

Time: 2:30 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before lunch I had been indicating that this government was perpetrating a shell game on the people of Manitoba, and I was indicating that there was no real feeling for the human benefit. All they were interested in was creating a balanced budget on paper, irrespective of how it affected Manitobans. And I had been discussing the educational aspects in respect to the fact tuition fees had risen, that costs to people who were interested in a higher education were rising, and that they were the ones who could least afford it, since many of them were in the non-earning bracket even though they were adults.

And I opened up today's Tribune and right there on the front page, in the left-hand corner, very prominent, it says: "Fee rise, cutbacks foreseen at U of M, University of Manitoba". And the article is by Carol Picard of the Tribune, Education Reporter. And the first paragraph says: "University of Manitoba tuition fees will increase about eight percent this year and program cuts are inevitable because of inadequate provincial funding, university president Ralph Campbell said Thursday". He said: "This is not a threat, it's a prediction of what things are going to be. We are on the brink of it right now." And that just further buttresses my point that this government says one thing and really does another; the old shell game. It doesn't commit itself to anything, it just gives a cosmetic appearance of doing something.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the only department that carries on that way. You can take a look at Urban and Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Attorney-General hides behind the fact that he's got block funding, and that is supposed to give them some self-government or some home rule. But I recall when he was on the Council, he was one of those who was indicating that there should be some form of growth taxes provided to the City Council. Today he has changed his tune; it's just block funding, no more growth taxes. Now, maybe he'll look at it in the future, but at the present time the block funding is inadequate. It has created higher taxes at the municipal level. It is creating transit cutbacks, higher transit fares.

And the other day he was asked the question, what about the DASH bus, and he said, oh, that's the city's problem. But he's the one who is creating the problem, not the city. The city has no other resources except that which it can collect on property taxes, which are not a very fair form of taxation, and that which it can receive from the province who created the city. And so therefore, he has to accept the responsibility that when there are cutbacks at the municipal level, he is part and parcel of that problem. His government has done nothing towards the property tax credit increase which is necessary because the cost of living has been continually rising. That property tax credit increase would help those who are living on fixed and low incomes. It was a form of transfer payment. This government has no heart for those people at the bottom of the economic ladder. Yes, its prepared to make tax adjustments on those who are going to get a windfall in the estate field of half-a-million dollars or more. But for the ordinary citizen at the lower level, there is no relief, not from this government.

In the health care field, the same thing applies. Mr. Speaker, this government is prepared to negotiate and say it has got to raise the fees for the doctors. They have raised it by some 22 percent for the next negotiated term. What other group of people in Manitoba did they raise it 22 percent for an equal term? Did they do it with the civil servants? I know they haven't. Have they recommended for anybody else an increase of that size? No they haven't. But what they have done, they have cut back the grants that are necessary in this field. They have increased the deductible for pharmacare, again hitting those people who have the least resources with which to fight this government, except at the ballot box. And, I think that they will find out about that at the next election. They have cut back on denticare to a degree. There are a number of areas where they have done that, Mr. Speaker.

In the health care field, for instance, there was an article just recently in the Letters to the Editor, and this gentleman elucidated quite well the number of areas where they have cut back. They have cut back 100 staff in the Manitoba Mental Hospital in the areas of housekeeping, dietary maintenance and aides. Not per, se but by refusing the adequate grants that have been necessary because of the cost of living and because of inflation. One hundred staff positions eliminated in community and personal care services; budgets for the three Winnipeg Community Health Clinics frozen; Gladstone Community Health Clinic cut by \$60,000 - I wonder what the Member for Gladstone thinks about that - the Churchill Clinic cut by \$100,000; provisions for Home Care Services for Elderly cut from 700 people to less than 600 people; subsidization of elderly slashed from \$2.2 million to \$550,000; 1,770 taken off programs of health service assistance to elderly. Mr. Speaker, these are all humane services that this government, with its approach to government, which it follows blindly, has denied service to Manitobans. Health care bed closures; hot lunch and nutritional programs. --(Interjection)-- When I am done the honourable minister can have his question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health with a point of order.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order and a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The report and the accusations that the Member for Kildonan is recounting are utterly and totally without foundation, and have been repudiated by me factually in letters to those publications, such as the CUPE publication, which have carried them.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, as usual the honourable minister didn't have a point of order.

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

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just repeat. The honourable minister only had an opinion; he didn't have a point of order, and that is debatable. I would suggest that my facts are just as correct as yours. This person is involved in the health care field. He supervises many many people who are working at the level of health care where it's delivered, not at the administrative level like the Minister, who is half the time not aware of everything that is going on at the administrative level and at the health care services level.

Much as I appreciate the fact that he is trying hard, I also have to admit, and he has to admit, that he cannot be aware of everything that is going on. The people at the bottom of the ladder who are working the field are more aware of where denial of service is occurring than he is, because his administrators, many of them, although well-intentioned, have to justify their jobs and cannot indicate everything that is going wrong. They must put a good front up. That is what is occurring.

Anyway, we can leave that, and we can say this: "Concordia says facility plugged". Again a large headline, Mr. Speaker. And it's been indicated that hospital staff and administrators complained about the overcrowding last summer to the Health Minister. And it's been admitted that Concordia's problem, and that the hospital needs another 160 beds for fundamental primary care by Dr. Krahn - this also has been admitted. But Dr. Krahn says, "But they could not give us any commitment" - and that is going on continually, Mr. Speaker. There is a lot of sham, a lot of shell game, but when you lift up the shell there is never any substance or essence there. And that is what is happening continually.

Let us switch to another field. The Honourable Minister of Labor has left, but I would like to say that he, too, provides us with a shell game. In the Throne Speech, the government has indicated that they are going to do something about industrial processing strategy for Manitoba in conjunction with the agricultural development that is supposed to also take place in Manitoba. Now, I am sure that our farmers will do their utmost to keep Manitoba's economy going strong, in spite of that government.

But what is also occurring, Mr. Speaker, is that we've had the opportunity - this government has had it - to do something about industrial processing. Swift's closed. What did this government do? They sat on their hands and said, we can't do anything else except be present at the funeral of those people who lost their jobs. --(Interjections)-- I see I'm getting to them. They're starting to squeak and squawk.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the same packing house industry. I know that many of those people - I know a lot of them personally - haven't got jobs and they are not going to get jobs for a long

Friday, 29 February, 1980

time through the efforts of this government. Because this government is not capable of providing human services. It doesn't try. All it wants to do is balance its books.

Let us go to a little other area of the Labor Department. The Workplace, Safety and Health Act. You know, what happened? This government sat on its hands when it first came. The Act was there, a director was there, everything was prepared to go when the change of government took place. But no, this government put a freeze, a restraint, on it and nothing occurred for over six months. Then eventually they got started that they were going to do something about it. But to date there has been no real development.

But another facet of that kind of attitude is the fact that this government, as soon as it came into office, contravened one of the acts of this Legislature and then had to backtrack in respect to The Power Engineers Act and give an exemption. First of all they were going to stop prosecutions which were already in process but then they changed their minds because they realized they were getting into a real can of worms.

But ever since then, Mr. Speaker, they have been carrying on in this fashion and this is an unfair way of operating. All other industries have to comply with the Act and have qualified engineers to operate their plants. These two plants, who have a fairly poor track record down in the United States, especially Hooker, where it's being, I believe, sued by a number of citizens in an area where they have polluted the total environment of a community and where they want to accept no responsibility. These companies are operating and saving themselves money by not having to pay for qualified engineers. The Minister says he is prepared to take that onus in respect to safety. But that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. There are other individual companies in this province who have to adhere to the letter of the law and have to pay the higher wages. That's an unfair competition he is providing through the exemption he has placed on those companies.

Further, he says they have engineering staff. Well, I would concur with him and I have a great respect for some of the engineers at Hooker and at Simplot. But the fact is that if they are engineers, qualified professional engineers, then they should be able to write a Manitoba Power Engineers Act and qualify to run that plant. And if they can't write it, then they are not qualified in spite of the fact that they've got an engineer's title. And that's what is wrong with the exemption that the Honourable Minister of Labor provides. An electrical engineer is not a mechanical engineer. A chemical engineer is not a mechanical engineer. Whether they know the difference or not is beside the point. What is important is that they are not qualified as power engineers or to do the job of supervising power engineers. And that's why I say, again the shell game; one thing for some and another thing for others but never the right thing. So that is part of the shell game that is going on, Mr. Speaker.

It was mentioned before that we have created through this government a number of Commissions of Inquiry; we bring them in and we take them out. That's part of the shell game. The Member for Inkster mentions the Spivak Task Force, he mentioned the Burns Commission, I think there is an inquiry into the liquor sales; half a dozen of these things are going on. All of these things are going on. All of these things are part of the shell game. They are really indicating that this government has no intention of doing something on its own. It hasn't got the courage to put itself on the line and say we will do this or we will do that. You must have someone else fronting for them, flying a kite, creating a scam, so that they won't have to accept the responsibility. And I think the people of Manitoba are on to that. Let me indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest thing they have perpetrated on the people of Manitoba is the hoax of the hydro rate freeze. I don't hear a peep from them because they know it's so. You know why, Mr. Speaker, simply because what they have done is something that they have no reason to take credit for. It takes five to six years to produce hydro energy from the plans, to the construction, to everything else. When they came into office all of that was there in place and it became operable within a short period time when they were in office. And so, consequently, they can't take credit for that. Freezing the rates at that time was the result of the previous government's planning and previous government's organizing.

Let me go a step further, Mr. Speaker. Let me indicate to you why else this is a scam, because the transfer of the difference in respect to the money exchange rate to the Consolidated Fund, which all Manitobans will have to pay, is part of the scam, because they are exporting energy to other provinces and to the south and that cost is not reflected in the rate that is being created for the export of that energy. So again, it's a part of the shell game of now you see it, now you don't and it's treating the people of Manitoba unfairly.

Mr. Speaker, there are many areas where this government has just got no heart in respect to the ordinary Manitobans. Consumer Affairs, the number of times the Minister of

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Consumer Affairs has been asked to conduct studies, research into the rising cost of living, he has had no part of it. He wants no part of it, he is going to leave it all to private enterprise, irrespective of the fact that every so often we get indications where the profits of some of the corporations, including the supermarkets, are going up continually. Prices are going up but the ordinary fellow citizen cannot get the same kind of wage increase.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect to the computerization of pricing at the supermarket level, I think that this is a dangerous thing. I believe that it's a major concern to many citizens because it will eliminate comparison shopping. You will not be able to compare one price versus another on the shelf. You will have to carry a code along trying to decipher it, and that is just beyond most people's ability.

