

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Thursday, 18 December, 1980**

**Time — 2:00 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 35 students of Grade X1 standing from the Charleswood Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Simms. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister. On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my difficulty is that I have questions involving the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, none of whom are present, so the Member for Rossmere will lead off question period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, just on that point, in view of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, my understanding is that the Minister of Finance is away at a Finance Minister's meeting; that the First Minister was not well this morning and therefore I don't expect him here. I do expect the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of that, we had understood the Minister of Finance would be present today. In view of that and in view of the fact that we are faced with an urgent situation pertaining to the recent — within hours — announcement from the Bank of Canada of a record interest rate establishment of 17.63, the highest in history. The question is to the Acting Minister of Finance if indeed there is a statement that the government is prepared to issue today arising from that announcement that has been made today.

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had been following the comments made in the House yesterday by the First Minister and the

comments made by our Minister of Finance in Ottawa, he would know that those concerns about the record high interest rates were being expressed in Ottawa yesterday by the Minister of Finance. I am sure that when the Minister of Finance is able to get back from Ottawa to Winnipeg that he will have something further to say, but as we all know, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility with respect to interest rates rests with the federal government and that is precisely the subject that was being discussed yesterday.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it probably was through some naive hope that there would be something more than the generalized vague types of references that were made yesterday by the First Minister and indeed by what we have heard from the Federal-Provincial Conference dealing with interest rates. It's like spitting against the wind, the proposals that are being made. And a further question to the Acting Minister of Finance. Despite his disclaimer of any responsibility on the part of the provincial government, can he advise whether or not the Government of the Province of Manitoba is entertaining any programs any policies that would reflect indeed some initiatives in some other provinces to provide some assistance pertaining to small businesses, home owners and others that are effected by the sharply increasing interest rates that unfortunately now are becoming a pattern each year in Canada?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, as is so typical of the Leader of the Opposition and of his party is the indication that somehow a provincial government, indeed any government, is able to simply wave a wand and control interest rates or pass a law and control interest rates. It is an extremely naive position that the honourable member puts forth and it's one which I think does no service to indicate to the public that in fact it is within the power of a government, of a provincial government especially, to deal with that problem. When there's some agreement among other governments, provincial and federal, as to what steps might be taken, if indeed the provinces can have some input, then our government will be announcing programs. At the moment there are no further announcement that I am in a position to make, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's somewhat interesting that the Acting Minister is again referring to no government being able, but we do note that his Minister of Finance and fellow ministers of finance appear to feel now that the federal government can do something about rising interest rates. A specific question to the Minister of Finance is whether or not his government is undertaking any initiative pertaining to debt moratorium legislation that this side has repeatedly asked for from the government across the way, ever since last spring, or whether it indeed is undertaking any efforts to renegotiate the Manitoba Enterprise Program, which is not working effectively, which could be better utilized by way of the funds that are provided for it,

to provide stabilized interest rates for the business people of the province of Manitoba.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we do not need to be lectured on the effects that high interest rates have on this province, especially upon this province, because of the nature of the businesses in this province that rely so heavily upon financing for their inventories, for example. We're quite aware of that; we're aware of the impact that it has upon agriculture and all sectors of our economy.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, what can be done about that, and it is not something that the provincial government can deal with in the fashion that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to indicate. I haven't noticed that there is a different interest rate in place in Saskatchewan, for instance, where they have an NDP government in place, than there is elsewhere.

When there is some indication, when we have some assurance that action that this government could take, either in consultation with other governments or alone, that could be useful under these circumstances, both in the short term and in the long term, then that action will be taken.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred to Saskatchewan, that the situation in Manitoba is no different than Saskatchewan. Then can the Minister of Finance advise whether or not the Government of the Province of Manitoba is prepared to study and to analyze the program which is now in existence in Saskatchewan, whereby all businesses that gross 500,000 or less in any particular year receive a rebate of 4 percent on interest rates, if indeed that business is located in a centre of 6,000 or less; 2 percent rebate if that business is located in a centre of 6,000 or more? Since the Minister is interested in comparing Manitoba to Saskatchewan, is his government prepared to study that existing program in the province Saskatchewan in order to ascertain whether Manitoba can be equated with the business people in the province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what I said, that we are prepared to examine possible means of dealing with an unprecedented situation and we are prepared to examine anything to see whether it might be effective, and there is serious question about the advisability of governments entering into artificial limitations on interest rates at the provincial level. We would want to examine that sort of program very carefully before making any commitment to it. I think last night, Mr. Speaker, anyone who was watching the Federal Minister of Finance refer to expectations, the role of expectations in inflation, would understand that it's very important that we not encourage further expectations of some ability to deal in an easy painless way with these extraordinarily high interest rates.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Premier or the Acting Minister of Finance and it does follow up on the whole question of interest rates. Since the so-called

monetarist policy of restricted money supply through the instrument of very high, in fact, outrageous interest rates, and that was a policy advocated by Milton Friedman and has become the cornerstone of Conservative economic policies by Conservative governments, namely, the one of Clark, the one of Margaret Thatcher, the one of Ronald Reagan and, in fact, despite the fact that those interest rates are very high . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Has the honourable member a question? The honourable member.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Since Conservative economic policy based on monetarist policy using very high interest rates has been disastrous and has in fact been part of the policy advocated by this government, is this government now abandoning the monetarist policy it was praising one year ago and two years ago because they have now come to conclude that policy is disastrous, not only for other countries in the world but for Canada and, in particular, Manitoba?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the honourable member place that question to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa or the First Minister in Ottawa where there happens to be a Liberal government there strongly supported in most of their efforts by an NDP government.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that people on this side of the House have attacked high interest rates when there was a Conservative government in power in Canada, as well as a Liberal government in power in Canada, because high interest rates are disastrous for this country, will this government not now concede that its policy of high interest rates that it's been advocating through its monetarist economic policy has in fact been disastrous for this province? Will it now concede that position in view of the fact that yesterday it put forward a different position than it put one year ago.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Order please. Has the honourable member a question?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I suggest to the honourable member that if that was his question I would have to rule it out of order. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question. Has this government looked at the disastrous effect of high interest rate policies in Great Britain which have led to 20 percent interest rates which have led to outrageously high levels of bankruptcies; have they compared the effects of that disastrous Conservative policy to the situation in Manitoba where we have the similar situation prevailing? And if so, and if they've done that comparison, are they now changing their policy with respect to high interest rates and saying that the

interest rates should in fact be lowered because they do have a very disastrous impact on our economy?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the honourable member should realize that we of course have no responsibility for what happens in the British Parliament nor any responsibility for the policies pursued by the federal government in Canada. And for the honourable member to once again indicate that somehow it is within the power of a provincial government to simply roll back interest rates is not a very constructive position to place before the people of the province, anymore that the position that was placed by the Liberal government during the election last year was a responsible position to place before the people.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, and refers to the cutbacks at the Seven Oaks Hospital — the staff cutbacks. I wonder if the honourable minister can report to us —(Interjections)— To the unopened Seven Oaks Hospital rather, the staff cutbacks before the hospital is even open. Could the minister tell us how much in fact this is costing the people of Manitoba, this delay in the opening, the fact that some of the staff are there with very little to do, and the entire cost of this delay please?

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I can't give the honourable member precise figures on that but I can tell her that the operating costs of the new Seven Oaks Hospital, including the amortization of the capital debt will be 21 million a year, so that works out to approximately 1.75 million per month. The hospital is not open and operating at the present time so it's obviously not costing the people of Manitoba 1.75 million a month; I can't tell her what the precise operating costs at the present level are. The reason why the hospital is not staffed fully and operating at the present time is because of delays in equipment supplies and material supplies. The hope of the Hospital Board and Administration is to open the facility by the latter part of January but that date is not officially confirmed yet.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Yes, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister confirm that there was no penalty clause in the contracts with the suppliers, that there is no liability on them whatsoever; and if this is so, would he assure us that in future penalty clauses will be included in contracts with suppliers in circumstances such as this?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is correct when she says there is no penalty clause in the contracts with the suppliers but my understanding that there are no bonus clauses in those contracts either so that the situation cuts both ways. In any event, that's a decision taken by the board of any such hospital, it's not taken in my office. I would think that if the circumstances at Seven Oaks point out some difficulties that establish

some warning signs that should be observed in the future that hospital boards throughout the province will observe such warning signs. At this point in time the follow through on the contracts has created some frustration and some delay but it has not been described to me as a matter of urgency at this point, and the board is satisfied with the contractual arrangements made. They regret, of course, the delay in some of the supply shipments.

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

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister not agree that performance bonds whether . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Questions of agreement are hardly proper during the question period. Has the honourable member a question?

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Is it not the usual practice when contracts are being signed for performance bonds to be included with specific dates and would the Minister not feel that perhaps it is time that Manitoba Health Services Commission, in approving building programs, should require that such performance bonds should be included in any contracts? And would the Minister also, since this is my last question, would the Minister also confirm that the Executive Director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission has intervened asking the Executive Director to cut staff in order to avoid unacceptable payroll expenses?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three questions involved in that question and the first point raised by the honourable member dealt with performance bonds and I would say it is certainly a practice for performance bonds to be posted in many contractual arrangements, but it is not necessarily the universal practice. The architect assumes a responsibility in those cases for ensuring that contract dates and commitments are met under the terms of the various contracts and sub-contracts awarded. In this case there were, as I say, no penalty clauses and no bonus clauses.

Insofar as the staffing situation is concerned, the hospital naturally wanted to acquire as many personnel as it could to orient them to the new plant and the functional program there. There was no justification for continuing that buildup until there is a firmer fix on the opening date. So I think that the Executive Director of the Health Services Commission is acting responsibly in this connection. I would hope the delay is not unseemly, but at this point in time, in today's market situation, I don't think the delay is unusual.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services. Does the Minister and the government recognize that this is the International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981 and does the government intend to encourage participation by volunteers in this thing?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, for those who have not a chance to hear the Throne Speech or read the Throne Speech, I think it was very clearly indicated in the Throne Speech that we did want to have participation by the community with regard to the Year of the Disabled. I might say, for the information of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, myself and my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Health, have met with a steering committee that is composed of the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped along with 21 other groups and agencies who have spearheaded what they call an organizing committee. I commend them for the work they have done and I have indicated to them personally that I support what they are proposing to do.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, apparently the Minister has known that this has been coming because it was included in the Throne Speech with other vague things that were going to happen, but does the Minister realize that this is an '81 and administration and organization has to take place immediately or a month ago if there is going to be any action this year?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, the meeting which I indicated to the honourable member took place approximately two-and-a-half weeks ago and after that they met with the Community Service Committee of Cabinet approximately, I believe it was about 10 days ago. At that time, the chairman of the committee, the Honourable Minister of Health indicated that the group would have an answer from the government by the end of December. I might point out to the honourable member that the present date is, I believe, December 18. I might say at that time, Mr. Speaker, the group accepted that date that we said we would give them a definite answer on being near the end of December.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the latest report indicates that the cost of food will be increasing at the rate of 13 percent, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can confirm that on January 1, bill price increases for consumers at the retail level will be permitted, but that no increases will be going to producers.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to indicate to the member, as he has indicated, there are predictions that food prices will rise. In answering the question I find it interesting in hearing a news report on that very item this morning that it was quite understandable that the transportation costs in this country were going to increase because the costs of energy were going to increase, but the costs of food were going to increase, but no reason. Let me answer the member

in saying this, and the people of Manitoba, that there is a lot of energy goes into the production of food and can be directly related to that. The dairy farmers, Mr. Speaker, have received an increase. Mr. Speaker, the consumers are being protected under the Milk Price Review Commission. They have the right to have input and in fact, if he would read the press, there is a prediction from the Producer Board this morning in the press that the milk price could in fact go down. Is he against the price of milk going down, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary point. I would ask the Minister if the commission has approved a cost-of-production formula at the present time, or are the producers going to be made the scapegoats as we pointed out to him last spring in session. I'm asking the Minister now if any increase at the retail level is going to make the producers look like scapegoats as they have been and made in the past.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it is under the control of the commission which, let me say, is dealing with it responsibly. They are working with the Consumers' Association of this country to monitor the price of milk to protect the consumers. It's under the control of an appointed commission which is responsible for that and, no, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, the producers will be the scapegoat but under the government that he was a member, Mr. Speaker, they truly were and had to go begging for milk price increases.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Acting Minister of Finance and ask him if he would confirm a statement made by the chairman of the Progressive Conservative Caucus on Page 346 of Hansard when he was speaking about, "These people are screaming about high interest rates", — and the confirmation I'm looking for is the next statement — "I don't think they have any more answers than they have on this side of the House". Will the Minister confirm that the Department of Finance and his Minister does not have any answers in relation to high interest rates?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the caucus chairman does not speak for the Department of Finance and I do not speak for the caucus chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, accepting the fact that the chairman of the Progressive Conservative Caucus speaks for the caucus only which, of course, includes the members of the Cabinet, recognizing that the Bank of Canada interest rate today was announced at 17.63 percent which one could expect to lead to a prime rate of 19 percent, what does the Department of Finance and this government consider to be an interest rate with which the people of Manitoba can cope?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure that the honourable member realizes that there is no way that

