Order.

Mrs. Charles: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. The distance that lies between Winnipeg and Churchill of course is more than just the physical distance. It is a distance in lifestyle and in accessibility to transportation, communications and choices of services that are available. I believe that many people would wish to live in the North if opportunities were more diversified for them.

We certainly have, in the last few years, certainly in the last decade, seen that the industry of tourism has become a major support of Churchill and a future for Churchill. We have had major tourist ships come in the last few years to Churchill. I think that is just a beginning of where we can go.

* (1720)

I have heard in various reports that the United States has some 29 million bird watchers who have signed up into organizations. That indeed is more population than we have in all of Canada, and as the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) points out quite correctly, the fastest growing recreational sport in all of North America and probably the world is bird watching and wildlife - (interjection) - I suspect that it probably is in the world as well as we all come to watch the environment and to be more concerned. We have other sports that are being seen for the difficulties that are becoming inherent. We certainly in the Olympics and in the Commonwealth Games have seen in competitive sports that there are problems occurring.

Our wildlife is extremely important in Churchill. We will be known I think in the future for our polar bears. It will become more of a challenge to have peoples and wildlife living together. The slide show that I saw two weeks ago pointed out how much variety exists in Churchill, and at one point had a particular kind of gull that was nesting there and had not been seen there for several years and was being protected and actually had armed guards while it was there and nesting.

We have Churchill as a tourist industry and a blossoming tourist industry, but I do not believe that

will be a sustained service to the people there if we do not develop some sort of a variety of base. I think the rocket range traditionally has had a place to play in the service industry. It has provided competition to many other aspects of the aerospace industry.

We as Canadians have from time to time shown that we have expertise in the aerospace industry, indeed with the Avro airplane years ago and last decade the aerospace arm. We can challenge the future. We are very proud to have the latest astronaut for Canada be a woman and coming from our country will be adding to the knowledge that we have from being an astronaut in the Nassau Program.

We have a future in the aerospace industry as we have had a past, but it has been very sporadic. I believe that if we work with the peoples in Churchill and with the federal Government that we could find a future in aerospace industry and rocket industry in Churchill.

There is always the question of whether in this fragile environment we can easily meld both an industry of space industry and of the climate and environment itself. I guess we all have to have faith that it will be done, and we speak of the round tables and sustainable development centres and our commitment to sustainable development. That is the actual belief that we must put in practice in such fragile environments as the Churchill area.

The Churchill region of course, as are most northern areas, is very fragile environment. Again in this slide show I was privy to, we could see the minute flowering plants and shrubs that were there in the springtime, but not for everyone to see because of the size, often an eighth of an inch or smaller in some respects, but they were there and thriving in their own world.

We must be very careful in wishing to develop this country that we do not overlook the fertility of the environment, and that we look to seek out for the future in our space industry as well as in the future for our environment. It will be a challenge but then again many of the rockets that have been set off, especially over the last decade in the Churchill area have been in support for knowledge of what our state of environment exists.

The air balloons that have gone up to record, I understand, can do so much at a longer duration than can be done in more warmer southern climates because of the angle and the temperature of the location that the airships, balloons that go up to test the various ingredients of our stratosphere, the various components of the stratosphere can indeed have a longer recording time than perhaps in other areas.

You have to wonder, if all these things are very appropriate for the area, why it has not been done. I suspect that because we often overlook our North and the capabilities of it, we forget so often certainly in our day-to-day living that there is a thriving community up there. There are people who choose their lifestyle to be in these remote communities and in choosing to do so they have a right to options as well. I think we owe a lot to our northern Canadians, as we do to the original settlers of Canada. They have given so much to keep the space open and to provide hopes for the future.

Churchill has gone through hard times, there is no doubt, with the lack of grain that has been shipped through their areas and Government has sunk very many dollars into trying to keep the grain storage areas open, and the bay itself open for grain handling. We cannot always assume that grain will be available every year, although I believe that there seems to be some verification that it is indeed cheaper to ship wheat and grains through the northern ports, and that we could be putting some pressures on various countries and companies to bring their grain shipments in through the Port of Churchill.

Also, other factors could be used as shipping routes through the Hudson Bay area and the Port of Churchill—that we have not thought of offloading supplies sufficiently through, enough to see the value of how many supplies could be offloaded through the Port of Churchill, and how we could use it more as a remote health-care station and enhance the programming that is going on through there.