They also have indicated that they are going to have an inquiry into the sale of liquor in private stores. Now, I think that, too, is a dangerous thing. I think that it will connote higher prices because if the private entrepreneurs are going to be involved in it they will have to have a profit margin and probably one that is not controlled, so therefore it would be greater.

Secondly, I believe that there will be less revenue for the government and, consequently, it will probably serve their purpose of not having to grant money here or there where it is essential, but at least it will give them a weak or a lame excuse for not spending in some areas where it is essential.

And, of course, taking liquor into the private sector there will be less control of minors who wish to purchase liquor, whether they are entitled to it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a long time comparing the things that they say and the things that they do and the things that really effect Manitobans. But I think it is sufficient to say that all they have been doing to date is they scam, all they have been doing to date is the shell game, pretending there is something under the shell when, in essence, there really isn't. The substance has been palmed and the shell game has gone on. —(Interjection)— Yes I do, I am totally aware of it. The Member for Minnedosa, probably with his fluency in PR work is one of those who is helping to create this shell game, this sham.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, what this indicates is that there is a deterioration of quality in our life in Manitoba. The person the street knows the quality of this provincial government and he knows also the quality of his life is deterioration. Just stand on the street, surrounded by the for sale signs, and every day you see it one way or another. The other day there was a TV program in respect to the number of foreclosures; they are getting greater and greater every year since this government took over. Now, I am not going to attribute all of it just to this government but they are creating part of the climate as it exists. And, let me say that this tale of woe is inevitable as long as this government is going to stay in office; and fortunately for Manitobans, who are catching on to the shell game, I am confident that they are not going to be in office very long. I can just say this to the First Minister who is absent from his chair that there is going to be a loud and collective voice come the time when he has the courage to call the election and it is going to say, we don't want to stand and watch your shell game any more; you and your colleagues are carnies but you're not professional enough at it, we've seen through your shell game; the public is fully wise to your game and they will not continue to be taken in any more.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again, my compliments to you and congratulations for taking over the leadership of this House; and I know that your job is very very tough at times but you have shown, over the past three years, that you are very capable of handling it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to congratulate the new members that have come into the House; the Member for River Heights who is no question that in time, after hearing his speech, moving of the Speech from the Throne, has proven that by that speech he will be a credit this Legislature and to his constituency. My congratulations to the Lady from Fort Rouge. I have no doubt that she and I will have some discussion about grocery stores and different things of that nature from time to time, but I would like to say to the lady from Fort Rouge, or the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that she mentioned the SAFER Program being a program that was suggested by the Liberal Party. You know, in the middle of 1978, Mr. Speaker, I sent two people to Vancouver to look over the B.C. SAFER Program that was then in B.C. We examined it closely and in 1979 during my Estimates, when the

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Member for Fort Rouge was sitting there, I happened to mention that this was a possibility and something that was being looked at in the Province of Manitoba to benefit senior citizens in Manitoba, and when we got it all ironed out we would certainly try to put it into practice. It wasn't more than about a month later we had a resolution from the Liberal Party saying that we should have it put in immediately. Well, the resolution had much more than the SAFER Program and we weren't prepared to go that far at the present time.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I know I have the sympathy of the members of the NDP Party because there is no question, no question, that they are very very used to having the Liberal Party steal all their programs. That has been said by the leader of the NDP Party federally and there is no question about it that that is what happens federally. The Liberal Party does steal the NDP policies, unfortunately, but I know I have the sympathy of the NDP members in that case.

Mr. Speaker, I can only compliment the Honourable Member for Rossmere. He put up a grim battle, and a real battle, as much as I congratulate him and welcome him to this Legislature, I can say that I don't think that he will have a very long stay. There is no question that in the next election in Rossmere I am sure the Conservatives will overcome that small majority that we have.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of debate so far over numbers. Manitoba's numbers from Statistics Canada, Manitoba's numbers from the Conference Board. There has been, to my mind, too little discussion in the debate of real substance, too little discussion about the facts, the actual efforts being put forward by the Province of Manitoba and the government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba to develop economic development in this province.

Mr. Speaker, you are, as well, well aware that I'm not a person who really likes to go on a lot of statistics. We are more concerned for concrete developments in the economy and, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the statistics to Statistics Canada and the Conference Board of Canada and the media. The media have been publishing statistics and if they want to go ahead and just grab figures without any real reason of doing the research that they should do on the figures I leave it to them all.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this. Before I turn to the matters of more substance, I would like to briefly say something about numbers since they have been so emphasized to possibly mislead this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about comparison with the Province of Manitoba and the Canadian national average. Such a comparison is really not worth much as an indicator of performance. Because of the resource boom in the most western province economic growth in the country is very uneven and I'd like to just give some facts. As a result, the overall average in Canada isn't that typical of the provinces which aren't enjoying a resource boom. Nor is it all that typical of the provinces whose growth is on the border and built on industrial basis. For example, Mr. Speaker, looking at the investment data, the share of the total investment - that's for the total of Canada - investment in the three western provinces rose from 29 percent in 1975 to 37 percent in 1979. The figures for private investment only show that it increased from 31 percent in 1975 to 41 percent in 1979. When one area accounts for nearly half of the country's private investment, the so-called average is bound to be a poor reflection of what is typical and what is reasonable achievement for other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, anybody, anybody that has any ability to read figures whatsoever, any economist or researcher, can point out immediately that the balance investment in Canada is weighted to the three western provinces and it is not a very good comparison when you take the whole of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario, an article in the Globe and Mail, "Lag in industry in Ontario seen as a national drag". Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Government is having the same problem because of the investments that are going on in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the total investment in the Province of Manitoba is down, mainly because we have not been doing our hydro construction, but the other reason, Mr. Speaker, is for sure, for sure we know that the construction industry is down and it is concerning but the reason for it being down is we are overbuilt on housing; we are overbuilt in apartment blocks; we are overbuilt in office buildings; and we are very overbuilt in retail service space in Manitoba. We have much more percentage than most provinces as far as square footage of retail space in Manitoba than other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say though that the construction industry is moving up, and I'd read a little note here from the Winnipeg Construction Association. It says, "the construction industry is experiencing its seasonal slowdown for the winter months; however, there is more carry-over of work this winter than last and the total figures are not expected

Friday, 29 February, 1980

to reach the high of 34 percent but is anticipated to be only 26 percent this year". That's an increase of construction workers of 10 percent, Mr. Speaker.

In 1977 the public investment in Manitoba accounted for 40 percent of the total. In 1979 that percentage was 32 percent. That's still 2 percent above the average for Canada, Mr. Speaker, but it does show a substantial progress towards restoring some semblance of balance in our economy.

But now when you look, Mr. Speaker, at private investment, the picture masked by the total figure harped on by the opposition, the picture becomes a little clearer. Our private investment increased over 1978 and 1979 a total of 26 percent. Those are facts, Mr. Speaker. This is above the average of Canada and we exceed the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and even Saskatchewan. If you separate manufacturing, and I know, Mr. Speaker, members on the other side, especially the Member for Brandon East, does not really think manufacturing is all that important in the province of Manitoba, but we all know, in this House that manufacturing is where it begins, manufacturing of your resources, manufacturing of products that can be shipped all over the world or North America, and those are the places where the jobs begin. That is where it's important and, Mr. Speaker, if you separate out manufacturing you find that we were 37 percent up in manufacturing over the last two years, 37 percent up. That's more than 50 percent better than the Canadian average and we were above the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the facts regarding the growth in the province but I would like to say now that, Mr. Speaker, we have had facts presented to us by the Leader of the Opposition. His facts are as creditable as his statement he made the day he was elected the Leader of the Opposition party in this province. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from page two of his speech. On the second page of his speech, after he finished congratulating everybody, he said: Only this morning a gentleman approach me at the rear of this convention, who arrived here from Tokyo yesterday, and advised me that four companies, four companies that had been located in Manitoba during the period of the New Democratic Party government had withdrawn from Manitoba in the past two years, Sony, Sekine, Misawa, Yamaha. He indicated to me that the reason of their departure is that they did not like the environment, the environment generated by the Lyon government; and I am angry that some 250 employees directly or indirectly involved in these companies must now seek new job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read, just to talk about the credibility of the honourable member's statements, "The Honourable J. Frank Johnston, Minister of Economic Development, Legislative Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Dear Sir: Date, December 12th, 1979. We refer to the recent speech made by Mr. Howard Pawley to the Manitoba New Democratic Party Leadership Convention in which speech he stated that a gentleman, who had arrived from Tokyo had advised him that four companies had withdrawn from Manitoba in the past two years, and that the Yamaha Canada Music Limited was one of these companies. As we believe, we indicated in a telephone discussion to Mr. Pawley, Yamaha's head office was changed from Winnipeg to Toronto in 1976, which resulted in the reduction of employees in Winnipeg from 135 to 110. However, far from having withdrawn from this province, Yamaha is seeking to expand in Manitoba. Yamaha now holds 16,000 square feet of leasehold space in the city of Winnipeg in connection with its music school operation; and there are approximately 2,500 Yamaha music students in the city of Winnipeg. Yamaha has an active retail outlet on Portage Avenue and leasehold retail operations at The Bay. The National Education Division and the National Service Department both are located in Winnipeg. Yamaha presently employs 100 people in Winnipeg.

As you can see from the aforementioned, Yamaha maintains an active presence in the province of Manitoba. Signed, Hiroshi Oka, President."

Mr. Speaker, after they made that statement he had a phone call and I never heard a retraction. This company is doing business in this province, Mr. Speaker, they really don't need that kind of help. When they're trying to grow in this province, and I'm here to say that behalf of this company, Mr. Speaker, that company is a credit to this province. We want them, we want them to stay and we want them to grow.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is to the Department of Economic Department, Legislative Building, Winnipeg. The Honourable J. Frank Johnston, Minister of Economic Development. "Dear Sir: Re Sekine Canada Ltd. I am please to advise that the refinancing and management takeover of SCL is near completion. The management agreement between Acklands and CJS

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Development Ltd. was just signed last month with documentation, banking, shareholders, hand-over and take place on January the 18th. A shareholder agreement injecting \$500,000 new investor capital has been finalized changing the ownership to 25 percent Japanese, 75 percent Canadian; this with a banking line of credit of \$4.5 million should give the company a sound financial position in order to re-establish its base.