a definitive answer can be given to a hypothetical question of that nature.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, the fact of — the fact, not the hypothetical question — the fact that the Bank of Canada rate is 17.63 percent today, the highest in the history of the Bank of Canada, will have an impact on the rate of U.S. exchange, does the government — maybe I should be asking the question of the Minister of Economic Affairs — does the government wish to see the cost of U.S. dollars increased or lowered in relation to the economy of Manitoba?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to become involved in the details of responding to questions of that nature for the Minister of Finance but I can confirm, of course, that the chartered bank prime rates today are something like 17.5 percent. In the United States, prime rates have reached an unprecedented peak of 21 percent and are still rising and that the gap which the Bank of Canada has maintained between the Canadian interest rates and the American interest rates of some 4 percent has led also to a lowering of the value of the Canadian dollar and an almost unprecedented outflow of Canadian dollars to the United States.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, then I would like to address the Minister of Economic Affairs who spoke today on radio discussing the economic problems of Manitoba and what could be done about it, whether he wishes to see a variation in the exchange rate with the U.S. dollar in relation to the export business of all the industries in Manitoba that do export, as compared with the greater cost that would be related to the importer by the manufacturers and the consumers of Manitoba. Since the government has, through its Minister of Finance, appealed for controls on the national interest rate, what position are they taking in relation to its impact on the U.S. exchange?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question properly, the honourable member is asking whether the cost to Canadians to export products which is used in manufacture and in turn exported from Canada, whether the balance is there, I would say, sir, that it is probably desirable to have the Canadian dollar a little less than the American dollar but I don't think it's desirable to have it down where it is at the present time.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well then, I address the Minister of Economic Affairs, whose government has now embarked on a policy of wishing to fix interest rates rather than to let them float, and in that way keep the interest lower than it would normally be, and since what naturally will follow is that the Canadian dollar will drop even more than it is now — I think it was something like 82 cents yesterday — well then is the government prepared to face up to the fact that on one hand, in asking for a fixed interest rate, the exchange, the U.S. exchange rate will increase, the cost to Canada will increase, is that something that is part of the package which his Minister of Finance is recommending? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I think . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he is attempting to carry on a debate during the question period rather than asking a question. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I appreciate your concern and this is not the forum for a debate. It is a question of clarification of the Conservative government policy. On one hand we are told that the Minister of Finance is asking that interest rates be fixed, which means at a rate lower than it would naturally be on the free market. Since the impact of that, I'm suggesting to the minister, will be to make the Canadian dollar worth less in relation to the U.S. dollar — and he said that he doesn't like to see that happen to the extent that it has, where it is now something like 82 cents — I'm asking what is the policy of the Conservative Government of Manitoba in relation to the impact of fixing interest rates and, on the other hand, effecting the department he's concerned with, and that is the department that has so much to do with encouraging the dealing with U.S. importers and exporters and the impact of his government's policy on the exchange rate. Is that not a clear enough question for the minister to deal with?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** No, it's not clear, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to simplify the question then. Inasmuch as the Minister of Finance of Manitoba is asking that interest rates be maintained artificially at a higher level, and inasmuch as that would have the result of reducing the value of the Canadian dollar, how does that relate to his government's policy which he has just enunciated that he wants the Canadian dollar to be worth less than the American but not much, and today it is worth 82 cents. If it dropped to 80 cents, would not the minister consider that serious? When I asked him what relationship he would like see, he said, a little less but not much. Is 18, 19 cents a little less than something he can handle or is it something that should concern him?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** It would concern me, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable, the minister for his answer. Since his answer is that it would concern him, then I would like to know what is the policy of his government in relation to its demands on Ottawa to effect the interest rates without at the same time being concerned about the U.S. dollar value and the fact that he says it concerns him. What is the government proposing to the federal government relating to the exchange rate?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the question, it's clear now, but the question is on the assumption that it's going to get worse because American interest rates are going to continue to climb. We are not in a position to give the answer on the American interest rates at the present time and I'm sure if they do start to climb that our Minister of Finance will take into consideration all of those factors, and I don't really recall the Minister of Finance of the province of Manitoba presenting a package to the Legislature.

He was in Ottawa and suggested that because of the problems it is causing small business in Canada at the present time, that we should do something to look towards helping of small business. Now, I don't see anything wrong with the Minister of Finance trying to find some solution to the helping of business in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a seventh question.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address the Minister of Economic Affairs, referring him to the statement which I think was made just moments ago by the Minister of Natural Resources behind him, to the effect that when there is a tremendous differential between the U.S. dollar and the Canadian dollar, and I think he stated clearly there are hundreds of millions of dollars will flow and do flow from Canada to United States, which I think we all know has an immediate effect on the exchange rate to reduce the value of the dollar. My concern is that in the statement by both ministers, implying that there's nothing that can be done in Manitoba about the interest rate, what are they going to do about the exchange rate and its impact on the Manitoba producer and the Manitoba industrial, small business concerns?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the province of Manitoba is in the position to really do anything about the exchange rate.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. I ask the Minister of Labour, in light of the recent increase in the cost of living and the effect that it is going to have on an already decreasing standard of living for minimum and low wage earners in the province of Manitoba, is the minister now prepared to put into effect an immediate increase in the minimum wage so that the working people and the working poor of this province will not have to shoulder the full burden of these recent and exorbitant increases in the cost of living for people in the province of Manitoba.

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, we have a Minimum Wage Board in Manitoba, it is comprised of representatives from labour and from employers, they are charged with bringing in recommendations. I have called that committee together, they have been meeting, they will be bringing in their recommendations I understand shortly, and once they bring them in we will have a look at the recommendations that they bring in.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm afraid that answer is just not good enough for the people who are going to have to wait out that period of time suffering under the type of working conditions and living conditions which they must now.

I would ask the Minister if his department, or he, has instigated any studies as to the effect that the

exorbitant increases in the cost of living and the inflationary pressures may be having on minimum wage earners and low wage earners in this province, so that they can determine if in fact that minimum wage increase is not long overdue and that the people, the working poor of this province deserve that minimum wage increase immediately so as they can increase their income in proportion to the inflationary pressures which are being imposed upon them by the cost of living increases.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the Minimum Wage Board is meeting, as I said, and as I said last spring they would meet, and they will bring in their recommendations shortly. I don't know what it will include. I do know that it did include in the mid-70s, approximately 1974, there was a unanimous recommendation by the Minimum Wage Board to members opposite, front and middle benches, not the ones in the back, but made to them that a formula at that time be implemented the same one that some of the members opposite are now screaming about. That particular government, in that particular day, chose not to bother themselves with a formula. We have chosen to follow on with the recommendations, as best as we could, of the Minimum Wage Board. They have representation on it, labour and employers, and when that recommendation comes in I'll be prepared to deal with it to the best of my ability.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm a bit concerned about the Minister's ability to deal with it and I would just inform him that at the time of the last increase in the minimum wage the minimum wage was 54 percent of the average industrial wage and had gone up from 40-some percent when the Tories were in power previously, and it is now 43 percent, so that he has to answer for, and that he has to deal with.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that this is a time for questions, not for statements and speeches. That time will come later.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do accept your advice kindly and in the manner in which it was given. My question actually, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

I'd ask the Minister of Northern Affairs, as it is well known that the inflationary pressures and the increases in the cost of living are compounded in northern Manitoba because of transportation costs and because of additional factors, will the Minister inform the House as to what action he will be taking, or his department will be taking, in order to reduce the impact of the recent exorbitant increases in the cost of living for northern Manitobans in specific?

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

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the costs in northern Manitoba, I don't doubt that there are increased transportation costs involved, and we work very closely with the many northern communities in

determining their budgets and what not, and we take into account those types of increased costs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Time for question period having expired, we'll proceed with orders of the day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has eight minutes.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we closed off last evening I was referring to the Neepawa Food Processors who recently closed up in the town of Neepawa, and I heard the Member for Gladstone in his comments refer to the fact that this company had expended some, I believe I heard him correctly when he said that they had spent 420,000 on plant improvement. Now those figures, it could be correct, the figures that I have received are far less than that. The information I have, figures I've heard was 250,000, but regardless of what has been spent, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some of these moneys could be spent to have plant improvement in order to have depreciation. You know, it's a good way of transferring taxes that you would pay from other revenues and have plant improvements in Neepawa, on this particular plant, and that the expenses made thereon were for other purposes than actually just for plant improvement. So it is possible that that may not have been illegitimate or warranted expense, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that there should be more responsibility as far as companies are concerned. When a company like that closes — in fact, Mr. Speaker, I understand that before they closed up they had increased processing in that plant to maximum, in order to have a sufficient supply and a long term supply after the plant closed. And suddenly, Mr. Speaker, the workers were just advised that they would be laid off in a couple of weeks, and that was it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that this government has not looked at all alternatives to keep that plant open. Massey-Harris gave 23 million away in shares, Argus gave away 23 million worth of shares to the pension funds and it never cost them anything, because they had written off those shares, and the argument that I'm making, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases, like what happened in Neepawa could be a similar situation, a very similar situation. This government hasn't looked at all alternatives to keep that plant open. They could have gone in there and investigated what really was happening, and we don't know whether that plant was viable or if it wasn't viable, because we have no way of finding out and I think we should have better legislation that these companies should be more responsible to those areas where they have established themselves, Mr. Speaker.

And I believe that this government has failed, they have failed in Neepawa, they should have looked at that situation. I don't believe they are looking at it, I

don't believe they're doing anything to keep that plant open. I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, a moratorium on interest rates, an abatement such as there is in Saskatchewan. The good Socialistic province of Saskatchewan have abatement of interest rates — in Socialist land, Mr. Speaker, yes — abatement of interest rates for small business and grants for store front improvement and they should have the same thing. At the present time the Minister should be looking at interest rate abatement for farm loans as well, and he should immediately put on a moratorium so that we can save some of these farmers that are maybe going out of business and small businesses as well.

So these are some of the things that I would like to see done and I would like to ask the Minister of Government Services if he would possibly look at the possibility of coming in with some flood program for those areas outside of the Red River. Now, he says that he is trying to negotiate with Ottawa to try and get a program there and it's not forthcoming. Last session he said that he was expecting information very shortly when he was asked that question. We would like to see a program there for farmers out in other areas that are faced with flooding, yards being flooded out every other spring, and there maybe should be some kind of a program there, 500 or whatever to assist in flood protection of some of those farms.

I know that the Minister is trying to get something going with Ottawa on a cost-sharing, and by the way you know this government has been most critical of the federal government in having it cut back its expenditures. But the moment that they cut back on anything, funds for police protection, funds for other programs, for community services programs, they are crying crocodile tears, Mr. Speaker.

The First Minister can take the most of the blame if there's any cutbacks in cost-sharing from Ottawa. —(Interjection)

**MR. ADAM:** I am not wrong, Mr. Speaker. I can bring all the documentation that you'd want to have as far as this government asking the federal government to cut back on its expenditures, Mr. Speaker, and they are to blame if the funds are not coming through now — if there's any cutbacks — they can take the blame, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there should be more housing for senior citizens. I have one minute — I see that you indicate to me — but I want to see more housing for senior citizens. We need another facility in Ste. Rose.

Another item that I would like to see is the Turtle River Flood Board, the headquarters for that board should be moved out of Dauphin and should be in the area that it serves, in the Turtle River flood conservation area. That board should be either in Ste. Rose, Laurier or McCreary, but it should be situated in the area that it is serving rather than be in another centre.

Mr. Speaker, there's many other things that I could discuss and bring to the attention of this government and where they have failed but I close by saying that as far as the Throne Speech is concerned, it's nothing but a bunch of confetti and the sweet by-and-by. Stick with us in the sweet by-and-by you may see something. Thank you very much.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to, as tradition in this House, to congratulate you on your position as Speaker of the House, to compliment and to congratulate the mover from Minnedosa and the seconder from Springfield on the job on which they have done in speaking to the Throne Speech and moving it and seconding it.

I would like to compliment and certainly congratulate my colleagues who have spoken before me, in putting before the public of Manitoba a strong position, strong direction that this province is going, and of course I would be remiss if I did not at this particular time say how pleased I am at the direction, stamina and the foresight that the Premier of this province has had in our national debate on constitution. The input that he has had, Mr. Speaker, I believe will be appreciated and remembered by my children, by everyone's children in Manitoba, a man who stands on strong principle and retention of freedom through the parliamentary and the democratic system and, Mr. Speaker, I want the public of Manitoba to just stop and think that it is a time history when we have had a man who would truly stand up and defend the rights and freedoms of people of this country and, Mr. Speaker, through what is supreme and that is, of course, parliament.

I, Mr. Speaker, in my Throne Speech debate today would like to first of all in the area of recognizing Canada as one nation, I truly am a Canadian, Mr. Speaker. I'm truly a Canadian because I believe the majority of people in Canada believe that we have a country that is truly one which we are the envy of the world. The resources, the freedom, the system that we have is only demonstrated or can only be demonstrated in the way in which people are clamouring to get to Canada. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because we have had and we have a nation which is free and one that which leads to a promise that very few other countries in the world have.

And why, Mr. Speaker? I would like to just comment too, at this particular time, about an individual who is not directly from my constituency but a person who has touched the heart of every Canadian this past summer, and his grandmother lives in the town of Melita which is in my constituency, and that is the individual and I think he is to be complimented and congratulated and certainly thought of a lot because he has touched the hearts of, I say, every Canadian from small children to the elderly people of this country — and that is Terry Fox, ladies and gentlemen. I believe that that individual has truly demonstrated what Canadianism is and truly how he feels that he is dedicated to the betterment of the people of this country. And I do believe that I am proud of an individual such as that and I am very pleased that his grandmother, who I know, is a very fine person and I can see where his background and why he is taking the lead in which he has in that particular area. So I do feel very strongly about that, Mr. Speaker.

In speaking to the people of Manitoba today and to the House, I think it's truly only fair that we should really alert the people of Manitoba just what is happening in Manitoba and in Canada. I would like to refer to some of the moves that have taken place, some of the powers that we don't have in this province, but I think we should refer to the people of the opposite side of this House, very much along the

lines — it was mentioned the other night briefly by the Minister of Consumer Affairs — that we have an opposition in Manitoba that I would say truly pretty well could be tied directly to the Trudeau Liberals at the national level. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, for them to deny that would be very very hypocritical and I say this, Mr. Speaker, that the Trudeau Liberals and the members of the New Democratic Party across the way I think, could be tied very very closely. The Leader of the Opposition of course says that all the problems are created by the province of Manitoba.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have a country that we truly are proud, but the leadership that it has seen at the national level and supported by the members opposite — and let them deny it, Mr. Speaker, let them deny that they don't support the nationalization of the energy in this country — that they don't support the nationalization of everything that is profit-making. A just society as some people would call it and a just society in their estimation and the estimation of the national Liberal Party is to make the strong people weak, not let the people become stronger and stronger. So, Mr. Speaker, in my speech today I truly want to associate the members of the party opposite with the Trudeau Liberals.

It can be demonstrated in some of the actions of course by the members of the Liberal Party opposite in all their support — their support when it comes to voting in this House — the majority of the time they support the New Democratic Party. In fact one of the members from opposite who now found his way to Ottawa and now sits with the Trudeau Liberals in Cabinet, found himself time after time supporting the left-wing move of the people opposite. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, that is truly demonstrated. Now it bothers the Member for Fort Rouge but she has not been able to demonstrate differently because she follows the same pattern.

Let us look a little further, Mr. Speaker. Who upset the Joe Clark government last year? It was Ed Broadbent and his New Democratic Party — (Interjection) — and yes, they're pounding the desks, Mr. Speaker. And why are we in the trouble at the national level and in the provinces of Ontario today is because they believe in the state control and the state running. So, Mr. Speaker, it can truly be said that the members opposite are quite happy to associate themselves with the Trudeau Liberals.