It seems as if we can dump millions of dollars into companies such as Boeing Industries and so forth, and yet when it comes to supporting the people in these remote locations that somehow the dollars are harder to come by. I guess we all have to look at the business future of all Canadians and realize that in some cases it is worth putting money into areas if you can have a growing industry and have a self-sustaining community rather than one that has to be supported through various other non-development incentives. The Port of Churchill certainly has had its heydays and has had its times when it has not been successful. There are questions now, I suppose, to the future again as we have come into another shipping year and if tradition holds we will have to fight once again to have Government recognize that the Port of Churchill is an option for shipping grain through.

In the same way if we had an industry such as the aerospace industry and the rocket launch location in Churchill, you would see more attention paid to the area. Therefore, I think we would find it easier to convince Governments of whatever background to understand that Churchill is a growing and thriving community that is indeed worth investing in and worth giving the alternative shipping lines to. If we had an industry there we would have railway maintenance to a greater degree than we can accept now and we would have the money from private industry and from Government support, NASA programs and so forth coming in to Churchill who would be more demanding that support services be available. It always is, as it is in many cases, the chicken and egg syndrome of what can come first.

* (1730)

I think if we can have Churchill as a self-supporting community it would be preferable for all of us here in this House. If it can be done through the rocket launch systems, if that in any way can gain Churchill both the respect it deserves in being an alternative community support system and as an industry itself then I believe that we would have Governments pay appropriate attention because of its sustainability. They would not have the fear that this year they put money into Churchill

only to have it be non-serviced the next year as a shipping community.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there is no doubt that Churchill is part of Manitoba as much as often the average Manitobans seem to overlook that fact, that we think of northern Manitoba the same way Toronto thinks of Kenora in many respects. We like to think that Kenora could be part of Manitoba very easily and the northern area of Ontario could be part of Manitoba very easily because we see our similarities. Yet Toronto to northern Ontario has the same difficulties as we do to our North. It is with great difficulties that we understand our similarities. We tend to always see our differences rather than noting that people of Churchill community, I am sure, have as much respect for Manitoba and this legislative system, the people who represent them, as any community would have. I hope that we and this Assembly do not overlook any alternatives that could be given for Churchill and that we do not overlook any significance that could be given for the alternatives for Churchill because indeed as a growing, thriving community, Churchill has a future in Manitoba and we should offer them all support for their future. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Burrell): This matter will stand in the name of the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme).

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner). Is there leave for the matter to remain standing? The Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, I just want to indicate that we are quite willing to have this matter remain standing in the name of the Minister. He has had this adjourned in his name for quite some time, and I would hope the Government would extend the same courtesy to Members of the New Democratic Party. They did not today. I hope they will in the future.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks, just take a few minutes, to discuss this particular request. On that particular matter, I do not know why the organizers did not invite me to speak. I feel very left out. They invited the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), but they did not invite myself. On the other hand, we were very well represented with our Leader, Mr. Doer, who received a great response. I wanted to tell the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member is up on a point of order?

Mr. Leonard Evans: It is on the Address for Papers on the GST.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to advise the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) that he has already spoken on this matter. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The fact, Mr. Speaker, that you forgot the Honourable Member had already spoken may be one of the reasons he was not invited to the rally last night because everybody else forgets him too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader does not have a point of order.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I guess there has been a decided sense of *deja vu* in the Chamber after that last little episode. We have heard these comments before.

In any case, the goods and services tax, the total overhaul of the taxation system of this country, is something that is not to be taken lightly. In this Address for Papers, the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has requested the presentation, the tabling in this House, of a report developed by the provincial Department of Finance on the impact of the goods and services tax on this province. This is a paper that was prepared on a joint basis by Ministers of Finance from across Canada on the impacts of the GST in each of the provinces.

We on this side of the House are most interested in seeing how those impacts will hurt Manitoba. I say "will hurt" because I do not think there is an assumption that there is going to be positive and negative impacts. I think it goes without saying, there is going to be negative impacts on Manitoba from this GST, otherwise known as the "gouge and steal" tax, to use the vernacular.

There is another study that has also been commissioned by the provincial Finance Ministers to be carried out by the Conference Board of Canada on regional impacts from this same goods and services tax. These two documents are something that should have been provided to the House along with an accompanying statement by the Minister of Finance. Had there been an opportunity for all Members of this House to review the contents to see for themselves what the impacts are likely to be so that Members can be in the position of being informed so the message can be conveyed to the public because the number of calls that we are getting on this matter, the number of letters to the editor, the start of grassroot organizations in opposition to the GST is something that is quite amazing.