We would like to go on record, at this time, of thanking your department for the assistance given SCL from its concept in '73. Most of the company's problems of the past can be attributed to the federal government's policies with respect to the existence of secondary industries, and especially if competitive to manufacturing companies located in eastern Canada. Our considerable negotiations with ITC Revenue Canada DREE have been given extensive assistance by your department and we are now looking for expertise assistance in breaking into the U.S. market which is presently in a bicycle boom. We believe that SCL's problems of the past have now been resolved; an interesting new one is now taking place, to that of material procurement. North American and European bicycle factories like CCM and SWIM manufactured bicycles using mainly steel components are changing to light alloy-class components. This component, such as a handlebar, seat posts, handlebar stems, chain wheels and mudguards, etc., labour costs and energy costs in France and Italy have resulted in Japanese manufacturing becoming overloaded this year causing problems for SCL. Once SCL has managed to get its own house in order we will certainly have a look at some of the aspects of component manufacturing in Manitoba, because Manitoba's energy, labour and material sourcing in this field has a considerable advantage.

I would like to extend to you and your colleagues the very best in 1980 and thank you, again." That's signed. Mr. Dennis Scott, Director.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, last November, when the Leader of the Opposition was making this statement, almost the second thing he said when he became leader, which misled the people of this province, we were negotiating with Ottawa at that time to get that loan and support for that company. And I can tell you his babbling didn't help.

Mr. Speaker, letter number three. This one is addressed to Mr. Donald S. Rogers, Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce: "Dear Mr. Rogers: It has come to our attention that Sony of Canada was named at a political meeting as a company that had moved its office from Winnipeg to Toronto. Sony of Canada is one of a number of companies that are administered by General Distributors of Canada. We have not now or any plans in the future of moving Sony of Canada's head office from Winnipeg. During 1979 seven individuals were transferred from Winnipeg in the course of reorganizing Sony's marketing system because Toronto represents the major market we serve. Sony's principle distribution center continues to be in Vancouver and its accounting and personnel services continue in Winnipeg.

We should also point out that coincident with the transfer of certain Sony personnel to Toronto we established a new division of our company, an electronic marketing field, Jana Electronics, in Winnipeg. This new company employs a staff of eight and is expected to increase in size depending on the marketing success. Signed Mr. Albert D. Cohen."

The fourth company, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I requested the secretary of the board of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to contact the executive of Sony of Canada here in Winnipeg, set up an appointment with him; the day came for the appointment, I waited in my office, I cancelled a luncheon engagement I waited so long. A phone call was made to the office and it was said that they were on their way over but they never showed up. Mr. Speaker, as late as last week, because Misawa of Canada have got an option on a very large number of lots in our Inkster Park and we are having some problems getting people started because of mortgage money, we want to make new arrangements with those companies that are in there, we have called them and said, would you please let us know what your intentions are because of the statement of the Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition. We have not yet been able to have any contact with Misawa, they have not attended my office to find out. But if they are having problems we are willing to help them, we are willing to make some arrangements in our Inkster Park if it's possible to do so but they have not come forward to talk to us.

Mr. Speaker, that's the type of research, that's the type of stuff, just absolute babble that is coming out of the Leader of the Opposition. There was absolutely no research done. Some guy in the back room of the convention who just arrived from probably a holiday in Tokyo tells them this and he stands up in front of the people of Manitoba and misleads them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you wonder why Manitobans are walking around questioning the economic development of the province when you have people from that side of the House giving them that kind of nonsense and that kind of impression.

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Mr. Speaker, the 1980 growth rate is expected, according to the Conference Board and these are facts, the Minister of Finance touched on them this morning, Manitoba is expected to exceed Canada, exceed Canada's average in 1980; 1.3 but, Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous increase over 1979, going to be one of the highest. Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board is only predicting Manitoba and Saskatchewan to have an average higher than the national average next year. Even with all that weighted investment that I'm speaking of in the western provinces we are still expected, the way they work out the figures, to have a higher increase. Mr. Speaker, our growth will exceed and has exceeded during 1979 according to the Conference Board, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario, and it will be six times what Ontario is in 1980.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as far as statistics are concerned, we can't overlook the Labor statistics. In 1977 we had an increase of 3,000 jobs, that was in 1977; in 1978 and 1979 the increase was 11,000 and 13,000 for a total of 24,000 new jobs in two years, the percentage figures were 2.6 in 1978 and 3 in 1979. The performance in the past has been exceeded only in 1965, 1968, 1973, 1974, 1975, in the last twenty years. Now, Mr. Speaker, really. I know, I know very well how the Conference Board does their work. The figures that the Honourable Minister of Finance gave this morning were very clear. We have the whole graph here right back to 1971 and these are fact. The constant figures he referred to in 1977 were 4.392 million; in 1978, 4.528 million; in 1979, 4.567 million, and we're predicted to go up 1.3 to 4.642 million in 1980. You know, that's the constant figures we're talking about. It's moved up every year, and we're expected to move up even with all that weighted investment to the west of us.

They touched on retail sales, Mr. Speaker. Only four times since 1961 were we above the Canadian average in retail sales in Manitoba, and he brings up these figures.

Mr. Speaker, he brought up another figure. Mr. Speaker, he mentioned another one. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the four years and I can only say thank heaven we have four years, because different than our people in Ottawa, if they'd have had four years, they'd have done it. We've had two years to clean it up and now we've got two years to do it and we will do it

MR. GREEN: What four years were we ahead of the national average?

MR. JOHNSTON: What four years? I'm quite willing to give him the figures, in fact, it's wasting my time but I could table them. It was '70, '72, '73 and '74.

MR. GREEN: Four New Democratic years.

MR. JOHNSTON: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the other situation of the. . . --(Interjection)-- I'd like to be able to speak; I didn't interrupt you, but that's fine, I'm quite used to it, I'm quite used to it. I wish, Mr. Speaker, if you could move me further away I wouldn't mind.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say this, that the Leader of the Opposition and I won't be detracted from another figure that he gave. He gave the IT&C figure of being - it was printed in the paper from a report from IT&C - that we were down 7 percent. Mr. Speaker, they do not do a big survey, they do it with large companies. There were approximately eight or nine large companies approached in this survey. One of them was a public company in this province and I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, it's very obvious that the private companies were up because the public company was down in its spending.

Mr. Speaker, we know that they have changed the IT&C intention, they have removed it down from a decrease to 6.8 and they had originally said that Manitoba would be 13.3. So, you obviously have to conclude that if the public company is down with these adjustments, the private companies have to be up. There's no question in that.

Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board, again, in 1977, for 1977, do you know when the Conference Board stops making adjustments and intentions for the Province of Manitoba? Their last one for 1977 was April of 1979, where they said that the - and this was the figure the Honourable Member for Brandon East kept harping at me in Estimates last year, he kept saying, "Your only .7. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board figure for 1977 was 0.7 and that came out April of '79. 1978, the last Conference Board intention for 1978 came out in November of 1979. In November of '78 we were 2.2, but we ended up at 2.9, that's what the Conference Board said. The Conference Board keeps adjusting their intentions as the figures come out from Statistics Canada. In 1979, in November, they have us at .08, the figure that



Friday, 29 February, 1980

my Honourable Minister of Resources said we're not that happy about it.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me just ask this Legislature to think seriously about something. The last figure we have is .08 in November. We know that their intentions will change all this year and maybe even part of next and in August we were 2. They dropped us in three months to .8, Mr. Speaker, yet our employment went up, our manufacturing went up, more people were working in the province, more shipments were going out of the province. We've had an increase in shipments out of this province of 20 percent in '79 over '78 and they tell me, well, you know, I'm not going to say it's going to happen but I'm pretty hopeful that when we get the final intentions from the Conference Board on 1979, we might be in a very different position.

Mr. Speaker, I have to comment and I know my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs commented on the outmigration. And, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance said this morning these are not future figures, they're fact from Statistics Canada, and the average outmigration between 1969 and 1977 was 33,911; 34, 34, 37, 35, that's people leaving Manitoba and there is the figures. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the people. We can talk about the people that are coming into Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we know that we're off balance with the other provinces.

Now let me tell you, in 1978, Mr. Speaker, one thing that happened in 1977 and 1978, immigration went to zero in this province; and as my colleague mentioned, people are not moving from Ontario to Manitoba. We haven't been losing to Ontario, we have to Alberta. Ontario has been losing to Alberta. Right in your report by the - it was published in the paper by the Canadian Association of Movers - we are losing people, yes, Mr. Speaker, to the resource development provinces, because the construction is there and we've admitted that our construction is down but it's coming up and construction workers have to move where the work is. Construction people that were working on hydro have to move where the work is.

But there is an interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker, we know, we know that there were people that moved from Manitoba, but our manufacturing is coming up as I told you. Where else do you produce new jobs? What's the reason for having a car salesman? What's the reason for having a waitress? What's the reason for having somebody working in a retail store, an insurance man or anybody if you don't have a manufacturing base and that's what this government is building. If you get the movers' report, if any of the honourable members want to get the complete report, there is an interesting figure. We did lose a percentage, we were 33 percent higher migration to Alberta in 1978-79, but did you know, Mr. Speaker, according to the movers, Saskatchewan had a 50 percent increase to Alberta '79 over '78. --(Interjection)-- Yes, '78. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's not listen to the members from the other side. I've never heard of such doom and gloom in all of my life. Mr. Speaker, I have here and I'd like to lend the honourable members know, that in 1979, Mr. Speaker, we had DREE grants; we are a DREE province, we use DREE because we are able to take advantage of it and we do. We have tremendous co-operation with the federal DREE people in Manitoba.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, the amount of money, the amount of money that was approved for DREE grants was \$70 million, \$70,900,000, nearly \$71 million. Mr. Speaker, that is the amount of money that DREE on any expansion would approve but the amount of money that is paid or actually spent is much higher, probably in the neighbourhood of \$100,000.00. DREE supported these applications to the tune of \$15,704,000, bringing into a total of 2,127 jobs in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, when you apply for a DREE application you don't apply and say, "I'm moving to Ontario." When you apply for a DREE application you apply and you say what street, what address and where you're going to build; and those applications were made by people who want to expand in the province of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that in our small plan we have made, 110 offers have been approved. We have created 357 jobs in the rural area of Manitoba with our RSCI Program. Mr. Speaker, it's going to be very interesting how they vote on the Honourable Member for Inkster's resolution. In that resolution, he says because the government is using public money to help private companies, I haven't got the exact wording. Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in what the Member for Selkirk would do because this paper says we helped four, there's been another two since in Selkirk, and Selkirk has had \$400,000 Selkirk projects approved as far as infrastructure is concerned. --(Interjection)-- Yes, he was with me when we gave out the cheques. I'd be very interested to know how he votes on that resolution, very interested to know how he votes on that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I've been watching with interest, Ricki Katz and her CBC program and she does an excellent job. CBC and the University of Winnipeg had a seminar with some

Friday, 29 February, 1980

economics involved in it and she interviewed the people. I must say that they had that seminar with part of it valuing economic development; there was not one person invited from the Economic Department of the Province of Manitoba, not a one.