A further evidence of that is the appointment of the Minister responsible, or who should be responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. What is the reputation of the Senator who is appointed to that job? CCF all the way, state control from Saskatchewan and where does he sit? He sits in the same Cabinet as the Member for Fort Rouge who was in that Cabinet. He sits in the same Cabinet; he's a member of the same faith as the members opposite. So, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is quite fair to say that in establishing the fact that they truly believe in the same thing, then I hope to be able to speak to the same group of people at the federal level, and Liberal and NDP. Let's not the Canadians be fooled.

There is truly one opposition in Ottawa and it isn't the New Democratic Party; it is truly the Conservative Party who believe in the rights and the freedoms of the people; the rights and the freedoms of people protected by the parliamentary system.



But, Mr. Speaker, no, we have the Ed Broadbents of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, we have the Ed Broadbents of this world who say we believe that the provinces should own the resources. Yes, the provinces should own the resources. All it means is, Mr. Speaker, that they want to have a state provincial ownership like the Sask Oil, instead of the state federal ownership like the Petro-Canada. What is the difference? It's still the state control. The resources, I believe, should be controlled by the provinces, truly Canadianism, Mr. Speaker. I will get into that, Mr. Speaker, because I really believe the members opposite should fit right in very nicely with the Ed Broadbent New Democrats and with the Trudeau Liberals, they are one of the same and don't let them deny it, Mr. Speaker, because they believe in the left wing control. They believe in state control of the people, not the people controlling the government, they believe in exactly the opposite and I'll give you some examples in a few minutes of what that has done to countries that we're seeing having the chaos that they are today.

I think Canadians had better pay attention to what really is happening to their freedoms and what the people opposite would have happen because it truly is a belief that we do not believe should be cast upon the people of this nation or this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go a little further in talking about the economy of this country and we've heard some comments across the way. I truly believe that Manitoba is truly a province that has strong, steady potential and growth, growth potential.

We've heard the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, in their reply to the Throne Speech talking about "there isn't anything in the province for the hog producers." Under the New Democratic Party they cost the hog producers 2.75 million in a contract to Japan. That's what they did to hog producers in Manitoba, 2.75 million and let them deny it.

Let us talk about the Swift Canadian plant and the closing of the hog-kill in Brandon. Who was responsible for that, Mr. Speaker? It wasn't the government of today, it was the New Democratic Party who stopped the flow of 250,000 hogs annually from Saskatchewan to Manitoba to be killed, by regulation which they brought in, Mr. Speaker. They removed jobs in the packing plant in Brandon. They were the cause of the closing of Swift Canadian and they have the intestinal fortitude to stand here and say that we were the cause of it. It is on record what they did, Mr. Speaker, 250,000 hogs. 250,000 hogs annually coming from Saskatchewan to Manitoba and they stopped it, Mr. Speaker, and don't let them deny it.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Neepawa plant and the Member for Ste. Rose in his political speech to try and get election. I'll tell the people of Neepawa who cut down their production. The New Democratic Party took that company to court for producing too much product to put through that plant. Again, it was their fault. Mr. Speaker, don't let them hang on us because they, in fact, increased their production. Ask the people of Neepawa who produced poultry. Why don't they want to use the Neepawa plant? It's because they didn't like to go to the particular company that was buying their product. Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of the product is available to that plant in

the province of Manitoba and if they want to buy it, if the producers want to sell to them, then they can but it isn't the government that has caused the closure of Neepawa. It is a business decision and the farmers of that area did not want to use it and it was the New Democratic Party who sued them, took them to court, because they were producing too much, for growing chickens. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and let him face the people of Neepawa with that kind of a report on his back.

Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Would Hansard give us both speeches because it's very difficult to hear both of them at the same time? It sounds like a tag team?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak on the economy and, of course, we talk about interest rates which I will refer to somewhat a little later and how they are affecting and certainly not doing anyone in business and anyone in this country but, of course, as it was said by the Acting Minister of Finance and it was said earlier today and I heard him on a Canada A.M. report, that we don't like the things that are happening but it is very difficult for provinces to get involved and do what in fact the federal government should do.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government under Joe Clark, were making moves to correct what is now causing problems and in fact they were responsible, their philosophy put that government out of power, Mr. Speaker, and now they are trying to say, "We have to do something," when in fact they were the initial cause of it or supported the initial cause.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about energy. We have not heard in this year's Throne Speech of course about the hydro rate freeze that is in Manitoba. Let's talk about energy because we do have and we have protected the people of this province in their cost of energy by freezing the rates for five years, Mr. Speaker, in the time of an energy crisis such as we are facing today, an important move that is critical to the young and the old, and the people in farming, in business or whatever. It is in fact one of the most important moves that this government has made but they have never said one good thing about it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that we have been able to do that kind of a thing.

Let us talk about the national energy policy and let us not talk about Alberta on one side and Ontario on the other because let's talk about Canadians, because that's what we live in as a country of Canada. The imaginary line between here and Saskatchewan, between Saskatchewan and Alberta, or here and Ontario, what does that mean to us? It means that you're just driving into another jurisdiction. The people aren't any different, the people aren't a bit different, they all want the same kinds of things. They want life and freedom and food for their families, recreation. They are not bad because they are from Alberta or from Ontario. They are all people, we're all one and we better get our

heads out of the sand and act as one because I don't believe it's in our interest that we start polarizing and pointing fingers as I think we are seeing happening at the national level. Why would we pay the people in the far east 40 a barrel? Why would we pay the people from outside this country exorbitant prices with an 80-cent dollar — and remember that, we've got to add 20 percent on everything we do — on an 80-cent dollar to do what, to destroy the people of western Canada or to destroy the people of eastern Canada who are producing goods and services that support ourselves? That's what we're doing and the people of Canada better pay attention. It's the left-wing movement that's doing it because they want to destroy the strong, free enterprise system and it's the members opposite along with the Trudeau Liberals that are doing it, Mr. Speaker. Let us use a couple of examples to back that up?

Let us talk about PetroCan — and I know the reason why people want PetroCan — because they are afraid. They want security of supply. Let us use the example of some of the federal government handlings of certain things in this country. Who runs the postal system in Canada? If they run PetroCan like they run the postal system, you'll drive up to a gas station and wait two weeks for a gallon, and when it comes to producing food, Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. The people of Canada have to be fed. Do we want to turn this nation into a country like Poland where they have to line up to get two ounces of ham for Xmas? They're starving in those countries, and why are they starving, because the Socialists and the Communists have taken over and they're not going to take over in this country, Mr. Speaker. (Interjection)— That's right, state domination.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about something that's even more current than the post office. Who runs Air Canada, and what about the people that want to go home to their families at Xmas time, and sit down around their open fireplaces and open their Xmas presents? They will not, Mr. Speaker. Why? Because of the incapability of the federal government to run what they say is the best to do it. Mr. Speaker, it is deplorable.

Let us carry this one thing one step further. If you have, in fact, if we follow along the path that the federal government and the members opposite would have us, with a controlled energy price right down, so that — and heaven knows we don't want to go to the world price, we have to go to a price where the people are paid for what they do and a return on their investment. A fair request, nobody should be expected to do less than that in this country today. But what do they want to do? If in fact, and I am afraid ladies and gentlemen and members of this House, that what is going to happen is if the agricultural system in this country does not get the energy supplies that it needs — and we had a meeting in Brandon several weeks ago and got the assurance from the federal government later that they were going to provide or put us on a top priority list — but if the energy isn't here how do we do it? So let's follow that one step further.

Supposing that the agricultural industry fails in this country? Is their answer — and pay attention to this — is their answer to this an AgroCanada and a state

farm system to take it over, so that it will be forced to produce the food? I said we've already seen examples of that in Poland, where it has failed. And, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government's answer and supported by the members opposite, is an AgroCanada, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada, eastern, western or any part, want state-owned farms and that's where he's taking us, Mr. Speaker, supported by members of the philosophy opposite.

Mr. Speaker, to follow on to that same line of thought, if in fact that is the path we are going, if that's the path we are going then we are throwing away what has been traditionally the whole spirit of Canada. And for the Prime Minister or the members opposite who don't understand what a Canadian feels like, who is a farmer or a private enterpriser, when he goes out and accomplishes the producing of a fine field of wheat, a fine herd of cattle, food for the nation and the international market, there's pride, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't learn it out of a book, he learns it by doing and seeing it all happen and, Mr. Speaker, that's what Canadian is, is accomplishment, profit. Mr. Speaker, it is the ability to do things for yourselves and help your neighbours, without being told to do it, without being directed to do it by some big heavy-handed government.

Mr. Speaker, I should just reiterate, or re-mention what was said to me some time ago, and this pretty well says why I got involved in the political arena. Somebody said, you know, we appreciate what you're doing as a government. The best thing of all we appreciate is that the government is now less in our lives in Manitoba than it was before, less government involved in our lives. And, Mr. Speaker, that says quite a bit to me and I really believe that that is what we have to continually strive for.

I, Mr. Speaker, feel very strongly about this and I think if we stop as Canadians — and I say Canadians — and truly see how the people opposite, or if they were in fact in office in Manitoba, along with the Trudeau Liberals in office, how they would take us into the depths of what I would consider almost an irrecoverable or an inability to be able to look after ourselves because we would truly have everyone thinking that the total country depended on government. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't depend on government to produce one thing. To produce law and order, yes. To produce those things that we best can't do as a collective group, whether it be highways, or transportation, Mr. Speaker, and of course, I made one example of how they're looking after transportation when the people want to go home for Xmas. So I want to really emphasize that particular point.

I want to further talk about some of the things that I think are important that have been mentioned and some of the direction that we are going in this particular province, and I think that there are strong signs of development, even though we are suffering from the lack of good policy and good direction at the national level we, Mr. Speaker, have got the opportunity to do some things in this province. Mr. Speaker, it has taken a while to build the base that we have to work from and that, Mr. Speaker, is something that I would just like to refer to at this particular time.

When we're talking about some of the developments that we've seen — and I won't go

through the total Throne Speech — but there are some developments, some developments that I think, I as a Minister of the Crown, a member of the Manitoba Legislature, are pleased to see happen, not because we forced them to happen as a government, Mr. Speaker, because the people who have the initiative to go ahead and make the investment and make the things happen is the reason why.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside has indicated that we have created the climate. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have created the climate within the power that we have available to us. I indicate the climate at the national level is somewhat less desirable but I have got faith, I have faith, Mr. Speaker, that if enough Canadians stand up and tell the Prime Minister, tell the federal government how they feel, and I think it's starting to show out, Mr. Speaker, what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today that the people who are talking separatism, don't want to talk separatism. I believe that truly the majority of people truly are Canadian, but what options do they have? And let's briefly talk about some of the things that have been proposed in constitutional change.

You know, the Member for Ste. Rose with his irresponsible comments, it's one of the worst kind of comments he could make, by hollering about certain people in different provinces, because it's an irresponsible statement, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at his buddies, the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, and what is starting to show now? That truly a just society, as he would suggest or the federal Trudeau Liberals would say this, that a just society is that everybody should be equal. Well, Mr. Speaker, what are they doing in trying to cripple the producing provinces? They're trying to say to them, yes, you've traditionally been the starting ground for all these things and now it's happening, you've got wealth and things are going, but because we aren't able to catch up to you in certain parts of Canada, we will hold you back until we all equalize. Well, in doing so, Mr. Speaker, what do we end up? We end up with an 80-cent dollar in a country with very few people — 23 million people — and unlimited resources. If we had our act together — and I say we because we've all got to work on it — if we had our act together we should be showing the way, we should be leading the way, not trailing it like we are.

And the members opposite will say, bring in interest controls, bring in debt moratorium. Where do you go from there? Where do you go from there, to complete state control on everything, like they've suggested? That's where it all ends up. You control, control, control. How about decontrolling some of the things, deregulate, let the people breathe for awhile. But, Mr. Speaker, the whole system has been distorted because you haven't been letting the people build on their strengths. I didn't speak here today to tear down individuals opposite, there'd be no challenge to that because they really have members there who don't understand. But really what it is, Mr. Speaker, we have to build on our own strengths and that's what I'm talking about in this province.

We build on our hydro, but we build on it on a sound business basis. Mr. Speaker, we build on our hydro, not because we want to create jobs internally and make ourselves look good, like the Socialists.

No, Mr. Speaker, we want to do it because we've got a frozen hydro rate, and we've got people who want to do things. We do it because we are going to sell the power to the people of the rest of the Canada and I don't mind whether it's east or west, Mr. Speaker, that is what we're building on, on the potential. We're building on the fact that we're going to do some good for the nation.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do we want to develop the potash mines of this province? Mr. Speaker, to provide the jobs, to provide the potash for the international market. We, Mr. Speaker, have no secrets on how it is to go on the free enterprise and promote them. Mr. Speaker, there's nothing wrong with the private sector going ahead and doing things because who pays the taxes? Who pays the taxes? Saskatchewan Oil coming into Manitoba and developing and drilling for oil, they've got to pay the wages on those people. We control the resources that are in this province. They aren't hauling all of the oil out of Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had a national energy policy, my constituency and the people of the southwest corner in the western part of Manitoba would be a lot better off, those towns would grow and develop.

Look at the town of Virden and I sit here and listen to the Member for whatever it is, talking about the oil industry, about the fact that as if Saskatchewan had come in and discovered oil in Manitoba. Back in the early Fifties when I was a young boy, Mr. Speaker, there was oil development and the towns grew and developed. But, Mr. Speaker, with the policies of the people opposite tied in with the Trudeau Liberals, it wilted.

Mr. Speaker, if everybody had their act together today, not only would we have potash, but we would have oil spilling across the whole country, we would help the people of Ontario but because of their policies we can't do it. They're tying the hands of the free enterprise motor and let them free, let them go, because, Mr. Speaker, eventually we will be self-sufficient as we are in food. But they are taking us the other way, Mr. Speaker, they're dragging this down into the depths of socialistic disaster. That's what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, and don't let them sit there with their smirky smiles because there is a difference. In this country they do not believe, the Socialists do not believe that government is to create a balance between the labour and the producers and the industry. They believe that they should control the government. That's not what is a good government, Mr. Speaker. The control should be by a mix of people to create a balance.

We talked and we hear talk about people who have come to this great country from the old country, countries that have been socialist states, and they can't understand why when they come to this country they want to bring with them the socialist policies that they left, the state domination. Mr. Speaker, it was told to me once and I think it fits very well, that people like that, particularly those who are heavily involved in the labour movement and want to support the New Democratic Party, you know what has happened? They've come to this country and they've lived in the old country with a club over their head and they came to this country and they saw the chance of getting a hold of the club and, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are faced with.