We did have a very interesting group. In fact, I believe there were over a thousand people just last evening in Brandon addressing this very same issue of the GST and the concerns that they have. It was I gather not exactly a quiet meeting; it was a rather vocal meeting. I think Canadians are saying, from whatever part of the country, we do not want this. That does not say

the present manufacturers tax, which has been elevated by some I believe 4-plus percent since the change in administration in late 1984 from a 9 percent tax on the manufacturing level for many goods to now over 13 percent by the Conservatives.

It seems that while in Opposition the federal Conservatives said we have here a very flawed tax, an inequitable tax, a tax that is not fair, it taxes certain manufactured things and lets others go. Instead of correcting it some six years ago or starting to correct it in any case, what they did is instead added on almost half again as much tax at that level in this flawed fashion.

I do not think there is a question that there are problems with the existing manufacturers tax. The tax is old. It is a tax that was not reviewed thoroughly in the past. It was added to piecemeal, a little bit here, a little bit there, change a little bit, add another item to it. In so doing we have a manufacturers tax federally that I think can be best described as a hodgepodge. It does not properly deal with the matter. It does not carry out what it was supposed to carry out when it was introduced some decades ago.

What we have before us, instead of an overhauling of the manufacturers tax the development of a new manufacturers tax. We have instead the introduction by Michael Wilson the federal Finance Minister of an *advalorem* tax, a tax which is going to add value at every level of the production of an item that is manufactured or of a service that is provided.

That latter point is very, very significant, because it means that we are going to see taxes on all sorts of things. We are going to see taxes on restaurant meals, federal taxes, not the provincial sales tax, federal taxes on top of. Somebody when they want to get their hair done, be that a woman getting a permanent or a chap going in for a haircut, you are going to be dinged that 9 percent, 7 percent, whatever it may be. It does not matter what it is, you are going to get hit. You go out and you buy a pair of shoes, you are going to get hit for the same thing. If you go and buy a new coat, and goldarn it we sure need winter clothing in this country, that is going to be on top of every single item of winter clothing.

* (1740)

In a country that is very much impacted by geography and impacted by weather, it is one of the leastwise types of taxes to impose, Mr. Speaker, that can be done. It does not allow for the fact that this country has a couple of disadvantages. It has a disadvantage from weather, it has a disadvantage from its wide geography, and so between free trade and this GST, we hammer ourselves twice. Such wisdom we have from our federal Leaders.- (interjection)- Pardon me.

We have a question from the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus), why is our Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) hiding it from us? In fact, why is he hiding his own position? I think that is really quite interesting. We had the Honourable Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) in Brandon yesterday, on his home turf, saying this is the position of the Filmon administration. That is what has been said publicly, that is true.

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

In contrast, the Honourable Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) has been rather equivocating on the whole position where he is, the chief financial officer of Manitoba on this matter, and it is not quite so clear cut. It is not clear cut at all. It would appear that philosophically the Finance Minister is in agreement with a gouge and steal tax. Philosophically he thinks that is the right way to go, and that is really unfortunate that we have the Premier on one hand, the Attorney General on others, and other front-bench Members saying one thing. The chief financial officer of Manitoba is not clear-cut in his position, whether he is speaking in this House or whether he is speaking in the public forums. That is very, very unfortunate.

I hear, Mr. Speaker, some noise coming from the Member for Arthur's seat, and there is a case of two-sidedness as well where the Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings) said one thing and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) had quite another on a certain very major project, the Rafferty-Alameda Dams in Saskatchewan. So the right things were said up-front for public consumption, but what this Member said in his riding in June, what this Member said in his riding just a week or so ago, the same thing.

He does not believe in the environmental impact studies that are needed, so there seems to be a little lack of unanimity on the front bench of this administration. I find that most interesting. I think the public and the press in this province have started to see through on this matter.

To go back to the value-added tax that we have before us and the fact that we do not have the needed studies here as Members of this Legislature to be able to properly deal with the matter, we should look at the experience that we have had in Europe, in Great Britain, in New Zealand. We have the same sort of tax in place there now, and in some of those countries, in place for quite some time.

I can remember when I visited Britain some years back, and they had only just put it in place. I thought, my gosh, this is a little bit expensive, is it not? I talked to many of the Britons, and they said, well, yes, it is, and we are grumbling. We complained about it before it was put in place, but they said that the real impact is insidious because some of it you do not realize for the first year or two how it is impacting your standard of living, because it is taking more and more dollars, in their case, pounds, out of their pocketbook so they do not have that to consume in their daily lives to look after themselves and their family and their home and the private transportation that they need.

It is really interesting to see that, Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly what is going to happen again on the European continent. The countries of the EEC all have an ad valorem tax.