Mr. Speaker, they said in that Conference we should be looking to the western markets, we should be looking to the markets to the south of us, we should be looking at companies that can manufacture and supply internationally, they said we should be looking at international markets. And, Mr. Speaker, in Hansard, Volume XXVII, page 50B, 8:00 p.m., I outlined that program last year. And that's the program that we've been working on, Mr. Speaker, small business assistance, technology centres, all of these things and, Mr. Speaker, I'll be prepared to expand on it in my Estimates or with anybody at any time.

Mr. Speaker, it just makes me sick when Manitobans criticize Manitoba, and I tell you this, the reason they have got into that habit is because we've had the NDP around for so long preaching doom and gloom. You know, the NDP keep continually running down the greatest province in Canada. We've got more water, more sand, more culture, more everything in this province and I defy any one of them to sit down and start writing the good things in this province and if they can't come up with a forty-minute speech or a two hour speech, they ought to be ashamed of themselves, but it's always run it down and mix it up.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to challenge the Honourable Member for Brandon right now, that any figures he produces, my department with the analysts that I regard are the best in Manitoba and some of the best in Canada because they are consulted by people across Canada, I invite him to bring his figures up to those analysts and we will discuss them, something he has never done, something the Member for Selkirk has never done. —(Interjection)— Yes, you did, you hired them and you know they're good and you don't pay any damn attention to them.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge is there, the offer is there to the media, to come forward; my department is available.

Mr. Speaker, we will have growth in manufacturing and more jobs in the Province of Manitoba in 1980 and I'm standing before this Assembly and saying it and it will happen, and I will tell you there are more people that have come to us because of our freeze on hydro than you would believe. There isn't a week or couple of days go by that we don't have somebody asking about the fact that hydro is frozen in Manitoba and they will have good energy rates. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I enjoyed listening to my successor, the Minister of Economic Development, on his dissertation, spoken like a Minister of Economic Development or a Minister of Industry and Commerce should speak. You know, he should be boosting the province and he should always be looking on the bright side of things. We tried to do that for a number of years and I must say, tried as we may, as some of my colleagues behind me suggested, we heard the doom and gloom from the members of the opposition at that time. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if we had doom and gloom to talk about, it's really because there is doom and gloom in the province, doom and gloom because of a very very serious situation of economic stagnation. And try as the members opposite will try, try as the Premier will try, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Resources, try as they will, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that you take any objective person and you show them the figures on the economic performance of this province and I think they will come to the conclusion that the economic situation of this province is lamentable, that it is probably the weakest of any of the ten provinces in this country.

MR. JOHNSTON: I told you why. Do you want us to come up and talk about it?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you for assuming the position of Speaker again. It's a very difficult job especially when you have some of us in the House that like to talk a little too much at times and I don't envy you your position but I'm glad you're there and I wish you all the best in the forthcoming days, weeks and months of the session.

I would also like to extend my best wishes to some of the other new members, the three new members that we have: the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for River Heights, and of course the Member for Rossmere. I look forward to their contribution to this

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Legislature and I know they will attempt to serve their constituents to the best of their ability.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss the economy of Manitoba, not because I haven't discussed it on occasion, not because we don't think about it a lot, but because members opposite have paid so much attention to some of the statements I believe I've made, some of the economic data that we have given out from this side, and their particular use and misuse of the figures over the last few days has caused me to get up on my feet to provide some rebuttal, as much as I can in the amount of time that I have available.

I even had the treat of having one of my speeches read to me the other day, a speech that I made about ten years ago, and you know, Mr. Speaker, it sounded pretty good. In fact, I would say the same thing again because what I said then was true and I would say, as the the Minister of Consumer Affairs read it, I would say it is true today. --(Interjection)-- I can assure you no one wrote it for me.

I think that we have witnessed in the last couple of days a rather lame defense of the economic situation in this province that we have experienced under this particular Conservative administration. And I think as years of their government roll on it will become more apparent that indeed the Manitoba economy is floundering on the rocks of Lyonomics. We are, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, we are floundering, we are stagnating, because of a very fundamental difference between the people on that side and the people on this side. We are stagnating because of the economic ideology of the First Minister and his associates, we are stagnating because of the economic philosophy of privatization. That philosophy of the marketplace and nothing but the marketplace for Manitoba will not work and is not working. We've had evidence of that over the last nearly two-and-a-half years and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that as we proceed through the life of this government we will find more evidence.

And indeed there are many statistics we can talk about. Many have been mentioned this afternoon and one could spend hours reviewing them. I choose to take three or four or five of the major series that seem to be of interest to people in this House. Population is one, but also what's happening to investment because I would like to put the information on investment spending into its true perspective because we've just had an exercise in misleading statistics from the Minister of Economic Development on the investment situation in this province. The investment situation in this province is damned serious. It's very very serious. And any reading of the statistics, unless you want to close your eyes to the figures, would give you this very pessimistic conclusion.

I'd like to say something about unemployment. I'd like to look at the rate of job creation, much has been said about it. And I'd also like to look at the real domestic product, that is the measurement of overall economic growth that has occurred in Manitoba over the years. By "real" I mean non-inflationary dollars. We've talked about it in constant dollars so we can eliminate the element of inflation that quite often distorts figures.

All right, let's talk about No. 1 myth that my friend, the Minister of Resources, talked about the other day, and that is the whole item of population. The performance of the Minister of Natural Resources was remarkable the other day, I'm sorry to say, because it indicated to me, at least for this subject, a lack of some intellectual integrity for this subject. I know he's an honourable man, but in this subject I think there's some intellectual integrity missing. --(Interjection)-- Well, just wait a minute. The Minister got up, and read us figures about outward migration and I don't dispute the figures, in fact, I went down and I checked my records and I think they're probably right. --(Interjection)-- Okay, they are right. No thinking involved, absolutely no thinking involved. Thoughtless figures.

And, Mr. Speaker, the point, of course, is that when we talk about the loss of people in Manitoba we indeed have to be concerned with the bottom line. The people across who pride themselves in knowing something about business, surely, when they run a business, and they want to be concerned about the state of that business, the health of that business, they don't only look at one side of the ledger but they must also look at the other side. They not only look at expenditures but they look at revenues as well. And when you combine them - add or subtract whatever you will - you look at the bottom line of profit or loss.

And the Honourable Minister got up the other day and said, well, the outward migration isn't any greater, it seems, than it has been over the last several years, whatever. And, Mr. Speaker, it's sort of equivalent to talking about the expenditures of a company. Expenditures are no greater; they're sort of on average. As the Minister of Economic Development said, they were up this last year or two, but nevertheless, he wants to take the long-term average and so on. But, he chooses to forget about the other side of the ledger, namely the revenues -

Friday, 29 February, 1980

what's coming in. He chooses to ignore the people that are coming in or are not coming into Manitoba through the process of interprovincial migration. And, of course . . .  
—(Interjection)— Well, he left the impression with me that he was ignoring it.

Mr. Speaker, he left the impression that we should only be concerned with one side of the ledger, and I say it's ridiculous, it's totally ridiculous. And to try to parade these figures in front of this House, and in front of the media, and in front of the people of Manitoba, that all is well in the State of Denmark because, actually, there's not much change in the number leaving this province, and therefore, presumably nothing is too bad. I say, Mr. Speaker, that he is misleading himself, surely, if not the people of this province and this Legislature.

It's the bottom line that counts. And it is very clear that the bottom line indicates that through interprovincial migration we had double the number of loss, double the loss through interprovincial migration in the first year of Tory administration than we had in the last year of NDP administration. It doubled, it doubled through the loss through interprovincial migration, doubled . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, it's not wrong. I'm sorry, the Minister of Highways says it is wrong and it is not wrong. As a matter of fact, the Estimates for 1977, the calendar year, show a net loss of 5,685 people in 1977. In 1978 the net loss of Manitoba population through interprovincial migration was 10,493 - so, approximately a doubling.

And for 1979 it's probably going to be about one-third higher than it was in 1978, because in the first nine months it was up by one-third already. So, if you project that it's possible - I'm not sure, we'll know in a couple of weeks - it's possible that the net loss this year will be 14,000 people.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, it's the bottom line we've got to look at. Surely to God, if you're only looking at one side of the ledger, you don't deserve to run the business. If you're only looking at one side, as a Minister of this province, you don't deserve to be a Minister of this province if you want to seemingly refuse to look at the total picture. Because, Mr. Speaker, of the sharp rise in the net loss through interprovincial migration the total level of population of Manitoba has dropped. The total level of population in 1979, according to Statistics Canada, was negative. The rate of growth was negative, it was a rate of decline. Minor, it was a small amount, it was minus 0.2, but nevertheless, significant inasmuch as we were the only province in Canada to register a decline in our total population, the only province in Canada. And I say that that has got to reflect something.

And I'm not changing my attitude with regard to the significance of population growth - I never suggested it for one moment before - and now the population growth is equivalent to economic growth. They're not the same thing, but what it does indicate, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a lack of job opportunities in this province. That's what it indicates. The net loss on interprovincial migration account is a direct function of job opportunities in this province. It's a direct function of the loss of the inadequate number of jobs in this province. And I say that when we have adequate economic growth in this province, when we have adequate job creation in this province, then you will see the total population growing again. But not until you have a better economic situation than we have. There are inadequate jobs, people don't come, and others leave.

There are a number of other indicators that I'd like to touch upon in the time that I have available. There are many many to look at that would pretty well paint the same picture of an inadequate state of economic health, but I will confine myself, because of time limitations, to three or four of the more key figures.

I'd like to touch upon investment, which was mentioned by the Minister of Economic Development in his speech, and ask ourselves, by looking at the figures, whether we're satisfied with this particular situation. In 1979, which is the latest information we have from Statistics Canada - we're all, I'm presuming, using the same source; in fact, it's really the only source of official statistics in Canada, other than some administrative statistics that are available probably at provincial and municipal levels. But according to the latest information we have on investment in this province, our investment in 1979 will increase by 4 percent over 1978. That increase of 4 percent, to put it into perspective, Mr. Speaker, first of all, it's less than the rate of inflation, which means virtually that the investment expenditure that takes place in '79 in real dollars, in real goods and services, will amount to less than occurred in the previous year, 1978.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.  
The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

Friday, 29 February, 1980

MR. EVANS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is your 4 percent the total of public and private?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it includes public and private. This was only - I said it was 4 percent. The Canadian increase was 11 1/2 percent, so it's only 1/3 of the Canadian increase. And if you look at all the provinces in Canada, every one of the 10 provinces, you'll see that Manitoba had the lowest rate of increase in total investment, the lowest rate of increase, 4 percent. I've got the list here. It ranges from 30 percent in Newfoundland to a low of 4 percent in Manitoba. If you're interested in Saskatchewan, it was 14.4 percent, Alberta was 17.3, B.C. was 11.6 and so forth and so on. Even Prince Edward Island was 9.2. So they are putting total investment into perspective. It's a pretty sad situation.