That is why it is very dangerous for the actions that have happened, for labour to support a party particularly as we're seeing across the way. It is very dangerous and the people of Canada and the people of this province had better be very well aware of the moves that are taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the things that I feel are positive in this province. I've talked about hydro, I've talked briefly about the potash developments and I'm very pleased indeed that that is taking place. Let us talk about agricultural processing of which I think we have a tremendous opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind standing here and saying that we have to review the freight rates if they are going to add to the jobs in Manitoba, if they are going to add to the economy of Manitoba, because I think the Member for Ste. Rose is irresponsible when he starts standing up and hollering that he wants to retain something that is an albatross around the necks of the people of western Canada. We believe the benefits of those rates should be remained for the people of western Canada but let's at least look at how they can be made benefits and not, in fact, taking away the jobs and removing the opportunities that his people and the people in his areas have, the people in the city of Winnipeg, of Brandon and those towns. Let us look a little broader than just down one track.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we look at some of the developments that I see taking place in agriculture, I feel very pleased indeed. We talk, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— Well, certainly, we talked about rapeseed that's taking place, the processing and it's already taking place in a very very big way in Altona. There's nothing new about that. They have done a tremendous job and what are they doing? They have confidence in this province. They are reinvesting some of their money, and Mr. Speaker, let's talk about Canadianism, that's Canadianized. Let's talk about that.

They truly are Canadian-owned. They are truly owned by the Co-operative movement of this country. Not state-owned as some people would have us believe that Canadianization is. Canadianized, Canadian-owned, are the Co-op movement. Do the elevator companies, the United Grain Growers and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pools and the Pool Elevators think that the government of today and its PetroCan, is that Canadian-owned? That's state-owned, Canadian-owned, not straight producer-owned and that's what I'm talking about, the Altonas, the CSBs and the Manitoba Pool Elevators who are building the plant at Harrowby. They are Canadian; it is Canadian-owned, not state-owned, and ask them if they believe, if they truly believe that the federal government are telling them that the PetroCan is anything more than state-owned. Mr. Speaker, ask them if they support PetroCan. They support Petro-Can, I'm sure, only because they've been scared into supporting it because —(Interjection)— scared of multinationals, nothing. Mr. Speaker, let the people of the country go ahead and develop, let them go ahead and develop, then I think we would be going in the right direction.

I wanted to talk briefly about The Farmland Protection Act and I think again it is demonstrated why we have such a good country. Why do people

want to come to Canada, to Manitoba, to invest in land? Because it is the best country in the world, Mr. Speaker, under a system that we're had for 113 years and your intentions across the way are to continually turn it into a state-control system? Let the Member for Ste. Rose go out and campaign — and I'm sorry the Member for St. George isn't here — let him go out and campaign on the grounds that he's going to reintroduce the state-farm program of owning the land. Let him take away the policy of selling Crown land and stand up high and holler loud that when he's back with a Socialist government that he's going to own every acre of land in this province. Let him stand up in Neepawa or in any town and say that, Mr. Speaker, because he will never do it. He will never do it, Mr. Speaker.

When we talk about our Crown land sales, I'm very pleased indeed we are able to turn that generating power, that resource base, over to the people who are going to develop it. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have to continue to develop our water resources, our water reserves. Irrigation, Mr. Speaker, has to be one of the priorities of this government. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he says they wanted it for nothing. He says he wanted it for nothing. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is anything wrong with that, if he read a little bit of his history. How did he think the people originally got on the land? Because they were given an incentive to get on the land and produce. And what did they do? They produced food for the world and, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is against that. He's against that, that's what he's saying? He doesn't want the people to get a hold of the land. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elm Tree, Elmwood, I am sorry, is suggesting that I should sit down. I, Mr. Speaker, will sit down when my time is up.

We talked about the development of our resources. We have to expand our land base so that the people can produce the goods and services for the people of the country. They produce the jobs, as mining, as everything else does. The Member for Flin Flon should well know where the pay cheques come from to the miners in his town. Who produces the wealth? —(Interjection)— That's right, the people do. The Canadian people do and who pays them? Who pays them? The people that are doing the work and developing the markets. That's right, Mr. Speaker, it takes a combination, a working combination, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you if they take a look across at Poland and see how they are being looked after, they will soon change their tactics or their thinking on what political party they should belong to, because that's the belief of the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have to, as I said earlier, strengthen our highways. The Minister of Highways with his highway program is developing programs and plans to carry the loads that are going to be carried, the resource developments in this province. We have to have highways, Mr. Speaker, to carry the resource development that's going to take place, to service the processing industry that I'm talking about. Mr. Speaker, we have the Member for Minnedosa sitting here who I'm sure is pleased with the development that's taking place, and the Member for Pembina, the Minister of Highways, put it very well the other day to the members opposite

and burned them right out of here because he said, who was in government when they closed the plant at Minnedosa? It was the members opposite. And who was in government when they opened it, Mr. Speaker? They talk doom and gloom but, Mr. Speaker, this is not being built on alcohol, alcohol to drink that is the sin of all people, it is being built to produce the alcohol to drive. What is better to use alcohol for? To drink or to drive, and I say it's better to drive, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about that, there has been some concern by the public that we're going to use food that the normal population or people would use, food that people would use. There is going to be a product of the food; there is going to be starch used to produce alcohol to drive. Yes, Mr. Speaker, starch which is in surplus in the world but the protein is going to be left to go into animal feeds to make milk, to make meat, to make pork. So we are only using a part of that particular product. (Interjection)

By the way, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks today, I want to go back and just suggest that we do have a province that has shown what I consider considerable development and underpinning strength in our communities that have got the development and the industrial base to go ahead and work. We have the agricultural community that I think has a tremendous potential. We have seen the setback this year, and as we did last year, with the problems with the weather but, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you the farmers are still there. They are still there, Mr. Speaker, and they are concerned and I am concerned about high interest rates, about energy costs.

But, Mr. Speaker, give them the markets and that's, if you read the Throne Speech, that is what we are going to do is continue to develop markets for those people who are producing. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're going to develop markets with the co-operation with the private sector, with the co-operation of the federal government and I think that is what we can do for the people of this province is continually show them that we can sell their product at higher prices and get them more to keep the system going. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's in production; the people want to produce, they will produce. We have to help them with long-term investments through some interest rebates. We have, Mr. Speaker, addressed that in the Throne Speech that we will be continually upgrading our programs. We are going to continually support our farmers with crop insurance, Mr. Speaker. We are having a review so that it will be more in tune with what the needs of the farmers are today, expanding coverage for new crops, to give them higher coverage so that they can put the inputs that they need to produce the goods.

I just touched on it briefly in question period but I think it's important to note. In hearing a newscast earlier today, I heard that transportation costs were going to go up but it was quite understandable because they needed energy and energy costs were higher. They said food costs were going to go up but they didn't say why. They just thought that farmers pull it out of the air, I guess, but they pull it out of the ground, Mr. Speaker. How do they pull it out of the ground? It takes machinery, it takes energy, it takes fertilizer that comes from the petro chemical industry. Mr. Speaker, that's what makes food grow.

They have to buy fuel, they have to hire labour, they have to buy machinery.

Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot to produce food and the people of the public had better understand it because it isn't going to go down. It can't go down in today's times because the federal government, tied in with the members opposite, truly won't put in policies. Truly won't support policies as Joe Clark put before this public to do the things that have to be done to control the costs that are causing problems today. We were on the right path in Canada, Mr. Speaker, we were in the right path a year ago but we had an 18-cent opposition, an 18-cent group of short-thinking people and why did they get re-elected? Because they mislead the public, they scared the public with an 18-cent gas increase. That, Mr. Speaker, is why the Trudeau Liberals are in power. The people weren't told the truth, they weren't told the truth.

Look at your gas price today. What is it? Higher than it was ever before the Joe Clark government went out of office and the Member for Ste. Rose shakes his head. Who, Mr. Speaker, are they trying to kid across the way when they say that they are going to make things better in Manitoba if they get back in office? They will take us right down the road to the depths of Socialist disaster, that's where they will take us and I think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada, the people of Manitoba are going to understand when it comes to the next year-and-a-half, really, what we have. We have a sound, solid government led by the Premier of this province, supported by the MLAs who I am very pleased to be a member with. I truly believe that the options that Canadians have is not to separate but the option that I think that should be given to them, that the Prime Minister and his Socialist government should step aside and let Canada go ahead not hold it back. He got back into office to bring Quebec back into Confederation or hold it in Confederation, because he said he wanted a united Canada. Is he as prepared today to step aside so that the west can stay in Confederation, and we can have a Canada that we all Canadians believe in, not his image of what he thinks Canada should be?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a tough act to follow, but it nevertheless is an act, and I would like to begin by saying that — oh, the member is leaving now, he's not going to listen to some of the remarks directed at his remarks — he took some relish, Mr. Speaker, in saying that a few New Democrats were in bed with the Liberals. But I want to ask him this question. What about Jack Horner? Remember Jack Horner, wasn't he a Conservative? Didn't he get into bed with the Liberals, Mr. Speaker? What about Gordon Fairweather? Remember him? Wasn't he a Conservative, didn't he get into bed with the Liberals in Ottawa? Well there's a couple of the big name Tories. The name of Jack Horner — my honourable friend, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, he supported Jack Horner and he was betrayed, and I think that he has reason to feel somewhat concerned about the fact that a man that he looked up to as a leader, a pillar of the Conservative party, Jack

Horner, rode out of the west to champion the west —(Interjection)— Well, he's nowhere, is he? He struck out. (Interjection)— You mean you're interested in people who went to bed with the Liberals. I'm giving you the names of a couple of Tories. So if you can think of one or two New Democrats, I can think of one or two Conservatives. And it's the old problem, isn't it? The Liberals have the money, they have the government, they have almost every form of incentive or every honour that could be offered, and anybody who can be bought can be bought, because they have a vast array of things to offer people who want to join the party and to join the fun.

You know the interesting thing about the speech by the Minister of Agriculture, is that he's fighting the battles of ten years ago. He is fighting the battles from 1969-1977. He doesn't want to deal with the issues of the 1980's and he doesn't want to deal with the record of the Conservative Government, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when we fight the next election we're going to fight it on their record, and they can fight it on our record, and we'll see who the people of Manitoba will listen to. We'll see whether they want to rehash the issues of the Schreyer administration, name them, anyone you want, or whether they want to deal with the record of the present administration. I mean what are we fighting? Is this historians arguing about an interpretation of history or is this a government that is presenting itself to the people of Manitoba for re-election?

I would suspect that if the government won't defend its own record, nobody will. They have to go on the attack and talk about the Schreyer administration in the late '60s and '70s; if that's all that they have, then they must be afraid to defend what they have done, and I think it's for good reason, because it's very hard to think of any accomplishment. (Interjection)— They already got their message, well sure. Well, my colleague from Logan, who is a very shrewd grassroots politician, says they already got the message. Sure they got the message. The polls, we know what the polls say, we have polls and they have polls and we get leaks from their poll and vice versa. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think the common wisdom is, an election held today means ten less seats for the government. Ten. Among them the likable but mistaken Member for Emerson. You know, Mr. Speaker, how can he possibly compete against our candidate from St. Malo, who isn't in office yet and has already got Highway 75 twinned and is getting roads built into his riding and he's not even elected yet? Imagine what he'll do when he becomes the MLA. Imagine, just imagine that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Throne Speech because one of the questions that I wanted to determine was, is there going to be an election in May or June? You know, that was what I figured was up. (Interjection)— How about March? March is okay. In my mind, I'm not saying this is correct, March is the end of winter and the beginning of spring, because I like the short winter and time for a change, you know, a new beginning, with the New Democratic team. But, Mr. Speaker, when I read the Throne Speech, when I listened to the Lieutenant-Governor reading a Throne Speech to us, I said to myself this is not an election Throne Speech,

definitely not, there's nothing in here. They're just a rehash of a bunch of old programs. There's nothing new or exciting in the Throne Speech, so therefore I conclude, I mean I'm not going to fall asleep in the event that they call a snap election, but I know what the government is doing. They were getting ready for an election and they are still hoping for an election this spring, but I think they've already discarded that. Now they're waiting to see if things will get better in the fall and if not in the fall, then the next spring.

They're going to get locked in, Mr. Speaker. You know, there's a danger; the Schreyer administration did the same thing, right? We waited a little longer, because we were a little concerned at the time, so we said, well let's go a little longer, a little longer, and it didn't work. They're doing the same thing; they're afraid to go now, they're afraid. They were hoping —(Interjection)— no, well the reason you should stay in is, you should stay in until the five years, that's my honest advice, because you know that's going to be it. So you may as well stay in till the end of the term, blow it in 1982, and then go back into opposition. I mean that's really you're alternative, because if you go now you know you're going to lose, you know that, and we know that. We can name the seats, we can list the seats now, Mr. Speaker, ten of them that are going NDP.