We have a much more recent example with New Zealand. New Zealand has put an ad valorem tax in place some three years ago, and what did it do? It cost that Government its life; that Government went down the tubes because of the reaction and they spent two years preparing the public for this, laying it all out, saying how it would be beneficial and how it would

make for fairer taxation across the system, and really you would not pay more in the end. Well, you do pay more in the end and on top of that the temptation of Government is to raise it.

If you want to look at the Scandinavian countries, now you have ad valorem taxes in Scandinavia at 20 percent. Now that just kills people, it kills people's incentive, it lowers their standard of living, and that is the sort of thing that will happen in Canada.

To get it through, because they are so far down in the polls, Mr. Speaker, the Tories in Ottawa, on the advice of the Finance Committee, are lowering it from nine to seven. Well, I am prophesying, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be more than two years that it will be back at nine. Then it will be 13 where the manufacturer's tax is now, and the temptation will be to raise it more and more and more until we have the same impact in Canada as we have in Europe, as we have in New Zealand, because they keep edging it up.

In addition, we have the difficulty of small companies, whether they are manufacturing companies, but particularly those at the retail level, Mr. Speaker, where they have so much administration for themselves anyway, but on top of this they report, after report, after report to different levels of Government, different departments, and guess what? They are going to have one more set of reports to do that is going to complicate their life more, that is going to take from their profits and is going to make them less viable. In these times that is the last thing we need is more businesses about to go under. We already have the spectacle of Manitoba having the largest numbers of bankruptcies, whether those are personal or whether those are business, and we have that sad fact to live with.

All this GST tax is going to do is lead to more of that, and we have a Government that is soft on the GST. They have not been doing anything to fight this all the way. All they have been doing is they make their initial public pronouncement, notwithstanding the confusion from the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) here on the matter, but they make their initial position and they say: we are good guys and that is it, you can see where we stand. Well, we can see where you stand, where is your action? The action is not there, it is not there at all.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has plenty of time, Mr. Speaker, to study this and develop a strategy as how to go after the federal Tories on this, but they have not got it.

An Honourable Member: It is the spinning wheel syndrome.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) says we have a spinning wheel syndrome. Well, that is exactly what we have got, -(interjection)-yes, and we had the recent case now where our Finance Department is working actively with the federal Finance Department on how to better collect the taxes.

Well, that is irresponsible as heck, because what should be done is you fight it to the wall, you do not cave in before the battle is done, but that is not what

this administration is prepared to do. It is soft on the GST, Mr. Speaker, it is soft on the environment, it is soft on the protection of the public, whether it be in health care, whether it be in community services matters. We see the lip-service, Mr. Speaker, we see not the action.

An Honourable Member: Bullish in giving away Crown corporations.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, and they are rather bullish in giving away certain Crown corporations, not on reaping a decent dollar for the public investment there, but in the giveaway—and we have a bad track record of that with the federal Tories, as well.

Look at Boeing, they practically have been paid to take over a company that was producing state of the art, the best short takeoff and landing aircraft in all of the world, and what did we do? We paid them to take it.

We have similar things going on here. Get rid of it. Ideologically the Tories have problems with public enterprise of any form and in any state, but at the same time when they make the sale they cannot protect the investment.

We have got that, Mr. Speaker, with Manfor. We got that even with Manfor. What has happened there is that the company has had to put little money up so far. We have a giveaway of 40 percent of the land area of the province, the largest tract of forest land in North America under a single licence. What do we have happen? We have a forest management plan being developed after the fact, after the licence is already in review for award. We have ditto on that for Abitibi-Price, which is also being awarded this spring. After we award those two huge licences for commercial forest, then we will start the forest management strategy exercise. What a load of nonsense.

* (1750)

Normally you would do your forest management strategy exercise first, Mr. Speaker, and then you would decide how you are going to award the licence with certain conditions on it. I think we see here just more of the same old thing. It is lip-service. It is not action. We are waiting to see the presentation of these papers from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) so that we can look at these and share these with the people of Manitoba. All too often it is the Opposition that has had to provide these sorts of things. We just had a very serious report that the Leader of the Opposition tabled in this House because the Health Minister (Mr. Orchard) refused to table it. Although the Health Minister is not sitting in his seat and is sitting elsewhere in the Chamber making one heck of a lot of noise as per usual, the fact of the matter is he was not prepared to table it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I too was wanting to put a few words on this particular return for order, Mr.

Speaker. The official Opposition has recognized the problems and the implications and the potential harm that the proposed GST that the federal Tories, the cousins to the provincial Tories here, even though they would like to disown them and I do not blame them, I can understand why they would want to disown them. This is an issue that the Liberal Party has addressed time after time.