Okay, let's look at public investment. The Minister is interested in the breakdown. Let's look at public investment. Public investment in '79 will increase by a mere 1.7 percent over '78, compared with an 8.2 percent for all of Canada, 1.7 compared to an average of 8.2. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is obviously below the rate of inflation, so therefore, in real terms there will be less investment in the public sector in '79 than occurred in 1978.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this is not only below the Canadian average, but again, we have the lowest rate of increase in public investment of any province in Canada. --(Interjection)-- Private, private rate of increase was 5.1 percent in Manitoba, '79 over '78, this was only two-fifths of the Canadian average of 12.8 percent, two-fifths of what occurred as a national average, but the national average is just that, it's the total . . . --(Interjection)-- no, it isn't. Well, so what? It's the Canadian average, it's the Canadian average and if the Minister doesn't like averages I would like to tell him and give this, that Manitoba's increase in private investment is the lowest of any province in Canada in 1979. We had the lowest rate of increase of any province in Canada in 1979. --(Interjection)-- That rate of increase, total private increase was 5.1 percent, Saskatchewan was 15.9, Alberta was 17.5, B.C. was 13.7, and as I said, the average for Canada, the Canadian average, or the Canadian total increase was 12.8. That's all investment expenditures from every industrial sector.

Now the Minister will now say, "Okay, let's do manufacturing?" Do you want to do manufacturing? We'll do manufacturing. Manufacturing for all of Canada - the average increase, well it depends on whether you take new or new and repair, I'll take new and repair. It doesn't matter, there are some slight differences but it was 12.4 percent for all of Canada, 12.4 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister will say, "But hurrah," because Manitoba's rate of increase was 24.9 percent. So, the rate of increase of manufacturing investment in '79 was about double. Just hang on a minute, will you? Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Minister of Highways interrupt me, not on one occasion but on 10 or 15 occasions since I've been up and I've only been up 10 or 15 minutes, so I would appreciate a little assistance here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would caution the members that they have their opportunity of 40 minutes when they get the floor. The Honourable Member for Brandon East may continue.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point is - and while we welcome this rate of increase in manufacturing in Manitoba compared to Canada - the point is that the amount of investment dollars in manufacturing is so small that it's pitiful. You can have large percentage increases if you're dealing with small numbers, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, if you look at all investment in Manitoba manufacturing accounts for only 6.3 percent. Of all the investment expenditures in this province manufacturing accounts for 6.3 percent.

In Canada, if you take all manufacturing investment, it accounts for 15.1 percent. So really, you can have a high percentage increase but you're talking about a relatively small amount of expenditure in the total spectrum of things.

And the other thing that disturbs, Mr. Speaker, is that when you look and you're putting this into perspective, if you look at manufacturing investment per person, the per capita investment in manufacturing is estimated to be \$168 per capita in Manitoba in 1979 compared to an average or per capita figure of \$457 for Canada as a whole. In other words, the investment per person in Manitoba in manufacturing is only 36.7 percent of the Canadian per capita expenditure on manufacturing. --(Interjection)-- Well, I've gone over that. And as I

Friday, 29 February, 1980

said, although the manufacturing investment is up, you know, and I indicated that, is up in Manitoba in '79 over '78, if you take - it depends on whether you take new and repair or new alone, but let's take capital and repair, new capital and repair - Manitoba's expected increase is 24.9 percent. But let's look at what's going on to the province to the west of us. He likes to drag this in every once in a while, what's happening to Saskatchewan. Our increase was 24.9, Saskatchewan is or will be 42.4. Look at the Maritimes, Nova Scotia was 29.3 percent, still higher than Manitoba. Look at Newfoundland, it goes up by 66.5 percent. Okay, but the point I would make, the point I would make is that these figures on manufacturing expenditures in these provinces, all of them that I mentioned, are relatively small so get more volatility. You look at Ontario and Quebec you don't get the same volatility. With a bigger figure there is more stability.

And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that manufacturing investment is not adequate. It is not adequate when it's only 36.7 percent of the Canadian average expenditure in manufacturing.

Looking at the figures on employment, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite like to talk about the jobs that have been created in Manitoba during the past two years and fair enough, and there's no question that from the figures I have, in 1978 there were 11,000 new jobs and in 1979, 13,000 for a total of 24,000. But they always want to compare them, you know, with the last two years of our administration which was a down period on the business cycle. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, you know most often if I say, "Why don't you look at '73 under the NDP administration?" We created 16,000 in '73, 17,000 jobs in 1974 and this is total - this is from the Labour Force Survey, this is net jobs created from all sources.

And, Mr. Speaker, the sad fact of the matter is that while there has been some increase in employment in this province, which we're all happy about, the rate of increase of employment compares very badly with the rest of this country. Our employment, the jobs created in this province in '79, using the numbers I just gave out which you all cheered about, was an increase of 3 percent compared to an average or to a Canadian total of 4 percent. If you look at all of the provinces in Canada Manitoba's rate of job increase is the lowest of any of the 10 provinces. We're the bottom the totem pole. So, you can brag about a 3 percent increase in jobs if you want, but I say if I was in Saskatchewan I'd brag about more jobs being created on a percentage basis; or I was in Nova Scotia, I could brag about more jobs being created; or if I was in Quebec or Ontario or what have you? The fact is, and let's not forget it because it's easy to ignore comparisons but the figures mean nothing unless you compare historically or geographically, and I say when you compare us in the national spectrum we come out at the very bottom of the totem pole. --(Interjection)-- Compare it geographically, I just told you, we're the worst of the 10 provinces. --(Interjection)-- Well, look at every province, Newfoundland, 5.4 percent; Prince Edward Island, 4.4; Nova Scotia, 3.3; New Brunswick, 4.6; Quebec, 3.3; Ontario, 4.2; Saskatchewan, 3.7; Alberta, 6.7; British Columbia, 3.3; Manitoba, 3.0 and the lowest. --(Interjection)-- Well, we're the lowest, we're the lowest and, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate prediction, I think, that we're going to have to satisfy ourselves with, I shouldn't say satisfy, but we're going to have to, I'm afraid contend with practically no growth in jobs in the year, 1980.

The forecast for job creation in Manitoba is relatively dismal for this year, 1980, and we'll see, we'll see, and I hope there are jobs but I am not optimistic that we're going to have even that 3 percent increase that we had last year.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at unemployment which is the other area, I think, of some significance, there's no question that Manitoba experienced lower unemployment rates in '79 than in '78 which is good. And also, we seem to be maintaining our historic role, we usually are about third lowest unemployment rates in Canada and we have been the last year or so. Although I must say, I recall in the early '70s, we were sometimes the lowest or sometimes the second lowest and then sometimes the third lowest. But the last couple of years, we usually seem to be about third lowest but that is more or less where we fitted in a pattern in the past years.

The disturbing point about all this, of course, is the fact that our labour force is not growing. The reason, unfortunately, for the low level of unemployment is because the labour force, that is the pool of people who are available to work, is not expanding at a very fast rate. If it were expanding in keeping with the rates experienced in most other provinces, in many other provinces, our unemployment rate undoubtedly would go up higher. And, I suppose, you could say, well, that's the bright side of the coin when you look at the loss through interprovincial migration. That if we didn't have that net loss we'd have more unemployment, and that's probably true. If we didn't have that net loss we would probably have more unemployment in Manitoba and so you could argue, well, it's better that they're

Friday, 29 February, 1980

working in some other province than being unemployed in this province. That's looking at it on the bright side of things and I don't think there would be any dispute about that. You can talk to the economists in the Economic Development Department, you can talk to federal economists, you can talk to anyone, business, bank economists and you look at the labour force figures and you'll see that, as I said, the rate of increase in the labour force has slipped and this accounts for the continued low rate of unemployment.

Just taking a moment to look at the overall measurement of growth, that is the real domestic product which provides the most comprehensive measurement that we have in economic growth, real domestic product, increased in 1979 by 0.8 percent which is one-third, only one-third of the Canadian average increase of 2.6 percent. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this again is not satisfactory because not only is our rate of increase only a third of the Canadian average but, of all the provinces in Canada, we had the lowest rate of overall economic growth, the lowest rate of the ten provinces.

Now I know it stated for 1980 great things, Manitoba's 1.7 is the forecast and it's fractionally higher than the Canadian average of 1.6. I say, Mr. Speaker, it's rather nice to think of yourself of being above the Canadian average for a change but, low and behold, that figure of 1.6 is the lowest, I think it's the lowest rate of increase that Canada has experienced in the past nine or ten years. I have a series of numbers here, well maybe '75 is one exception, '75 was a bad year, but apart from 1975 this forecast of 1.6 for 1980 in Canada has got to be the worst that we've experienced. And now that Canada is experiencing about the worst in many many years, about the worst, now we can say, well, Manitoba is going to be slightly above the Canadian average.

You see, Manitoba is a rather stable type of economic performance. We don't have the fluctuations that you have in Ontario or certainly in British Columbia. Our rate of growth tends to be relatively slow but stable, nevertheless. I could make the same comparisons that the Minister of Resources or the Minister of Economic Development, take averages over the past several years and make comparisons, and if I did, I haven't done it, but if I did, I can tell you that the average rate of growth under the NDP administration was double the rate of growth that we're going to experience in 1980, the forecast, and it was certainly a lot higher than that dismal 0.8 percent experienced last year.

The rates of growth, this is in real dollars, this is taking out the inflation: 1973, 3.1; 1974, 2.8; 1975, it was not as good, 1.5; 1976, 3.3; 1977 was a bad year, it was down to 1.2; 1978, 2.9; and then of course 1979, 0.8. One of the factors behind this figure that causes some change, of course, is what happens to the farming sector, what happens to the income earned in the farming sector and I would have to acknowledge, and I think we should all be aware of that component, the volatility of that component. Okay, enough about these figures.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if you have any intellectual honesty about you, you have to conclude that this rate of economic performance is less than satisfactory, it is not adequate, it is a situation which I think is probably more serious than any other province in Canada. And I say we've had two-and-a-half years experience of conservative economic policies; those policies have proven deficient.