**A MEMBER:** Minnedosa?

**MR. DOERN:** Well, I'll let my backbench colleagues name them. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that when I listen to the Chairman, who was kicked in the pants today by the Minister of Natural Resources, told not to dare to speak for the government again. What cheek, Mr. Speaker. Imagine the Chairman, presuming to speak for the administration, and the Minister of Natural Resources had to admonish him and remind him that although he's banker he doesn't know anything about finance, and that he shouldn't speak for the Minister of Finance. (Interjection)— No I didn't. I never listen to anything you say, that's why I didn't listen to it.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to his speech and to the Seconder, and what was it? —(Interjection)— Fine speeches. They talked about the future, talked about the future and the Member for Minnedosa attacking the Schreyer administration. Did he trumpet the successes of the Lyon administration? No. They talked about bearing fruit. These projects that they announced are going to bear fruit someday. They don't have anything to talk about now. They don't have anything to talk about in the present. (Interjection)— I'll talk about your record too. I'll talk about the 1.4 million that this Minister lost. He allowed his department to blow 1.4 million and to this day they're not sure where that money went, Mr. Speaker. Well, you know, that's not very good. Imagine my friend, a hardnosed Tory, a businessman —(Interjection)— Oh no, Harry found the lost chord and he also found the piano, but he didn't know where the piano was. You see, that's the problem, he didn't know where it was.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine a Conservative government, who talks about fiscal management, overspending 1.4 million and not having the faintest idea where that money went? I mean, can you imagine a bunch of people who presume to be

businessmen operating in such a sloppy fashion? Can you imagine if you yourself were responsible for a budget of 25-30 million, not being able to account for that kind of money? That the Provincial Auditor has to come out and rap you on the knuckles. That certainly is not very impressive for a group of people who pride themselves in being businessmen. — (Interjection)— We've heard of "Dirty Harry", that was a movie, this is Naughty Harry.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure who I'm backing yet. There's a couple of contests that I haven't decided on. I'm trying to decide whether to support, in Gimli, the Minister of Government Services or the Minister of Education, and one day I'm inclined one way and the other day another; or the Minister of Corrections versus the Member for St. Matthews. That one I don't find as much difficulty with. (Interjection)— Well in Inkster there's a New Democratic candidate, and we'll see what happens. I notice though that the Member for St. Matthews has suddenly reappeared, I'd forgot what he looked like. Well, he's not there now but he has come back; and those are two of the contests that I'm not so sure of. I think I know who I prefer in the St. James instance; in the Gimli one I'm torn between the merits of these two gentlemen. (Interjection)— Who do I like in Wolseley? Myrna Phillips. She's a shoo-in. She's a shoo-in. You're candidate I don't know. I don't know about your candidate how he's going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to also mention that this Throne Speech has ignored the needs and requirements of almost over 60 percent of the people of Manitoba. There is practically no mention whatsoever in this Throne Speech about the problems of the City of Winnipeg. I mean can you imagine our province, which is unique to this extent that we have a capital city in which most of the people live, some 62 odd percent of the population lives, including your riding, Sir, and mine, and that is almost entirely ignored by the present administration. They are going to look after the needs of southwestern Manitoba. That's the thrust. They're going to do something about the needs of the southwest portion of Manitoba, but they are going to ignore the needs and the problems of the City of Winnipeg, and as a Winnipeg MLA I want to say that I'm going to do my best to try to get them on track. We know about the Minister of Highways who only builds roads in Conservative ridings. And now we know about the government that only attempts to deal with the needs and the problems of the area outside the Perimeter, not the north, they don't pay attention to the north; not the City of Winnipeg; and not the NDP ridings, but basically southwestern Manitoba alone.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad my colleague has come in and I wish that he heard, it would have given him a headache, but I wish he had heard the speech of the Minister of Agriculture which will be torn to shreds I'm sure somewhere in the next day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to describe one of the serious problems of the City of Winnipeg that bothers me and a lot of people, and that is the sad state of business in the community. You know, if you look at the amount of business being done in the City of Winnipeg in the shopping centres; all around the city now there are huge shopping complexes. There is our downtown which is declining. Then the thing that

really upsets me is that there are literally dozens, if not hundreds of buildings, where there are two and three and four and six and eight shops. A few years ago you never saw them. Now every corner of every intersection has a small building with a whole series of shops. Go and look at those, Mr. Speaker, and you will see vacant signs and you will see entrepreneurs who are sweating blood. I want to predict right here and now that the level of bankruptcy in the Province of Manitoba will go to an all time high in 1981. I predict that right now. I will bet, Mr. Speaker, that the small businessmen in our area, I'm talking now of the City of Winnipeg in particular, will not be able to meet their rent, let alone their salaries. Now you know something about business, but I tell you these people in . . . there's hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of small shopkeepers, and they are all taking money away from each other, and they are competing in a stagnant economy, the province isn't growing. If the province was growing by five or ten percent a year it would be okay. There would be no problem because if you had it hard now, in a year or two you would start meeting your costs and you'd start showing a profit and so on. The problem is that the suburbs are taking business away from the downtown and everybody is fighting over the same stagnant pie, and this is the problem.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, condemn and criticize the Winnipeg City Council which has allowed a boom in shopping centres throughout Metropolitan Winnipeg to the detriment of all the other shopping centres and all the other businesses, and the downtown area in particular. I want to condemn those on Council, and I don't know about my friend from River Heights, whether he was a participant in this or whether the Minister of Correction was a supporter of this notion, but allowing all these shopping centres. Go downtown and talk to people who work in the big stores. I talked to a woman I know who works in the Hudson's Bay Company and worked there for almost 40 years, and she told me last year in February or March that it's the worst she has ever seen in her life. She works in that store, she said it's pathetic at night when you're there — there's only a bunch of clerks talking to one another. We have record bankruptcies, we have record out-migration and we have low, low and declining retail sales. We have over-expansion in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, I took a look at Portage Avenue. I'm one of those who likes the downtown. I enjoy shopping in Eaton's and The Bay and the stores in the whole downtown area, including the Convention Centre, the Trizec area and so on, down along Portage and Main. I want to tell you what Portage Avenue is like nowadays. Remember in the old days when you could walk up and down Portage Avenue and go window shopping, there were nice stores on both sides of the street. I want to tell the kind of stuff that is now right downtown north of Portage and I'm going to ignore the pinball machines and all this other stuff that Al Golden and others have brought to us on Portage Avenue, and just look at a key block from Donald to Smith on Portage Avenue on the north side. That was once an area where they had Genser's Furniture and there were a lot of high class banks, businesses, legal offices, restaurants and so on. Remember there used to be Moore's

Restaurant, Child's Restaurants, and all of those nice places, and Hanford-Drewitt was there and so on. Here's what's on Portage Avenue right from the Eaton's corner across the street down to Smith. On the corner Ben Moss Jewellers for lease, Ben Moss Jewellers okay — there's an empty building; beside it Jean Junction. Can you imagine a high class place, I mean can you imagine going into Edmonton or Calgary on the main drag, or New York or Chicago, and you're on the big shopping centre and there's Jean Junction — some guy selling blue jeans out of crates of apple boxes. That's what's going on in Winnipeg, but they're temporarily closed, but they're there. Shopper's Drug Mart, well okay a drug store, but you know Portage Avenue is full of drug stores now isn't it? A whole bunch of little drug stores. Sears Catalogue Sales, not Sears Retail, Sears Mail Order — I mean if you go into the small towns of Manitoba and the small towns in North America you'll see Sear's and you'll see other places where there's just a little catalogue store. Is that the kind of business that we're doing on Portage Avenue? Is that all the retail clout that we have? Then there's 293, that's for lease, there's an empty store there if anyone wants to go into business. I mean, think what the Tories have done for business in Manitoba, there's a chance for a Tory to open up and to get into business, there's another vacant store. Then there's Le Chateau clothes, I don't want to run them down, but they don't look like the greatest place, they look like an average low price type of place. Then there's the entrance way just to go to the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, so it's just really an entrance way. Then there's Champ's Restaurant — remember Moore's, Child's, I mean, remember our high class restaurants — Champ's, they now rent to Champ's Chicken and Hamburger Stand, Colonel Saunders. Then we've got Izzy's Restaurants — I wonder how Izzy stacks up to Moore's. These are little tiny operations, Mr. Speaker, these are not high class restaurants, these are fast food joints, these are chains and hamburger and chip shops. That's what Portage Avenue is nowadays, and then one place at least on the corner, Fort Garry Trust.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that not only was everyone better off in Manitoba when the NDP administration was in power, but business was better off when the New Democratic Party was in power.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative administration just has been unable to cut it, they have not been able to live up to their advance publicity, they can't deliver, they promised to deliver, they promised to get the economy going and they have struck out. So what do they do, what are they going to do, Mr. Speaker. Well, red-baiting that's one technique. They decide to divert attention away from their record by attacking our Leader. They have now decided that they will attempt to destroy the credibility of the New Democratic Party by attacking our Leader. You have to, is that all that is left? I mean do you have to go after our leader? — (Interjection)— Well, the Member for Springfield says he has to; I don't know why he has to, he didn't say why, but he says it's necessary.

Instead of the old days where the Leader of the Opposition got up and made a speech and it was adjourned, the Tories throw up a dozen speakers. They get everybody that they can to speak to

attempt to detract attention from the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition. (Interjection)— Of course it's your right to speak, we agree, I agree, but you know isn't there a tradition? Isn't the tradition that when the Throne Speech is moved and seconded that it's adjourned, and that the Leader of the Opposition speaks — (Interjection) — well it has been, I've been here 15 years, it always has been. The tradition is the Leader of the Opposition speaks and it's adjourned and then it goes after that.

**A. MEMBER:** They don't believe in it.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, okay they don't believe, these are Tories who don't believe in tradition. I never heard of such a thing. Mr. Speaker, I say that the reason they did it, I say that they are concerned about the New Democratic Party and they believe it, their strategy is attack Pawley. You kill Pawley, you kill the NDP, and we'll win the election.

Mr. Speaker, that's not going to work. It will not work and I'll tell you why. They underestimate the ability of the Leader of the official Opposition. (Interjection)— Oh yes they do. They say, he's easy we'll kill him; Sterling's better. That's what you think. Wait till the next election

**MR. MINAKER:** That what the polls say.

**MR. DOERN:** The Minister of Corrections says that's what the polls say. I don't believe that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I realize everybody wants to get into the debate but I think if the honourable member addressed his remarks to the Chair we could cut out a lot of this chit-chat.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to the Minister of Corrections through you, Mr. Speaker, that he's now going to put a thesis that his Leader is more popular than our Leader, they're going to go into an election on that basis and win the election. I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, you'll recall in 1977, our Leader was more popular than their Leader and we went into an election and we lost, so it's not a guarantee. It cannot be relied upon that the Leader is going to carry the party.

Mr. Speaker, the polls say that we're going to win 10 seats more. We're going to pick up to the 32 seats and they're going down by 10. I'm not sure what's going to happen to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, because I predict the Liberal Party will be between zero and one seats. Some think I'm optimistic about their chances, but I say that those are realistic estimates, Mr. Speaker.

Who's going to vote for the Tories? I'll tell you who. Other than the Driedger family I'll tell you who. (Interjection)— There's a few cousins that are on the suspect list, Mr. Speaker. Die-hard Tories. Here's who's going to vote for you, die-hard Tories. (Interjection)— That's right. There is going to be an element in the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, that is going to stay home. I tell you when the people are not enthusiastic about the performance of the government they will not betray their party, they will not go to the polls and vote for the enemy, they will stay home and their vote will go



down, because their die-hard supporters won't betray them, the die-hards will vote, the medium Tories will stay at home, and the red Tories — remember them, remember Sid Spivak and Duff Roblin, remember those guys — the red Tories are going to vote New Democratic. That's right, that's what's going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, there's going to be an alliance, and a new alliance in the next election. I just predict — (Interjection)— The member came in having heard my dire prediction.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** One of us equals ten of you anyway so . . .

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I say that the supporters, the die-hard supporters of the Liberal Party, they will vote Liberal, but a lot of Liberals who voted for us in 1969, all kinds of them in '69, in '73 they voted for us again; they left our party in '77 and they went Tory because they wanted the NDP out.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** But where are they in 1980?

**MR. DOERN:** Now where are they in '80 and '81?

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Back home where they belong.

**MR. DOERN:** Back home. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Liberals, small "I" Liberals in particular, and the progressive wing of the Liberal Party, they're going to say to themselves in the next election, who do we want in power? They can't in conscience vote for the party of Mr. Lauchlan and the Member for Fort Rouge and the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy. Here's a Minister from down east; he has a bag with 4 billion in it and he's losing ground. Can you imagine Santa Claus with 4-billion bucks in a bag losing votes? Well, that's what's happening. He is unable to entice or interest the people of western Canada in voting Liberal. When the Liberals say they are going to pick up seats in the next election federally, Mr. Speaker, they will be lucky federally, federally, to hold what they now have. They will be fortunate because their vote will go down and with it may go their number of seats.

So who is going to vote NDP? First of all, the die-hard New Democrats, that's for sure. Then the small "I" liberals who are going to look at the two parties and say, "The one thing we must do in Manitoba is get rid of the Lyon administration." They will put their votes on the NDP. The progressives, the progressive people, they always vote for us because we are the progressive party in Manitoba. Then there will be a few Liberals who will want to vote for the Member for Fort Rouge and her cause but they will say, "Third party, splinter group, what are you going to do? We would like to vote Liberal but we can't, but we must get rid of the Lyon administration." They will vote for us. So you total that all up. Lukewarm support for the Tories, impossible to vote Liberal, the votes will go New Democratic. That is what is going to happen and I think there is no question of that whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the Tories are really running scared. I laugh when I hear them attacking. They think the Free Press is an NDP organ; they say the Free Press is backing the NDP. That's what they say. Somebody said that just the other day, I've heard it before, our

friends in the Free Press. What a switch, what a switch, Mr. Speaker. I've been saying all my life that the Free Press . . .

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Tell us how many you had at your fund-raising dinner.

**MR. DOERN:** We had 150 to 200 people.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Gee whiz. That's great.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, I don't think that was bad. The people who went to their dinner were simply businessmen. What's 250 bucks to some guy who is in business? It's a write-off and the Liberals have more wealthy supporters than we. Our people don't have 50-or-100 bucks to pay for a dinner but they will vote for us.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** But they could get a rebate on it, you know it very well.

**MR. DOERN:** I have to tell the honourable member that it's votes that count. It's not 125 plate dinners that counts. Mr. Speaker, one of the people who have allied themselves with the Conservative Party for the last three years is becoming disillusioned. Fred Cleverley, can you imagine old Fred? Old Fred has lost faith. (Interjection)— Yes, he has. He has. He has written three columns in a row critical of the Lyon administration. Can you imagine that he himself, after these years of hating the NDP and of writing against the NDP and as they say in current jargon, dumping on the NDP . . .

**MRS. WESTBURY:** He hasn't said anything in favour of us.

**MR. DOERN:** No, he hasn't said anything in favour of us but he's changed his attitude towards the government. He's changed his . . . Mr. Speaker, even Fred Cleverley has seen the light even if it's just a flash.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the gentleman in question is not able to defend himself here. Isn't it unparliamentary to be discussing someone who is unable to defend himself in the Chamber?  
Interjection

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If we paid attention to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Elmwood we would only have five more minutes to hear the rest of his presentation. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when the election was held last time and we came into this Chamber, the First Minister was fond, very fond, of talking about the mess that we left, eh? Remember he talked about brooms and shovels and elephants and so on, and rubber boots. He had rat-infested, you know, remember all that stuff? Do you remember we heard that for about two years?

**A MEMBER:** Horror stories.

**MR. DOERN:** Horror stories and I want to tell him a story about elephants. He likes elephant stories so I found an interesting one and that is, in Britain when they were doing Aida at Covent Gardens, they had an elephant in the opera. The elephant unfortunately came out and dropped something on the stage. Thomas Beecham, who was the famous conductor of the orchestra, said in observation of that, "Not much of a performer, but gad, what a critic." Mr. Speaker, I say that maybe part of what they saw was simply the New Democratic reaction to the new administration. I want to say that if they thought there was a mess when we left office, it's going to look like a fly speck when we get into power and have to clean up what they have done, because think of the problems that we are going to be confronted with that have been left by this particular administration. Think of the manner of competence that is being exhibited in this Chamber by this government. Do you remember last session? Do you remember the fumbling, the stumbling and the bumbling of the government in the last month or so? Do you remember how the bills had to be pulled and the bills had to be gutted and it was just a complete disaster. Robert Matas, who is no longer here, in the last day of the session, July 30th, said that competence was the major issue in the 31st Legislature. It was the competence of the government which was found wanting in that session.