In fact, it was the Liberal Party last June that introduced an emergency debate to the Chamber last June of '89, and the response that we got was very disappointing. Had the Government of the Day and the third Party in this Chamber been opposed and been looking ahead in terms of the damage that the GST is going to be causing all Manitobans, they should have been voting at that time to discuss the emergency debate in June. Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the question, why were they not doing it at the time?

What ends up happening is several months later after the summer time we have an emergency debate once again introduced, but by the third Party. That time it was endorsed by all Parties. That is really what it was. The third Party recognized the work that the official Opposition was doing in trying to raise the issue and maybe began to see some of the potential harm that the GST can have on our economy and raised the issue through an emergency debate. We were glad to see that they too jumped aboard because we believe that ultimately it is important that all three Parties come out very, very strong against the GST. It is important that we send a very strong message to the federal Government that Manitoba is not pleased with what they are trying to impose on all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) has pointed out, on several occasions, why we must question the Government of the Day here in Manitoba and their intentions and what their honest beliefs are regarding the GST.

We had the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) at one time saying something in contradiction to what the Premier (Mr. Filmon) was saying but then had quickly been tuned in and came out in the Chamber saying that he too now opposes it.

I think the Minister of Finance's real feelings on this particular tax is that he believes it is a tax that would be acceptable to Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Finance is seeing something that we are not privy to seeing. We are asking for documents that we believe will help us fight the GST and for whatever reasons the Minister of Finance feels is not allowing us, in the Opposition, the opportunity to go over what the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has requested.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is anything that the Minister of Finance should be embarrassed in terms of handing over. Is there something there that he wants to hide from us, that we might be able to use, that he too possibly supports, an aspect that he supports and that he might be held once again in contradiction of some sort?

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned in terms of what this Government's real position is. In Estimates, I asked

Wednesday, February 7, 1990

the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) what impact the GST was going to have on the housing industry in Manitoba. It was unbelievable the response I received.

The Minister of Housing, the Department of Housing, has not done a thing when it comes to the impact of the GST on housing starts in the Province of Manitoba. Housing starts have declined in the Province of Manitoba like they have never done before. We have a Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) who is not taking into account the potential impact that the proposed GST is going to have on the new housing market.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there is going to be an obvious impact on the housing construction and on the housing starts and so forth. Why would this Minister not want to proceed or at least inquire into what type of impacts it will have? Should—

An Honourable Member: He is too busy with Portage Place.

Mr. Lamoureux: The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) pointed out, maybe quite correctly, he is fairly busy at Portage Place. It will be some time, I am sure, before that issue gets straightened out. It seems the further we seem to ask questions the deeper the hole gets for the Minister to try and get out of. I do not know if he will ever be able to get out of it.

When this tax comes in—because now we have a federal Tory Government in Ottawa that is, through closure, going to shove this new goods and services tax down us whether we like it or not. We do not see the Government of the Day standing up and opposing what the federal Tories are proposing to do, au contraire, Mr. Speaker. I find it very unfortunate that they are not standing up, that they are not sending a message to Ottawa saying that they oppose a closure of any form on the GST, because this is something that is going to affect, and they oppose it.

They say they oppose it, but they are willing to let the issue be forced to a vote and, ultimately, unless you get some Conservatives in the back bench that listen to their constituents is going to be ending up passed.

The impact of the GST, Mr. Speaker, is going to be covering all aspects of the economy. In September I had sent out a general mailer into my constituency, because I felt many of the constituents would really like to see how severe the impact of the GST and what type of things are actually going to be taxed. There are very few exceptions such as groceries, but if you take a look at the initial 9 percent in the brochure that I had circulated, it included everything from haircuts to a meal at McDonald's to a purchase of a new house.

This is going to touch upon everyone in a very non-discriminatory way whether you are poor, whether you are rich, whether you are on a fixed income, whether you are in the six-digit figure for annual income. There is nothing there that is going to be able to assist the people in need to be able to purchase up-front the products that they might be requiring.

Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed when the Leader of the New Democrats in Ottawa came down to Manitoba and I wanted to actually possibly quote. The NDP have said that they oppose the GST. They oppose the manufacturing tax that the GST is there to replace. The reason why they do that is because they believe that it is an unfair tax. While the NDP say that on the one hand in Ottawa, you have the Leader of the New Democratic Party suggesting that this tax should remain on the manufactured goods. I am starting to question federal New Democrats, what their real position is on the federal sales tax.

We know during the Ed Schreyer years when he had promised that a provincial tax would be a no-no, that in fact he would like to see the provincial tax taken away but given the opportunity when put in Government, the Ed Schreyer Government actually raised the provincial sales tax. I do not believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have six minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).