I can't help but be amused, Mr. Speaker, at the number of speeches that have been made referring to the loosening of the purse strings, in statements made in the paper that now the purse strings are going to be loosened. I'd like to know why are the purse strings going to be loosened? Our economic situation hasn't improved. I wonder why, why, I'd like to know why. .

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why oh why, are we going to have an increase in government spending? We were told that we were in a very serious situation in 1977 because the per capita debt was \$3,130, in 1977, at least that's the one I looked at in the 1979 Budget Address. That's what it says and I'm just talking it as it is so I presume it's correct unless it's been revised; \$3,130.00. In 1978, December 31st, the end of the year, the debt had gone up to \$3,744, I believe this is the net debt; and according to the latest report issued by the Minister of Finance, the net debt as of December 31st, 1979, is now \$3,968.00. In other words, the debt has gone up by over \$800, if you subtract these two it's \$838 in the last two years. Why oh why, when we were supposed to be bankrupt in 1977 and we were supposed to have acute protracted restraint, all of a sudden we can loosen the purse strings and start spending more money? And I say, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly not because of any improvement in the economy, it's not because we're in a better debt situation; we're in a worse debt

Friday, 29 February, 1980

situation. We've got more debt today than we had under the NDP. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm looking at the figures submitted by the Minister of Finance to this House. The figures show that we have a worse debt situation today than ever before.

Well I guess perhaps the federal election of last May had something to do with it, perhaps we're getting closer to a provincial election and that indeed may have something to do with it as well. Now we're getting closer to the truth. It's not the economic circumstances, it's not the financial or the fiscal circumstances, it's the political circumstances that's going to determine the rate of spending by this government.

I'm sorry to observe that in spite of all the talk and puppyery and so on out of the Minister of Economic Development, we have very little evidence of any meaningful accomplishments out of that department. There hasn't been one single industrial enterprise established in this province since this government came to office of any significance. Maybe a few small ones here, a few small ones there. Of course the few small ones have disappeared and some not so small ones have disappeared as well unfortunately. The most recent glaring example is the Swift Canadian packing plant in St. Boniface. --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, I think there is some opportunity in farm machinery and I like to see that occur. In fact, I would remind members if it wasn't for the NDP government using the MDC in 1970, Versatile may not have been here today because we saved it from the clutches of the Bank of Montreal which was going to close the doors of Versatile and that's a fact, that's a historical fact and you can look it up. --(Interjection)-- Well, that is not true, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that we saved Versatile in 1970 and the documents are there. Be my guest.

Okay, we are now operating under the Conservative economic philosophy, the Conservative economic policy of privatization. The government should stand aside, minimize government, make government as insignificant as possible, reduce corporate taxes, and wait for the industries to come in. Mr. Speaker, the industries are not flooding into Manitoba they are pouring out of Manitoba. We have no significant industrial expansion in this province under this Conservative government, and what little expansion there has been in the manufacturing sector, and get this clear, has been a direct result of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. The devaluation of the Canadian dollar has stimulated manufacturing jobs, manufacturing shipments, right across Canada including Manitoba. The only sad part of it is the stimulus in Manitoba is the weakest of all the provinces. Our increase, at least for the past couple of years of manufacturing output has been weaker than most other provinces.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that this recent neo-conservatism that we've got from this Premier and this government is not working. And incidentally, I would observe that this government is not in keeping with the. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member's time is up.  
The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity whilst you are in the Chair to congratulate you on your appointment once again, and like other members of the House, I have no doubt that you will carry on in your impartial and very official and very good manner as Speaker of this House.

And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Radisson, in his absence, in his reappointment as Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week we had the very pleasant opportunity to listen to one of the newer members to this Chamber, my colleague and friend, the Member for River Heights, and I know that all members of the House will join with me in agreeing that he made a very fine and very excellent contribution for his maiden speech in this Chamber and I think he indeed deserves to be congratulated on that effort. And my good friend and colleague, the Member for Emerson, likewise, did a very excellent job in seconding the speech from the Throne.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the newest member on the opposition side of the House, the Member for Rossmere. I trust that he will contribute well to the debates. I'm looking forward to his maiden address in this Chamber to see what sort of a debating form and debating decorum that he will bring to the Chamber and I trust that it is going to be in full agreement with his legal background and his eloquent questioning in the question period. I look forward very much to hearing some of his contributions to the speaking and to the debates in this House and I hope that he will bring to us some of the threads of his theory on economic development and where this province should go and possibly we'll find out in his maiden speech and others if he agrees with some of the nationalization and some of the state



Friday, 29 February, 1980

farm programs that the rest of his colleagues have, or whether he will divest himself from that and take on a different economic attack. We shall soon find out, Mr. Speaker.

And also to the only member of the Liberal Party in the House, Mr. Speaker, the honourable lady from Fort Rouge, I want to welcome her. I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, and I do wish the lady was here because it is not in any personal deference that I make my next comments but I was most interested in watching that particular race in the by-election and I was certainly disappointed that our very fine candidate was not successful in that by-election. But I had a great deal of interest in that by-election because, and as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, no deference to the honourable lady, I would have very much preferred if the winner was other than our candidate to have the winner being the NDP candidate, one Mr. Vic Savino. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I think he would have given to this House, he would have added to this House that very positive thread of political thought which has strung itself out amongst some of the newer members in the last two years. And I think he would have made some very dramatic contributions to what is considered to be the traditional thought on economic policy and the politics of the New Democratic Party. He would have clearly represented the new left that is emerging, even the far left, as my colleague behind me has indicated, and his addition to their caucus would have told Manitobans, prior to the next election, just in fact how far left the official opposition is moving in this province and given them fair warning of what they can expect should the New Democrats contend to be the next government in this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, such justice was not to be ours and I was somewhat disappointed in not having Mr. Savino here to join with us formally in the debates of this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Virden on the recognition that we have given him in his position in this upcoming session; and I note that a number of the members opposite, in the opposition, have agreed with that particular appointment; they say that it is long since time that we recognized our longstanding and senior member of our caucus. And I agree, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Virden will capably and ably carry out the position to which we have appointed him in this House.

I can't say, Mr. Speaker, in looking at our opposition caucus, that they practice what they preach at all times because, on one hand, they congratulate us for recognizing our longstanding member, the Member for Virden, and on the other hand, they get into a two-week bicker over one of their longstanding members of the party about where he will sit, the Member for Inkster. And if they would show him the kind of respect that we traditionally show our senior members on this side of the House, such nitpicking and bickering would not be part of the fabric of the opposition.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East mentioned, in the closing remarks of his speech, that he couldn't understand what the new, sudden loosening of the purse strings by the government was caused by, or what the reason was. And I can only offer the Member for Brandon East the small consolation that, as one of the newest members to the Executive Council, I certainly like to take credit for encouraging my colleagues in Cabinet to loosen the purse strings; and if it is any consolation and any answer to the Member for Brandon East, I will gladly take credit for the loosening of the purse strings on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment just briefly on the most recent federal election. Now, the federal election certainly was somewhat of a disappointment for me. I was not at all pleased with the outcome of the federal election. I was particularly not pleased to have the television coverage come on at 8 o'clock with the flashing sign "Liberal Majority" before any of the ballots were indeed in the ballot boxes, or even opened in Manitoba. I think that was a very very sad time for western Canada and, Mr. Speaker, I have basically three concerns about the federal election and, I'd like to share them with yourself and with members of the House.

My first and primary concern about the outcome of the federal election, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that western Canada, the four western provinces and the two Territories, have very little, and none, no representation on the Liberal government in rural Manitoba, and in agricultural Manitoba. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a tragic loss, that we only will begin to appreciate over the next several months as the two lone Liberal members for western Canada and the Territories begin their attempts to bring the western point of view to what used to be a Liberal Cabinet that alienated the west.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is particularly sad, in retrospect, to see that loss of representation, because the six to seven short months that we had to deal with a Conservative government with adequate representation from the west told us that things, indeed, were possible for the betterment of western Canada. We had massive gains in six to seven months of Conservative

Friday, 29 February, 1980

rule, aided by a strong and vibrant western caucus; we had strident gains in the transportation system; we had major gains in settling, and coming into, an energy policy, a national energy policy, for all of Canada, which is sorely needed, and each and every one of us know that it is sorely needed. We have lost that kind of western representation as a result of the last federal election, and that brings me a great deal of concern.

The second area of disappointment and concern over the federal election, Mr. Speaker, is that it appears as if, after the federal election, that the Canadian people are no longer capable of making the adjustments and the sacrifice necessary to keep Canada in its growing and prominent position in the world. It seems as if we have lost our will to survive in western Canada because the voters, particularly in eastern Canada, rejected a party - the Conservative party - which had a solid group of platform and policies to take Canada into the 1980s. They were rejected, Mr. Speaker, and replaced by a party that had no policy in the federal election; they had no energy policy; they had no pricing formula; they had no economic development strategy - they didn't have when they were in government and they didn't have in this last federal election. And, Mr. Speaker, we lost a government which was going to come to grips with the realities in Canada today; and the Canadian rejected that. And what is disappointing to me is that may well be a sign that the Canadian people are no longer willing to come to grips firmly with problems that confront them, and are going to take the easy way out and forget about the future.

And, Mr. Speaker, my main concern, if that is happening, is not for myself - because I am going to survive, and every member in this House is going to survive, Mr. Speaker, because we are reasonably well-established. But, Mr. Speaker, who will suffer from that lack of seeming care for the country will be my children and my grandchildren. And, Mr. Speaker, therein lies, indeed, the shame and the sadness if, in fact, the Canadian people are not willing to plan for their future, and to plan for a better Canada in the 1980s and the 1990s.

Our forefathers did it, Mr. Speaker. Men of vision and women of vision built this country, made sacrifices to pioneer western Canada and northern Ontario, the Maritimes; they built trans-continental railroads; they put in roads and ports and the economic infrastructure that we today are living and deriving the fruits of our economic wealth from; they made sacrifices, Mr. Speaker, in the past to make sure that our generation had that kind of economic stability and growth potential in this country. It appears as if we have lost our will to plan for the future. And, Mr. Speaker, if we have it is our children and our grandchildren who are going to suffer and that is the saddest part of that last federal election.

And the third area that I have disappointment in the federal election - and I'll just touch briefly on it - was what appears to be a failure. I want to put it gently because I don't want to appear overly-critical, but I believe there was a lack, Mr. Speaker, of very subjective and critical analysis by our electronic and printed media in the course of the last election. The media, Mr. Speaker, some nine months ago, in the May federal election, in the prospects of a three-candidate debate, the three leader debate, the Leader of the then Opposition, Mr. Joe Clark, was putting certain stipulations into the debate, and he was jumped upon by members of the media as being afraid to debate with the other two. He went into the debate and he did quite well, Mr. Speaker, but he took considerable personal criticism in the course of planning how he was going to get into that debate.