Then we saw just the other day, we saw the Wilson affair in this Chamber. The government knew for months what was going to happen. Did somebody get up and handle this in a professional manner? Did somebody get up and move a motion and clarify it? No, there was stumbling, fumbling and bumbling, and there was conferences. We had the First Minister, Sir, threatening you and your position. Mr. Speaker, we had motions that were improperly drafted, then amended and re-amended. We had chaos and confusion and now, after calling an early session, I think all of us expected to come back here in the middle of January. Now, what is apparently happening? They are not ready to come back. We come in for an early session; we're not ready to resume in a few weeks. We're going to have to wait till some time in February because the government doesn't have the Estimates ready. Where is this management? Where is this competence that is being exhibited? Mr. Speaker, when I look across the way I am getting sea sick. I feel sea sick because there is a sea of incompetence being exhibited by the gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say on the issue of the Constitution, the fact that the First Minister is using the constitutional debate as a smokescreen. I will save that for another point in time. I simply say that a government that came in in 1977, some three years ago, and promised to operate in an efficient businesslike fashion has completely failed to do so.

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

**MR. JIM GALBRAITH:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I would like to congratulate you on your resumption of your position at this fifth session of the 31st Legislature. As was proven the other day your position in this Chamber is sometimes a precarious one and one that I myself wouldn't really

look forward to trying to fill. It does get into some very difficult positions at times and I think the way you handle yourself has to be congratulated. At this time I would also like to pass on congratulations to the Mover of the Throne Speech and the Seconder. They spoke very well and they added to what I would say is going to be a very popular Throne Speech in the near future.

Members opposite want to talk a lot about our population loss in Manitoba, our unemployment and it just makes me wonder where they get all their figures from or how they arrive at all the problems that we are in. In Manitoba we have 30,000 more people working in this province now than when we took office some three years ago. That is 10,000 jobs a year or 10,000 more people working per year than when they were in office. The last three years that they were in office there was only 10,000 new jobs created all together and most of those were in the public sector, not in the private sector. Who pays for the jobs in the public sector? The people at large.

I often ask myself this question. How many Manitobans would have had to leave this province if the NDP were in power? There would have been at least another 20,000 or 30,000 on top of those who have already left according to the way they put the statistics across. I don't think that our province is in that bad a shape. I am told that welfare payments for people on welfare have been steadily decreasing and I'll even give the former government some credit. They say this started happening five years ago and is continuing to this day. Is it those people that are leaving the province or are retired people leaving the province? Maybe there are a few young people that are going west at the present time looking for the big dollars that are out in the boom situation that is going on there at the present time. I don't deny those young people that chance to go but they will be back. I'm certain they will be back. With the development that is going to take place in this province, potash, mining in the Flin Flon area and other parts of the north, the aluminum company that is making great progress. Their development stage is starting up in the outskirts of Winnipeg; the rapeseed plant at Harrowby; possibilities of our Hydro development on the Nelson River; the gasohol plant at Minnedosa. The young people that have gone west are going to be coming back to Manitoba because Manitoba is going to be the place to be in the very near future.

They talk about taking over the government in this province once again, heaven forbid. I would just like to know and I'd like them to tell the people of this province what would they do? Would they bring back all these corporate taxes and personal income taxes that were the highest in this country? Would they bring back the corporation capital tax to its former level? They would bring that back. I wonder if they tell the small businessman that they are going to bring that back. They talk about how they are going to help small business. The small business tax rate has been reduced from 13 percent to 11 percent. Are they going to increase that back to its former standard to help small business? Is that the way they are going to help small business? Succession duties and gift taxes, they've been abolished. I suppose they'll bring them back. That'll help out small business. Mineral acreage tax; there's a number of those other ones.

Mr. Speaker, what about the ordinary citizen on the street and personal income tax. It's been reduced from 56 percent to 54 percent. Are they going to bring that back up to its former level to help out the general public? I imagine they likely will. Then there's mining royalty taxes, I suppose they'll return them to their former level so that they can stop all the mining activity that's going on in the province at the present time.

Those are some of the things that I think we can look forward to with the return of a New Democratic Party government but I just don't think that's going to happen because when you get out in the field and talk to the people they don't want those things brought back.

The last session we had a great ruckus in here about fishing licences and I find that very interesting. The Minister of Resources wanted to make some changes so that fishermen could sort of have some more input into their own affairs, and buy and sell their quotas or licences. Now when I get back out into the country, I seem to run into all kinds of people wondering why they can't get a fishing licence. (Interjection)— I just say, well, you weren't speaking up last winter when we wanted to make those changes so that you had a possibility of getting a fishing licence so I guess you're just going to have to live with the administration that was set up by the former government. (Interjection)— Anyway, our Minister was working with the fishermen and trying to come up with more favourable policies and I hope that he reopens those hearings and get's the fishing industry back on its feet.

Earlier this fall, changing the subject a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of going on a tour that was sponsored by CN, Canadian National Railways, and they called it a Grain Industry Special Tour Train. CN officials escorted us to Thunder Bay and when we were in Thunder Bay they gave us a very extensive tour of their operation. We were taken on a tour of their marshalling yards at Neebling in Thunder Bay. Their whole distribution of grain cars at the different terminals was all explained to us and they even explained the car exchange system that had been worked out with CP Rail. This was all very interesting for a person who is interested in the grain business, such as myself, and I think it was a very worthwhile tour. When we were there we also toured one of the Manitoba Pool terminals and the operation there was explained to us.

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

The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question of clarification on the tour that he spoke about.

**MR. GALBRAITH:** The Honourable Member for St. George will have his opportunity to speak.

Going further with this tour, which honourable members aren't interested in hearing --- (Interjection)— All right, I'm going to tell you some more about it. On our way home we were shown slides and motion pictures involving the whole CN operation and that involved the major collection and distribution points in western Canada, the rail line problems that they're having in western Canada, and we were shown some specific ones in Manitoba. One

of them being the Rossburn subdivision, the rail yard operation including Symington in Transcona, switching and signalling operations which is a very complex operation and is really educational in itself; their computer operations and they are working very extensively with a new system of hot box detector systems to try and do away with some of the train wrecks that are taking place. This is an early warning system that would notify the CN officials in headquarters and they can directly relay this back to their engineers on the trains and they can stop them right away, quick, as soon as they have a hot box detection on a train. And we were also shown a very good film on their Prairie Branch Line Rehabilitation Program.

While I was on that tour we also had a chance to talk individually with some of the CN officials and it was very interesting to hear some of them comment about the possible amalgamation of the two railways. And I must point out at this time that as far as they were concerned, they certainly didn't want to see that happen. They look forward to continued competition with the CP Rail and it is the only way they have of gauging their operation, even though both railways may be subsidized at some time or other by federal governments. And I, myself, must go on record at this time in saying that I would not like to see the amalgamation of both railways as I see that as only a backward step. We have no way of gauging the railways and keeping track of their operations at all.

And while we're talking about the railways, I guess I might as well make a comment about the Crow rate, I find it very interesting to hear the Member for Ste. Rose, who is supposed to represent the cattle capital of Manitoba, and I often wonder why he can pit the grain producers of the Ste. Rose area against the cattle producers of the Ste. Rose area. I do not understand why he just looks after the grain producers and forgets about the livestock producers. I thought he was supposed to be representing the whole area and not just part of his constituency.

**A MEMBER:** Are you against the Crow rate?

**MR. GALBRAITH:** I am not against the Crow rate, but I think there can be some improvements made to it and I support a position that would benefit all agricultural production regarding that Crow rate. I'm not just going out on a limb and support the grain producers. I'd like to see all producers of agricultural products get some benefit from that Crow rate. (Interjection)— They wouldn't understand it anyway.

At this time, I would just like to make a few comments about the Throne Speech. One of the first things I notice in it is that we are going to be proposing a resolution to the federal government committing our support for a united Canada and I will be endorsing this resolution 100 percent. I know that the people of the Dauphin Constituency will be behind me on this or at least I am certain that a vast majority of them will. We have a system of government in this country that has worked to what I would say the best system of government in the world and it served us, as far as I'm concerned, really well for the last 113 years, and I must say at this time, that I have no hesitations about wanting to bring the Constitution home but my position is, let's bring the Constitution home here and have an

amending formula that the provinces and the federal government can agree on. Why do we have to get the Government of Great Britain to change our Constitution when we can do it here at home? I don't see why we have to get some other legislative body to do our dirty work.

I notice and I know that mining and oil exploration in this province has reached its highest levels of development in our history, and I was a little bit disturbed, I think it was just last night, that I saw a program on TV where it stated that some 30 oil companies, drilling rigs, that are now leaving, I suppose likely Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and B.C. and they're going to the United States because of the latest federal restrictions that are being placed upon them. They cannot compete and I think this is going to only lead to one way, and that is to disaster.

I'm quite pleased with the developments that are coming out of the St. Lazare area concerning our potash development in the province. I know that the people of western and northwestern Manitoba are very pleased. I, as a Member for Dauphin, have only one regret, that ore body doesn't seem to come over as far as Dauphin, but other than that, we are very pleased with that development. It is very encouraging to hear that we're going to have, or we could have approximately 400 new jobs.

**A MEMBER:** When, when?

**MR. GALBRAITH:** Sooner than you people want. That is going to be a big help for western Manitoba and it's really going to help develop that area of the province. Even in that same area we have the rapeseed plant at Harrowby that's going ahead so that western and northwestern Manitoba looks like they're really going to step ahead.

Hydro development is something that I'm very much interested in and pleased with and I support the government's position that hydro will only be developed as the markets become identified. I know of no constituent in Dauphin that wants his hydro rates increased if we go ahead and build when we haven't got an identified market. My understanding that if we do go ahead and build another one of those projects without an identified market, that our hydro rates are going to double.

**MR. URUSKI:** Are you suggesting that the rates won't go up if you can build a new plant?

**MR. GALBRAITH:** The Member for St. George says that hydro rates are going to have to go up if we build a new plant with the building market. I would argue that they would not have to but we'll have to see how it happens in the future. If you've got a ready-built market before you build, it should not have to necessarily go up.

The second principle involves the involvement of using as much capital investment from our province and sister provinces within Confederation to develop that hydro potential when it takes place and I as a true Canadian, support that as far as is possible because if it is developed and manufactured in Manitoba, that has an encouraging effect all across our broad dominion.

The third principle involves the strategy to develop our electrical resource, to develop our own resources in Manitoba, and that I fully support.

We have the Aluminium Company of Canada looking at developing a plant on the outskirts of Winnipeg and I strongly support our government in helping to encourage this company to go along with that; 700 more jobs in Manitoba with no real investment by the province. If that can be worked out it is nothing but a benefit to all Manitobans.

The proposed Western Power Grid, the people of Dauphin, I am sure support that 100 percent as it means more development in Manitoba, more jobs, and if it can be worked, a benefit to all of Canada because we all know that energy is going to be a big factor in the future.

According to the Throne Speech we are going to have many more developments in agriculture, support for the agriculture and family farms and I fully endorse that. We're going to be looking for the promotion of agricultural products for export markets, approved information programs to assist farmers in business and in their marketing decisions. I'm also very interested in the credit policy changes and programs of the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation to assist our young and beginning farmers and to help them to transfer farms within family units. And while I'm just talking about this, when it comes to cattle producers, I hope that our Honourable Minister of Agriculture will consider a better system of brand inspection within the province, because that is getting to be a major concern among cattle producers. As the price of livestock continues to increase I think that we have to take a look at a better system of brand inspections.

Manitoba Crop Insurance is supposed to receive a review and I strongly endorse that. With all the new crops that are coming on market and our ever changing methods of production, I think that Manitoba Crop Insurance policies must be reviewed to keep abreast of the times.

The gasohol plant at Minnedosa is encouraging to everyone in the agriculture field. It's going to provide another market for locally grown products and I'm sure some of that is going to spill over into the Dauphin area, and it's also going to provide another system of cheap feed for some of our cattle producers, our livestock producers, whether they be chicken, hogs or livestock.

It's interesting that this year so far during the Throne Speech we heard very little from the opposition about health care in Manitoba and I guess there must be a reason. It must be getting back out to the general public that health care and social services in this province is receiving nearly 40 percent of the provincial budget, and in the last year or so of the former government it was only receiving 33 percent, and I think people in Manitoba are realizing that our health services in this province have not gone backward, in fact they've gone very much forward.

I would just like to mention some of the ones that have taken place. We've made improvements to the Property Tax Credit Program; we've got more day care programs in the province; we've got a new Child Related Income Support Program coming into effect in January 1, 1981; we've got improved shelter allowance for elderly renters programs or the SAFER Program, which is welcomed by a lot of our elderly citizens; we've got the shelter allowance for family

renters program, which is supposed to take effect on January 1st, we've got the Child Related Income Support Program or CRISP; and according to the Throne Speech here we are going to be looking at recommendations from the Manitoba Council of the Aging. There's been a lot of personal care home construction go on in the province in the last couple of years and I finally see that the Member for Ste. Rose no longer comments about the one at Winnipegosis. He couldn't get it out of his own government for six years when they were in power and it is a reality in the village of Winnipegosis at the present time.

There are going to be funds for health research and I think that is always a welcome procedure by all people of Manitoba as more research is done, the more cures that are found for the ills that beset mankind. If we can make some contribution to that I fully support it.

At this time I'd like to make a few comments about the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and I'm pleased that they are going to be receiving monies for a stronger education and treatment capability, and at this time even though I don't like to give the federal government too much credit, I do support them in their program that they've been running in the Dauphin area in the last few months helping with alcoholism problems in the province. You have to give credit where credit is due.

There's going to be increased funding for the mentally retarded and that is going to be a welcome program as everyone I'm sure in Manitoba and in the Dauphin constituency is concerned about the well-being of our people that are not so fortunate within our society.

To go along with our further assistance to our needy, we're going to be taking a look at programs for our disabled persons . . . part of United Nations General Assembly proclaiming the International Year of the Disabled, and I strongly support our government in making any moves to help our disabled people. I notice one of the areas that we're going to be looking at is funds for the expansion of the rural handicapped in transportation services and that will be very welcome I'm sure to our handicapped persons.