What we saw in this last February election, Mr. Speaker, was not the Leader of the Opposition, Pierre Trudeau, trying to negotiate to get into debate, but out and out refusing to debate. And did we hear an objective analysis and critique of why the man would not debate the other two leaders on national television as he did prior to that? No. And, Mr. Speaker, I feel that that was a less than fair presentation on the part of the electronic and the printed media. They didn't want to tell the Canadian people that the Leader of the Liberal party did not want to debate because he had no policies and no issues to offer to the public of Canada, to the voters. And that's the basic bottom line of it, Mr. Speaker. And, in the course of the campaign, when we had a Liberal party representative in Vancouver talking \$4.50 a barrel increase in oil price, and another Liberal party member in Quebec saying \$3.00, and the Leader himself saying \$3.50, there was no effective critique of where their policy was at. Had that been our leader, Mr. Clark, we would have been decimated in the pages of the press and in the electronic media. But very little mention was made of that. And I feel that, in this particular case, the media - electronic and printed both - failed in their obligation, in a democracy, to present to the voting people an objective analysis of the issues as they were being put forth; or, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, as to the lack of issues as they were being put forth.

Friday, 29 February, 1980

There was no objective critique of the third party's promise of a made in Canada energy price; or a made in Canada interest rate; they weren't objectively critiqued to find out what they were. The voting public were asked by the advertising to buy a pig in a poke. And, Mr. Speaker, no one in the media, to the best of my knowledge, asked the Leader of the ND Party, what is a made in Canada energy price? A vote for that party was a vote for a question mark price on energy, a made in Canada price which meant nothing because it had no dollar value assigned to it.

But, Mr. Speaker, enough of the federal election. I want to deal briefly with some of the issues that have come out and been presented according to the Throne Speech Debate. And I have to congratulate the Premier on the thrust that he has put into and garnered into this Throne Speech Debate. The Throne Speech represented a change for the good in this province. Some of the things that are going to come out of that Throne Speech Debate are things that all of us would like to be able to carry forward. And, Mr. Speaker, we will now carry them forward because, over the last two years, as was mentioned in the Throne Speech Debate, we have, through fiscal prudence, brought the province into such financial condition as to now enable us to expand programs where needed. And, Mr. Speaker, that direction is clearly, positively and definitely outlined in a very very good Throne Speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal briefly with the one area that primarily affects my department, that being the comments on branch line abandonment. Now, the Member for Ste. Rose, although he is not here today, attempted to put a question before you and was ruled out of order, and in his debate of the Throne Speech some days ago, he did mention what he was trying to get at in terms of reference to rail line abandonment. And if I follow his logic, or lack thereof, Mr. Speaker, to its natural conclusion, what he interpreted from that paragraph in the Throne Speech is that it was my intention, as Minister of Highways, to build roads so that we could abandon rail lines, and thereby further allow rail lines to leave this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a rather strange interpretation of what we said in the Throne Speech. And the Member for Ste. Rose, I hope, knows full well what our intentions are. My explanation will not be for him, or indeed, for members of the opposition, but will rather be for members of the media, because I think it is important for them to appreciate what that particular paragraph on rail line abandonment and road construction meant.

And to explain briefly, Mr. Speaker, a rail line abandonment involves a fairly prolonged process. It involves a process which starts out initially with a rail company, be it CN or CP, making application to the Canadian Transport Commission for the right to abandon a given piece of rail line, and they develop their reasoning through economic justification. They will say that their losses are too high; the track is in poor shape; and a number of reasons that they can present to CTC. CTC takes that application into consideration; if it is considered valid, a public hearing will be held. And at that public hearing all areas of concern bring the pro arguments and the con arguments together, and they make a decision on the viability of that rail line and, in fact, whether it should be abandoned. And in the process of that hearing, Mr. Speaker, the main people proposing abandonment, of course, are the railroads; the main people proposing retention are the local communities, the local municipalities through which that rail line may well travel, the grain companies in some cases, and in particular the provincial government. The provincial government in each case has a very very solid case to put forward, because rail line abandonment, in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, by and large, transfers costs from the federal treasury directly to the provincial and municipal treasuries. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal at stake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that process of rail line abandonment takes some five years as a minimum figure before you will have an abandonment order for the rail line to be abandoned on a given date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose is chastizing this government for wanting to build roads to accommodate the transfer of tonnage of freight from rail lines to the highways, and he has interpreted it, in his wisdom, that we are going to build roads so that the railroads can abandon the railways. Not so, Mr. Speaker. What we are building roads for, Mr. Speaker, is a little list that I've just recently received. Now bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that it is a some five-year process from the application by a railroad to abandon a rail line until the time that the rail line service is discontinued - some five years.

I want to give you some status on prairie rail lines as of January 15, 1980; Manitoba CNR lines. Cabot, as a subdivision - and these are subdivisions, Mr. Speaker. The abandonment order comes in effect August 29, 1975. Carberry, abandonment December 31, 1978; Carman, four subdivisions in Carman, ranging in abandonment order from February 7, 1978 to November 16, 1975 to December 31, 1978; Hartney, two abandonments, November 22, 1975,

Friday, 29 February, 1980

June 9, 1978. And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker, 1978, 1975, 1977. We can go into CP lines, 1978 on the Alida sub; the Carman sub CP, 1975, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, what we are accommodating in the capital budget of the Department of Highways is not building roads so the railroads can abandon more lines. We are building, Mr. Speaker, roads that are necessary because the rail lines are already abandoned. And, Mr. Speaker, they were abandoned in the course of time that our honourable friends opposite had the jurisdiction and the provincial input to prevent that abandonment, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, naturally the Member for Ste. Rose and his colleague, the Member for Brandon East, who had responsibility for rail line abandonment in this province in presenting the province's case, want to try to hide the fact that they failed dismally in saving any rail lines in this province, Mr. Speaker. From 1975 to 1978 there are 30 some subbranches, subdivisions, abandoned in the Province of Manitoba, while that government should have been fighting on behalf of rural Manitoba to retain some of those lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate why that didn't happen, because if you take a look at the makeup of that government when they were in government, they lacked total and complete representation from rural agricultural Manitoba. And they didn't give a hot damn about it. And their presentation to the Canadian Transport Commission must have been very very minute and weak, Mr. Speaker. And that is the reason why today, Mr. Speaker, my government, the government on this side of the House, is forced into substantial capital investment in the roads, the PRs and the PTHs of this province, to accommodate grain movement caused by abandonment that occurred in the time of government of the ND Party in Manitoba. That, Mr. Speaker, is the true fact of what that statement in the Throne Speech refers to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Member for Brandon East, who is talking from his seat again as he is so wanton and aghast whenever any of us do it. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to give credit where credit is due on this whole rail line abandonment process. The credit for abandonment goes to my friends in opposition from their term of government, because more steel got abandoned in their term than in any time of this province, Mr. Speaker. They are the abandonment kings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the last two-and-a-half years that we have been on this side of the House we, a party of members, the Minister of Agriculture from rural southwestern Manitoba, the Member for Roblin, the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Emerson, the Member for Springfield, the Member for Portage la Prairie, myself as a backbencher in this government, in two-and-a-half years, Mr. Speaker, we worked with three departments and with some seven staff man years. Those staff man years, those seven staff were in the Department of Economic Development, the Highways Department and, Mr. Speaker, the Highways Department. Seven staff that worked a diligent and dedicated effort and deserve the full credit of every citizen of this province for the effort they put forward in two-and-a-half years. Because, Mr. Speaker, those seven staff worked tirelessly to develop a position for this government to present to the Canadian Transport Commission, to give us the ammunition, Mr. Speaker, that we needed to save some rail lines in this province. And that is in two-and-a-half years, Mr. Speaker, since we have had that kind of input into the rail abandonment process.

And, Mr. Speaker, what are the results of our two-and-a-half years efforts and the untiring efforts of those seven staff? The result of that effort, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that today the Rosburn subdivision is running south of Riding Mountain Park and servicing many communities in that area, is now in the basic network to the year 2000. That, Mr. Speaker, is our effort, our effort, Mr. Speaker.

A second line, Mr. Speaker, that is now in the basic network to the year 2000, it just so happens, and I know the members opposite will accuse me of political implications because it runs right through the middle of my constituency, it's 145 miles long, it's the Morris to Hartney subdivision. That is in the basic network to the year 2000, Mr. Speaker.

There is one more major line in this province that was saved, and it's in the Honourable Minister of Agriculture's constituency, the Waskada line, is now in the basic network to the year 2000. Mr. Speaker, God forbid if that gang of people had been in government when the abandonment process was ongoing on those lines; we would have lost another 250 miles of steel in this province. And they still wouldn't have built a single road to accommodate the traffic, Mr. Speaker, because they froze out every single road in those areas the time they had control of the road budget.

And, Mr. Speaker, then they sit back and have the gall and the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to sit back, as the Member for Ste. Rose did just in this session alone, and say that we are building

Friday, 29 February, 1980

roads so we can abandon more rail lines. The hypocrite - he doesn't understand what his own government did to rural Manitoba.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we have people like the Member for Transcona, who last year in the Estimates in the Department of Highways said, why don't you build roads without shoulders and save some money. That was the Member for Transcona's solution to the transportation problems in rural Manitoba. Build roads without shoulders. Mr. Speaker, that shows the level of integrity and a concern for rural Manitoba that the ND Party has in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege. I was saying that we shouldn't be paving shoulders in a time of restraint, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has noted a difference in interpretation. I'm sorry, it is not a point of privilege, but he has made that notification at the present time.

The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: So, Mr. Speaker, what we are going to hear, no doubt, in this Session, and in the course of my Estimates that will be coming up, we are going to hear that the Conservative government builds roads. They care for pavement before people, roads before hospitals. That's the kind of attitude that we're going to have pumped out by that group of people. And, Mr. Speaker, how can they justify that kind of attitude when they put no dollars into reconstruction of roads, put under stress and duress because of rail line abandonment that they condoned as government. Do they expect the citizens and the people of rural Manitoba in the agricultural communities to be second class citizens and not have the transportation system that they deserve now that that former government allowed the abandonment of rail lines? Is that what they're telling the people of rural Manitoba, is that they're second class citizens and don't deserve any roads?