One issue that I am very happy to see listed in the Throne Speech is that there are going to be some consideration given to changes to the Foundation Program regarding our education system, the first major revision since 1967, and I am sure that all people in Manitoba are going to welcome this revision as education costs at local level are getting a little bit out of hand, and I strongly support our government's move to make any relief efforts in that area.

There's another program that I'm going to be watching with interest and I'm sure that the people of the Dauphin constituency are going to be watching with great interest is our attention that is being paid to waste disposal programs and for more satisfactory alternates. Right now at the present time the Town of Dauphin and the RM of Dauphin have a bit of a problem trying to find another landfill site and if there's anything comes out of these new programs, I am only too sure that they will be only too pleased to accept any recommendations or help that may come out of this new waste disposal program.

Another one that I'm sure that the people of Dauphin and the Dauphin constituency are very interested in and will be very much in favour of is approval of additional funds to The Dutch Elm Disease Act. We in Dauphin are fortunate to have some of the most beautiful elms in the province located right in our Town of Dauphin, and I for one, and I'm sure the citizens of Dauphin do not want to lose any of our elms and I certainly endorse the program to try to preserve our elm trees.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problems supporting this Throne Speech and I'm sure that the majority of the people in Dauphin will have no trouble supporting this Throne Speech, and even though the members opposite are making some great grumblings, I feel certain that a good many of these programs that have been talked about are going to come into reality in the very near future and much to the disbelief of members opposite when these programs come into play, a lot of their doom and gloom predictions for Manitoba I'm sure are going to become cries of doom and gloom for the New Democratic Party across the way, and I look forward to seeing a Progressive Conservative Government in this province for many years to come with their sound economic policies.

Thank you.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, just a question if the Honourable Member for Dauphin would permit a question, if there is some time remaining in . . . Would the honourable member permit a question?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, as is customary during a Throne Speech Debate, firstly I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, although I realize you are not in your Chair your Deputy is, but I'm speaking to the Office of Speaker and not to you personally, not to the occupant of the Chair personally.

As a former holder of that office, Mr. Speaker, I do recognize the difficulties that the Speaker is from time to time faced with and that was certainly demonstrated a couple of days ago, and I think it is regrettable that it was handled in the manner in which it was, because I think that if there's any likelihood of a difference of view or opinion arising between the First Minister and the Speaker that there are more tactful and more suitable ways of resolving those differences. I can recall on many an occasion, Mr. Speaker, when a situation may have developed in the House which made it apparent to one side or the other or both sides, that the Speaker may have some difficulty in resolving the issue there and then, the usual practice was, from both the opposition and the government's side, to suggest that the Speaker take the matter under advisement. That gave him an opportunity either to consult with whomever he may wish to consult in terms of legislative staff or Rules of Order or just ponder over the issue in his own mind before making a ruling and proceeding with the business of the House. However, that, Mr. Speaker, is just another example of the

manner and the style in which this government operates.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refresh the memory of the Honourable Member for Dauphin. In fact, he may not even have been aware of this but when he spoke, and he is listening and if he is not it doesn't really matter. You know, he takes great pride in the fact in the opening of the nursing home in Winnipegosis, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that approval to proceed with the nursing home in Winnipegosis was given by our government long before this government came into office. In fact, Mr. Speaker, had the plans been proceeded with the building of the nursing home there and then would have been opened two years earlier, but it was because of the freeze by this government that construction was delayed of the home in Winnipegosis.

The Honourable Member for Dauphin also, you will recall he had expressed some concern about the return of the New Democratic Party to government, and then he concluded by saying that he doesn't think that that will happen. I would suggest to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that the next time that he goes to his home riding that he stop at Portage la Prairie at the office of the Daily Graphic, their daily newspaper, or wander over to the library over here and pick up December 12 issue of that newspaper and see for himself what the people think about this year's Throne Speech. The editor of the paper says that the speech was certainly visionary but it doesn't really offer much more than vague promises of the future. Farther on the editor continues, one suspects that Howard Pawley does not believe the future as promised by the Throne Speech holds much promise for the present situation for Manitobans. He says that it may not take much for him to convince Manitobans that the promise of Sterling Lyon in 1977 has gone unfulfilled. And why does he say that? Well, the editor goes on to say that Lyon told Manitobans that the province would do better under private initiative, that under the influence of government-directed activity — that has yet to be proved. Then, after hearing this year's Throne Speech and the announcements which had been made prior to that with respect to the St. Lazare development, with respect to the mining development in the north, the editor goes on to say that if Lyon had not been so doctrinaire in his belief about the ability of the private sector to stimulate the economy on its own, Manitobans might not now be so sceptical of the government finally going out to give the economy a little shove.

Because you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the attitude expressed by this government toward government — What is the expression that they use? — government intrusion. Right from Day One, or practically from Day One, because there was that brief session in November or in December rather of '77, but on March 16th of 1978 the government in the Throne Speech said, "My government has reaffirmed its belief in the fundamental importance of a strong and competitive private sector". And then they said, "My government is confident that market forces will operate and should be allowed to operate to keep price and compensation increases at levels which will not effect inflationary pressures." In other words, a market place will take care of it all. You needn't

worry. There's no need for government intrusion of any kind. Then he concluded that year's speech, this is in '78, "My Ministers inform that they are pursuing policies to encourage greater participation by prospectors in the mining industry, the exploration and development of Manitoba's mineral resources, and to decrease direct government involvement in that activity." You know, that happened immediately after the government took office, and that happened. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the following year, whoever wrote the speech from the Throne, I suspect that in 1979 it was written by the First Minister, I think that one was written by the First Minister, because, and I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, one-quarter of the eight page speech makes reference to government intrusion. It became a sort of an obsession with the First Minister, on every page is reference to government intrusion, and the action that this government is going to take to wipe out government intrusion. You know, starting on page 2, "The commitment to ensure protection for the citizen of a traditional freedoms of choice in economic, cultural and social concerns, stimulate economic growth through the private sector, not through any government involvement, has provided a solid base" — Oh no — "My government's actions over the past year to reverse the negative impact of government intrusions in the economy." Page after page, on this one page every paragraph talks about government intrusion, "the removal of government regulation and red tape, regulatory burdens on private citizens and on business". Again intended to stimulate development to private sectors. "Reduce the demands of the provincial public sector on the people." And then a couple of pages later, "improve the climate for mining investment by the removal of government intrusion, stimulate changes to exploration and production on freehold land by the removal of government intrusion." The First Minister couldn't move along for any more than one or two paragraphs without flogging the government intrusion issue all through the speech.

In 1980, Mr. Speaker, His Honour in reading the Throne Speech told us that government intrusions into the ownership of business enterprises and of farmland throughout Manitoba have largely ceased. Amen. The one line, the one line and just a passing reference to government intrusions, somewhere later on in that speech.

Mr. Speaker, you would have assumed well, okay, that's the Tory philosophy. Their philosophy is to allow the private sector to operate with no government interference or intrusion. So okay, that's the platform that the First Minister and his candidates ran on, got elected, and they're trying to hang on to power, adhering to that philosophy.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on Thursday, 11 December, 1980, we assembled here at 2:30 and we heard, by the time His Honour got to the second page, telling us the following: "My Ministers do not believe that government can afford to stand back as though what happens in the economy were not its concern. The private sector will continue to be the prime engine of economic growth in Manitoba, but within our mixed economy government has a variety of roles to play in encouraging development and in ensuring that developments which do take place serve the

interests of the people of Manitoba." — (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, and what about this business about government intrusion. You know, Mr. Speaker, there's practically a half a page, on page two, devoted to government involvement in the economic sector. "Accordingly my government will play an active and flexible role within the economy to compliment and support the activities of the private sector in the interests of all Manitobans. My Ministers are currently involved in a number of important negotiations to diversify and strengthen our economy", and then makes reference to the mining sector, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and International Minerals and Chemical Corporation, St. Lazare.

Mr. Speaker, how in the world does the position stated by the government in this year's Throne Speech square with everything which they had said over the previous three years. For three years they were preaching no government intrusion. We are going to plow through all legislation with a fine-toothed comb and we are going to weed out and pluck out every bit of government intrusion, and then last year they said we did it. And now flip flop or like a yo-yo, now they've reversed their position and now they say, now they reverse their position, and now they say, oh yes, but there has to be government intrusion. The Minister of Finance — where is he today? He's intruding. He's telling the federal government, the federal government must intrude and peg the interest rate. Now what happened? Do you remember when you said that the marketplace can take care of that? Did you forget that? You said the marketplace can take care of interest rates, the marketplace can take care of it. Now the Minister is trotting off, and I presume with the First Minister, to make his case stronger, to tell a government to intrude.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why this government is going to be defeated. That's where this government has lost its credibility — flip flopping; taking one position for the first three years and then saying, hey, there's an election around the corner, maybe we have got to be all things to all people. Now they are saying, look, we are not all that bad; there's potash in the ground at St. Lazare; there's mineral ore in the north; and sure we want all the people to benefit from this, we will participate with you, we will assume a 25 percent equity. Somebody asked, will I vote against that? That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker, but the issue is that this government for three years has been preaching the removal of government intrusion and now they are marching right back in. (Interjection)— Well, where the hell do you stand? Where do you stand? I would want to hear the Honourable Member for River Heights stand up and tell us where he stands. Does he stand with the author of the previous three speeches from the Throne or does he stand with the author of this one, because I don't believe the First Minister wrote this year's speech. It can't be. Maybe it was the Minister of Economic Development who is running scared, maybe he's turning socialist and wrote those paragraphs. That's right. I find that very very difficult to comprehend, to see the Honourable Minister of Economic — (Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Elmwood says it's only the colour of his face that's turning socialist.

Mr. Speaker, in that half paragraph on page two of this year's Throne Speech debate is the kiss of death to this government, because while they were preaching the removal of government intrusion, I suppose there are those people in Manitoba who also think that way, so they said that in 1977, 1978, and 1979, and 10 months ago in February of 1980, and then they come back now and they say, oh, no, no, there has got to be some government involvement here. We just can't sit back and let the private sector do its own thing. They have completely forgotten what they have been preaching for three years.

It will also be interesting to know not only who wrote the Throne Speech, but why this change. If this was a decision of caucus that you must change your philosophy, why did you change your philosophy? Now what about what you've been saying for the previous three years? Do you still endorse what you said in 1977, 1978, and 1979 when you came into this House? If you do, then, Mr. Speaker, I would expect the Honourable Minister, if he has not spoken yet, to stand up in this House and explain to us how the position on government intrusion, expressed by it in the previous Throne Speeches, squares, meshes, dovetails, with the position stated by government in this year's Throne Speech, because, Mr. Speaker, they are diametrically opposed to each other. When the Honourable Member for River Heights keeps yakking from his seat, where do we stand? He knows where we stand on resource development in Manitoba. But I repeat to him again, I want to know where he stands and how he supports the front bench on flip flopping from the position expressed three years ago to the position this year on government involvement in resource development. I hope that he will explain that and how he feels that this position expressed this year squares with that expressed by the government the previous three years.

Mr. Speaker, the other matter of concern, and you will recall what the editor of the Portage newspaper said that the vague promises of the future, and we heard — (Interjection)— Vague promises, huh, Mr. Speaker, now lets listen. The Honourable Minister of Highways says those are commitments . . .

**MR. DOERN:** He's not the Minister of Highways.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** That's right, he's the Minister of what?

**MR. DOERN:** Government Services.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Government Services, sorry . . . Now, let's listen to these commitments, Mr. Speaker. "My Ministers also informed me that they are examining ways to meet the need." There's a commitment. "My Ministers have been involved in negotiations." There's another commitment. "My Ministers are optimistic that an agreement to that end can be reached." Now there's a real hard definite commitment, etched in stone that's surely to materialize some day.

Here's another commitment, Mr. Speaker, listen to this one. "My Ministers will be monitoring the effects." There's another commitment. There are more commitments in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. "My Ministers will continue to work to

stimulate commercial research and development in Manitoba", and, oh, "My Ministers have authorized a review." There's another commitment. And then His Honour speaking on behalf of the government had to say — now listen to these definite, precise, commitments. Boy, when we hear these commitments we'll know exactly what the government is going to do — "Additional developments are anticipated in the coming year." There's a real commitment. There's a promise to the people of Manitoba for a plan of action.

Now listen to this one, Mr. Speaker. "My Ministers will continue to examine other ways of responding to the needs of the small business." There's another good commitment. Oh, and they are going to hold discussions with respect to the feasibility of . . . Now there's another commitment. They intend, ah yes, now with respect — here's a commitment to the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. They made a commitment that they intend to enter into agreements with the federal government and the City of Winnipeg to initiate a combination of major projects and programs and then it goes on to briefly describe them, in the inner city. But, now, they wrote that, and they figure well gee, maybe, this might be a little too concrete, so they figure they have to give themselves a loophole to get out of this, so then they go on to say to the people of Manitoba: But look folks don't hold your breath because "My government is deeply concerned that the federal government may reduce its participation in the cost sharing programs that are so critical to our health care, education, police, and community services in Manitoba." In other words, they are saying, look, we intend to enter into agreements but those damn feds over there, they didn't deliver, they didn't come across with the money that we thought they'd get, so sorry City of Winnipeg we can't help you, we can't help you, blame Mr. Trudeau. "My government is negotiating a new northern development agreement." Normally, I suppose, when one says I'm negotiating an agreement, one assumes that the details have been sort of agreed on and it's just a matter of finalizing the formalities of it. But in their language, "is negotiating", could still be 50 miles from finalization. The agreement may come into being, it may not, if you compare what has been promised in previous Throne Speeches and what has been delivered and the difference between the two.

Speaking of promises, Mr. Speaker, some honourable members if they check their last year's files may be able to come across the journals dated Thursday, February 21st, 1980. To refresh honourable members' memories, that was the day of the opening of the Fourth Session of the 31st Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. There were certain promises made and there were promises made and then I compared it with this year's Throne Speech to see what happened to them, because a Throne Speech really consists of two parts. In a sense it's a brief overall review of the government's performance for the previous year and an indication of what the government is going to present on its platter for the Legislature's consideration for the forthcoming session. That is what they are all about.

Last year, the government said the economy of Manitoba is expected to grow at a rate generally above the national average but, Mr. Speaker, the

government knows that this didn't happen and I would like to hear an explanation from the government. Then the government said, oh, in summary, the first stages of the recovery which my government began during its first months in office have now been largely completed and are beginning to bear fruit. Let's see that bountiful harvest — (Interjection)— yes, the gasohol plant, that every member on that side of the House has talked about. Oh, a million bushels of grain. Mr. Speaker, a million bushels. Number one, it hasn't produced a gallon. Mr. Speaker, number two, you figure out how many acres of land do you need to produce one million bushels of grain. (Interjection)— A couple . . . Listen to the Minister of Agriculture, there he goes again. There he goes again. You know, the expert in the operation of peanut stands, he and his First Minister, and it's going to be back to the peanut — oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, those are the First Minister's words. You have heard the First Minister say many a time when speaking to us that we can't run a peanut stand. Mr. Speaker, I'll be the first to admit I don't know how to run a peanut stand; I have never run one. Everybody on this side has been involved in running more responsible operations than peanut stands. But the First Minister seems to know how to run one, so I take it that he's an expert at the operation of one. I take it that's probably what he must have done for a living, is operated a little peanut stand. He says that in running peanut stands, at being good breeders, are experts but even their breeding capacity has not offset the population exodus from the province because the population is declining. (Interjection)— Well, there is one member in the backbench who feels he's made his contribution but obviously not too successfully or not adequately.

Where is the answer or some comment on this commitment and I'm using the words of the Honourable Minister of Government Services that a Throne Speech is made up of commitments. All right. So last year the government made a commitment to assure that Manitoba does benefit to the greatest extent possible from the growing economies to our west by government will be undertaking a greatly expanded marketing effort in western Canada. There was not a word mentioned about this in this year's Throne Speech. (Interjection)— Perhaps, perhaps before the debate ends, the Honourable Minister of Economic Development will respond to this and indicate to us what expanded marketing effort had occurred in western Canada. I hope that he would also —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, don't pay any attention to him. I don't, so it doesn't bother me at all. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the reference to the development of the Mexican market last year and you will recall the speeches that the Minister made about his trip to a Mexican market to sell jumping beans or buy jumping beans or whatever, but in this year's Throne Speech we don't hear about the Mexican market. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I will agree that these are probably relatively speaking minor developments.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the three years that this government has been in office, in every Throne Speech they made it a point to stress and highlight the need to develop a tourist industry in Manitoba. In fact, looking at one of the Throne Speeches I



suspect that the Minister responsible for Tourism had a pretty fair input into writing that portion of a Throne Speech, and this started right from Day One, the first year. But the first year it was sort of an afterthought, the third last paragraph. I guess, well, at that time it was the present Minister of Fitness and Sport who was the Tourism Minister and I suppose he didn't have as much influence in Cabinet. So he wasn't able to get his two cents worth until the last stage and he said, "But Mr. Premier, what about tourism?" The Premier said, "Yes, okay, we'll put this in about tourism that we're negotiating an agreement with the federal department of Regional and Economic Expansion which will enable Tourism and Recreation developments to be eligible for DREE funding. If achieved, this will have the result of making more capital available and of providing more employment opportunities in our expanding service sector." —(Interjection)— More welfare money, and I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations with DREE did not commence with this government but had commenced with our government with respect to the funding of our . . .

Then the following year in February of 1979, now the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has forgotten what year he was elected government. That doesn't surprise me. There are many things he forgets. They're all the promises, the commitments that this government made last year which they have forgotten this year so therefore it doesn't surprise me to have forgotten when they were elected.

In February of '79; there may have been a change of Ministers at that time, I think there was, and that Minister had more influence on the writer of the Throne Speech and there is reference to Tourism in several areas and the major one of course was, "My Minister has proposed to announce a new policy governing the sale of Crown lands, which shall have the effect of expanding the private ownership of family farm land and accessed recreational land," and there of course tied in with that, goes Tourism hand in hand.

"My Ministers, yes, report that they have been successful in negotiating a federal-provincial tourism development agreement. The agreement is intended to provide programs as a stimulus to investment in an important sector of our economy which provides employment for a large number of Manitobans." Mr. Speaker, this was said two years ago that this was going to create all these jobs in a tourism industry and were the hell are they? And where are they, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. ENNS:** After that said promise was made we set the all-time tourist record for any year year in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** And then, Mr. Speaker, the following year, as members will know, the responsibility for that important industry has been placed in the Department of Economic Development and in 1979 the funding of the province's tourist market effort was expanded. Oh yes, as well as continuing that higher level of financial support, — (Interjection)— this is 1980. For tourism marketing, my Ministers inform me that through the enhanced programs of support to small businesses, they will be providing additional management and other help to smaller tourist operators in the coming year. In

addition through the expansion of highway transportation to communities when this Minister was responsible, you know, the one who's doing all the heckling for Highways —(Interjection)— throughout the province, my government believes it can permit more communities to benefit from that important industry. This was one year ago, Mr. Speaker, all these commitments to develop the tourism industry, recognizing that tourism is one of the prime industries of the province.

And do you know what this year's Throne Speech says about the tourism industry? Absolutely nothing. There isn't one word about the tourism industry, Mr. Speaker, and you know why, because this government has nothing to say about the tourism industry. Because nothing happened. Because it's an embarrassment of this government. They made a commitment, they did not honour the commitment, Mr. Speaker. When the Honourable Minister speaks of making commitments, I wish the hell he'd check the dictionary to find out what the word commitment means, because then he will find that he did not do that.

Now, what were some of the other commitments? The tourist office in Mexico City, no, no, I think it was an economic development embassy or something that they set up . . . trade commissioner.

Now then, another commitment according to the Minister of Government Services, you'll be asked to approve increases for initiatives and curriculum and professional development in education. And not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, you will recall hearing complaints from the teachers that the level of support through the Department of Education for the conduct of in-service training sessions for them is decreasing, and that the teachers are expected to do much of this work on their own, dig up all the expertise and do all the research and so forth and pay for it on their own. So where is the commitment to approve increases for initiatives in curriculum and professional development. Ah, my government is appointing the Manitoba Council on Aging. To this day that council's not been appointed. Now they'd better hurry, Mr. Speaker, because of the few friends that those people have on that side. If they don't rush, they'll be gone. They'll be gone. I hope that the Attorney-General will respond.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the honourable member will respond because last year, and I hope he was aware of this commitment having been made in the Throne Speech on his behalf, that during the Session my Ministers will establish an Attorney-General's advisory committee on crime prevention and control to review existing legislation, to recommend new programs in that field. There was no mention of it in the Throne Speech. Has that committee been appointed? What has it done? Will the Minister table a report, at least a progress report to indicate to us what it has done?

Then, another commitment about which this year's Throne Speech is silent. "In order to permit as many retarded people to live as fully and independently as possible my government will ask you to approve funds for the development of new community

residences for retarded as well as workshops." How many? Where, Mr. Speaker? We haven't heard of any. Nor has the Throne Speech made any reference to that. Or the commitment to "approve funds for similar expansions in the facilities available to mentally ill people in the community." No mention of that, Mr. Speaker. Or, you'll be asked to "approve funding for the first stages of a long term program of providing flood protection to towns and villages with a history of significant flooding." Is that program being proceeded with? Perhaps the Member for Minnedosa would want to check with his colleagues, the front bench, whether this is being proceeded with. Or perhaps the Honourable Member for Emerson to whom this would of a particular concern and interest. He would want to check whether this commitment is being honoured, because there's no reference to it in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, one could go through last year's Throne Speech paragraph by paragraph and in practically every one find in the words of the Minister, "commitments", commitments upon which the government is silent on in this year's Throne Speech.

So I would hope that during the few days remaining for the debate of the Speech from the Throne that honourable members from the government side will stand in their place and support the Minister of Government Services and say, yes, we made those commitments last year and each and every one of those commitments were honoured and indicate to the House the manner in which they were honoured because I'm sure that the backbenchers wouldn't want to make a liar of their colleague, a Cabinet Minister in the front bench. He said these were commitments. So I would hope that the backbenchers would back him up and say, yes, our Minister is right. He made those commitments and here is the proof of them. There are a number in the back bench who have not spoken yet. There are some Ministers who haven't spoken and they should know even better because they are party to the decision-making process. So I hope that they would support the Honourable Minister and indicate that yes, we made those commitments and we honoured them because, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of that there is no evidence of many of those commitments having been honoured.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The previous speeches I must say throughout the start of this Session and this particular Throne Speech have been exhilarating, particularly this afternoon. It prompted me to rise at this time to once again participate in a Throne Speech. They're beginning to be that many that I wish to not keep track of them, but let me express my congratulations to you, Sir, and to the officers of the Assembly in once again accepting the responsibility in the carrying out of their duties in this Chamber. I know, Sir, that you will, as you've always received, my utter and complete co-operation at all times. I extend that to you. It seems to me that I make this commitment, we're speaking about commitments, it seems to me I make this commitment to you usually at this time

virtually on every start of every session, and you, Sir, know that I keep my commitments.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but feel as a member of the government, as a member of this government, but enthused by the kind of enthusiastic support that members on this side of the House have shown as they've risen in their places to speak on this Throne Speech. That must come as a bit of a shock to honourable members opposite. And of course it has a bit of a redeeming feature for us too, because we tend to sometimes get a little depressed about the situation. I'm sure that you fellows in your little caucuses, in your little meetings, you just about have yourself convinced that you are making some groundway, you are making some headway in your quest to move those — separate these 30 feet and come to this side of the House, but it must be a bit of a shocker, a bit of political culture shock to you when you face us with the obvious enthusiasm that was expressed by the Member for Minnedosa who moved the speech, and by the Member for Springfield who seconded the speech, and by every member that has risen on this side of the House to speak on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we sometimes have to, and I'm not going to engage in media bashing as I have sometimes done in the past, but, Mr. Speaker, it is disconcerting when a one-man accounting firm goes bankrupt in Minnedosa, and the Member for Minnedosa hasn't been able to find that firm yet. I think maybe it was a firm that was registered in 1948 and lay dormant for a number of years, and finally somebody wrote it off the book, but when that makes front page news of our one and only daily newspaper, then obviously there is some reason for recognizing that we have a bit of a media problem. There's a little hostility out there.

There is a one-man cabby firm, with this one cabby, went broke in Neepawa. The truth of the matter is he drove off Provincial Road 346 and smashed his cab, he wanted to get out of the business anyway, and Autopac wrote off the whole cab, but that made the front page of the Free Press as part of the stats of this province going to doom and gloom in a handbasket.

Mr. Speaker, these fellows sit back and they read these headlines, and they get enthused. They think, my God, they've got us on the ropes. We're sliding, and then when they have to face us face to face, when they have to stand up to us and they realize that the kind of message that you've been hearing here in the last few days, the kind of message the Minister of Agriculture is capable of giving in this Chamber, you must wonder about the effectiveness of those kind of messages as we travel throughout Manitoba.

I don't have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, because we have been travelling through Manitoba in Cabinet tours; as individual Ministers; we have travelled through the north, we have travelled through the northwest, we have travelled through the southwest. We will continue travelling — we have travelled to the southeast, and, Mr. Speaker, the message is loud and clear, that leaves us with nothing but resolve to carry on in the way we have operated the affairs of the people of Manitoba in the past three years with the quiet satisfaction that they will prove to be very acceptable indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the other evening the Member for St. Johns was delivering, and I have a considerable amount of respect for the Honourable Member for St. Johns, who after all was in this Chamber prior to my coming here in 1966. It's always rather sad, I suppose, when you hear of a member of long standing in this House in effect deliver his political obituary as he did the other evening when he entered into the Throne Speech debate. Now, I am not going to comment about his speech and his comments. What I want to comment about is the plight and the difficulty that the New Democratic Party is facing when people like the Honourable Member for St. Johns is bailing out; when the Member for Inkster, obviously not only is sitting Independent and not showing any signs of any healing of the wounds on that side, is sitting as an Independent and making his mark, Sir. Mr. Speaker, these fellows think that they are going to take us on in the next election]

Mr. Speaker, I will relate to you a little bit of history which I was personally well aware of too and it goes back to the 1969 election, which has been referred to by, I believe, the Member for Inkster. What is sometimes forgotten in that election — that election by the way was after a government had been in power for some 10 years — I'm talking a Conservative administration had been in power for some 10 years, faced with some of its share of difficulties that were current of the day such as the difficult question of South Indian Lake and the Hydro developments, and on top of it, with a third of the senior members of that Cabinet choosing not to run, including my current leader who was then the Attorney-General; the then Minister of Education, the Honourable George Johnston as he was then known; and the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Thelma Forbes. That is three people, three senior persons chose at that time for their own reasons to retire from politics. I can tell you, I can attest that had a very serious sobering effect on our ability to win that election. We didn't win that election, we lost that election. I am not attributing that much to that, I am saying that's part of it.

I just want to relate that little bit of history to you, and what you are doing to your leader. As your experienced veteran staff, people, legislators like the Member for St. Johns, is not going to be counselling and running with your party when next we meet at election time, you are not going to have the capable mind and eloquent debating in the style of the Honourable Member for Inkster on your side, and you fellows seriously think that you can take that into stride, and paper over the obvious difficulties that are in that caucus. They believe that they can tie one or two hands behind their backs and take this aggressive and positive group on. You have to be kidding.

Mr. Speaker, it has a certain soothing reassurance for us too, to be assembled again; to be able to look our enemy at close quarters and see the difficulties that they are in, and that gives us a great deal of encouragement to carry on knowing that we have to do so responsibly because we will be the next government for the next four or five years, and we will therefore have to be responsible for those actions that we take, those commitments that we make, and we have every intention of carrying out

and of course we have every intention of being around to bear some of the credits when some of the major changes, developments that are taking place in the province that are now so close to reality, will in fact be in place and will provide the kind of growth, the kind of climate, the kind of development, the kind of job creation that all of us want in this province.

Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made and I think it should be made by every member, certainly on this side of the House that rises to speak, about the growing support that our government and our Premier in particular is getting in that portion which rated number one in the position in the Throne Speech; his position; the position of this government on the very difficult constitutional question this country faces.

Mr. Speaker, let me be prophetic, because the New Democrats across this country, the New Democrats in Ottawa are going to squirm and wonder how can they extricate themselves out of that very fast convenient political bed they jumped into with Mr. Trudeau, because the polls are now already showing that was maybe a hasty act, one that you really didn't believe in anyway. Certainly the man with any intellectual capacity, intellectual integrity — your Member for Inkster recognizes that the New Democratic Party's position provincially and nationally is not in keeping with your general position. It was political expediency that thought because the issue seemed to be so one-sided, which we recognized, which our national leader Joe Clark recognized the evening that he took the position opposed to it, which my Premier recognized from day one, that it was not a popular issue. In fact, we were prepared to persist on that position, as we are, without any change in the polls. One of the gratifying things is that obviously, not just himself, but other leaders, other Attorneys-General, as the situation gets stickier and stickier, more and more people are coming to realize that what Mr. Trudeau is doing is wrong, and what the New Democrats are doing . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.