Mr. Speaker, I hope not, because if that's their attitude towards rural Manitoba, then they haven't learned their lesson of eight years of government wherein they lost all the minuscule agricultural representation that they did have, they lost it all. And, Mr. Speaker, that kind of attitude, the no shoulders on the roads attitude, the pavement before people that they're going to throw at the press and everybody, will keep them sealed out of rural Manitoba. Because the New Democratic Party considers, Mr. Speaker, that rural Manitobans are second class citizens. And they consider that, Mr. Speaker, because they don't happen to vote New Democrat. And anybody who doesn't vote New Democrat, according to their criteria, is a second class citizen.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's what happened in eight years. The people in rural Manitoba know that happened, and the people in rural Manitoba know that this government has addressed itself to the transportation needs of rural Manitoba and of the whole province. And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to address ourselves to the transportation needs of all Manitobans, including the ones in rural Manitoba affected by rail line abandonment.

And, Mr. Speaker, why do we do it? Do we like spending money on roads and having roads here, roads there? Mr. Speaker, we build roads into the rural Manitoba communities to service the growing industrial base in those communities. We want to see all areas of the province grow, Mr. Speaker. We want to see the Mordens and the Winklers and the Carmans and the Altonas grow, Mr. Speaker, through the provision to them of not only rail service, but of a decent, all-weather truck and car transportation system. We want to see the Roblins grow, Mr. Speaker, by providing the Town of Roblin with a year-round truck transportation route, unrestricted.

And, Mr. Speaker, we will do that. We will do that in upcoming budgets, and we will service the communities of Dauphin and the other communities of rural Manitoba to give them the opportunity to grow and become part of the industrial and economic fabric of this province, as they rightfully deserve, Mr. Speaker - something that our colleagues in the opposition, when they were government, failed to recognize and didn't address themselves to, and they let the road system of this province drop into a shambles, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will accept openly and completely some of the no-shoulder criticisms, some of the pavement before people criticisms because, Mr. Speaker, in the long run, the economic stability and growth in this province depends on an efficient transportation and distribution

Friday, 29 February, 1980

system. We intend, in this side of the House, in this government, to provide that transportation system to all areas of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, we will have many times, many times, budgets to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I've dealt enough with some of the silliness that has been presented already in the Throne Speech Debate by the Member for Ste. Rose. And I want to digress a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and I want to address myself to the 1980s. Because, Mr. Speaker, it's the 1980s that are going to be important to members on this side of the House, because we have the task before us to govern this province in the 1980s and see that the Province of Manitoba grows and thrives in the 1980s. And, Mr. Speaker, to date, in the last two years of government, we have made substantial strides in developing the economic viability and stability of this province. And, Speaker, how have we done it? We have done it by removing the long arm of government from unnecessary intrusion into the private sector. And, Mr. Speaker, that is paying off.

Mr. Speaker, we have industrial growth and expansion, plant manufacturing capacity increases in my constituency, in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, like we've never seen before in this province.

Now I full well appreciate that members opposite don't know that kind of growth is going on, because they have never driven south of the Perimeter Highway in their life, Mr. Speaker. They don't recognize that there is anything beyond the Perimeter Highway in Manitoba. And southern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, has responded positively, dynamically, and aggressively to the policies that we have instituted in this government of bringing spending under control, bringing deficits down to the manageable level that they should be at and stopping unnecessary spending by government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 1980s present a considerable challenge to all Manitobans and, Mr. Speaker, part of that challenge is in developing renewable resources in this province. And immediately, when renewable energy is mentioned, everyone thinks automatically of Manitoba Hydro and our hydro-electric development. That's an important part of it, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, agriculture serves the greatest source of renewable energy in this province, than any other source that we have, including Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, we are currently burning such commodities as flax straw which may well, with new processes, come in to the solid fuel needs of space heating in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, that will come and that will come very shortly and it will come with this government in power to encourage that kind of development and thrust into the 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, the other area has been touched upon by the Minister of Agriculture. It's gasohol, that is a very positive and definite new step that rural agricultural Manitoba will bring to this province and bring development and growth to this province and solve an energy problem at the same time, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, we will take such things as our oil seed economy, the soybeans, the flax seed, the rapeseed, the sunflower, the oil seed production in this province will take off dramatically. It has done so over the past few years. That represents, Mr. Speaker, untold creation of wealth in this province, because the agricultural sector has been the stablest, steadiest and most efficient generator of revenues to this province of any industry. And, Mr. Speaker, will continue to be that under the very excellent guidance and leadership in the Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House, quite to the contrast of the man who occupied the Chair before who wanted to nationalize agriculture with state farms; he wanted to take over the cheese factories; he wanted to take over the food processing; he wanted to nationalize everything as we have heard through many speeches over here in the past several days. We have heard that they want to nationalize the oil industry; they want to have public ownership; they want to get back into the state farms. You name it, they want to get in to complete public domination and ownership.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to one little sore point that I've always had and I don't want to take much time on it because it takes a long time to explain, but the whole energy situation, Mr. Speaker, as presented by members of the NDP party is a joke. They have played pitilessly upon the lack of knowledge amongst the voters in terms of energy policy. They have promoted, through strict lack of knowledge, that PetroCan is the only salvation to the energy situation in Canada. That's the NDP party. They want, nationally, to have PetroCanada to be the only oil company; they want PetroCanada, Mr. Speaker, to have all the retail stations across Canada so you drive into a PetroCanada station. And, Mr. Speaker, if one gives it some basic thought about making PetroCanada the only oil company that's responsible for oil and gas distribution in Canada, ask yourself one simple question, do you want the same people pumping gas and running refineries as currently run our post office, Mr. Speaker? I suggest,

Friday, 29 February, 1980

Mr. Speaker, most Canadians don't want that. The whole aura that they have been able to develop, and quite successfully, the big myth about PetroCanada, will be blown apart. The big myth will be blown apart because, Mr. Speaker, just recently I discussed energy with a northern California farmer, California is a state of the U.S., and this farmer in northern California - isn't it amazing, gentlemen what a little bit of knowledge will do for them? That is something, obviously, Mr. Speaker, they didn't learn in school.

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

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In discussion with this northern California farmer, I asked him, "What are you paying for diesel fuel on your farm now?" And he didn't know to the exact cent what he was paying but it was over a dollar a gallon, he said. Now, that is a U.S. gallon, that is U.S. currency. Translated into Canadian prices that's approximately \$1.45 a gallon. And, Mr. Speaker, I checked this morning with my local fuel dealer and I'm paying 75 cents a gallon in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the NDP party throughout western Canada told the farming people that you people are so inefficient that you cannot stand an 18 cent in your fuel costs because you will be knocked out of the market by the competition. Mr. Speaker, the competition is paying twice what we are for fuel. Isn't that the most ridiculous statement that you've ever heard in your life? And the bottom line of that statement, Mr. Speaker, is it demonstrates clearly and unequivocally, as I have stated in rail line abandonment, that the NDP party has no confidence in the agricultural community and their ability to survive and become an efficient part of Canada's economy. They don't understand, they tell them that they can't compete because of 18 cents a gallon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, the energy thing, as I say, is a very complex issue but if we follow the NDP party's policy to its natural finale we will drain Canada of the conventional oil sources at \$14.75 a barrel because they don't want any increase at any time by any means. Mr. Speaker, once the conventional oil at \$14.75 a barrel is gone, some several years from now, we will go onto the world market and pay up to \$50 a barrel. What will the farmers say then? What, Mr. Speaker, will the poor people of Canada, who they claim to represent, say at that point in time when their fuel costs rise, not from \$1.15 but the \$4. a barrel because that party wanted to live for today and forget about tomorrow and, Mr. Speaker, that is the basic difference between a Conservative party and a NDP party. The Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, are prepared to offer realistic options for the future of this province and this country. The socialist party want to live for today, get the vote for today, be in power today and to hell with the future, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member's time has not expired I wonder if he would answer a question? The honourable member has said that at the world price, by the time we run out of energy, it will be \$50 a barrel and then we'll have to pay it and that we, therefore, shouldn't keep our present price low. If we do keep our present price low, excuse me, if we do let our present price go up which is what he and his party is advocating, what will we have to pay when the price of oil goes up to \$50 a barrel, will we not be paying the same \$50.00?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the oil production situation in Canada, the current per barrel price of the next tar sands development is something like \$24 a barrel and that, Mr. Speaker, is where the excess revenues should and will go into the development of our own internal supplies of oil as come from the tar sands, and we can, Mr. Speaker, isolate ourselves from the \$50 a barrel. But if we don't spend the money now, Mr. Speaker, we don't have the tar sands development and we go on the world market at \$50 a barrel. The choice is his.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member's time is up.  
The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin by thanking you, Mr. Speaker, for the guidance you have provided to me in the first week that I

Friday, 29 February, 1980

have sat in this House. I trust that you will be somewhat patient as the new members learn some of the rules. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you consider, or this House allow me at this time to make a brief correction of one question that I had previously asked in haste, when I was rattled. The question was incorrectly asked and I would just like to correct that before I go on. It's recorded in Hansard on page 141 for Thursday, February 28th. The question was recorded as: the question I have for the Minister is, can he confirm that the total cost of this escapade in Hong Kong has been more than \$300,000 to the taxpayers of Manitoba? Yes, I agree, that is what I said. I would like to correct that, that is not what I meant to ask. What I meant to ask was, was the total cost of the escapade and including all other costs incurred with respect to that case, more than \$300,000.00.

I would also like, at this time, to thank all of those members of the House on both sides who have been of assistance and have been so warm in providing information to me in the first week. It is very much appreciated. I would like, however, to give special mention to several members of the House on the other side. I enjoyed the speech of the Minister of Supply and Services. I might add that I enjoyed his visits to Rossmere during last fall, during October of 1979. And he was right, when he went into 210 Oakland, that was a trouble spot. The Tories, in fact, lost 210 Oakland.

The Member for Morris was also kind enough to visit on MacAulay Crescent. He was correct in his assessment, MacAulay Crescent was a trouble spot for the Tories and it went NDP. I would like to give special thanks to the Attorney-General for his intercession in the dying days of his candidate's campaign. He was of great assistance.

I am the successor to Edward Schreyer as the Member of the Legislature for Rossmere. My predecessor saw government as an instrument which could be used to improve the quality of life for our citizens. He saw government as having a role to play in the economy of this province and in the planning of the economy of this province. He saw one of its functions as being providing greater equity in the distribution of goods and services amongst the people in our society, amongst those people who work so hard to produce those goods and services. In his eight years as Premier, he proved that an activist government can be as successful as those on this side of the House had hoped for. Indeed, in retrospect, the government that Ed Schreyer led looks even better today, when we have the performance of the current government . . . During Edward Schreyer's years in Manitoba I was involved within the New Democratic Party and, as well, in his latter period in public life. In Manitoba I was a constituent of his. He became both a personal and political friend. I, therefore, am pleased to take this opportunity, on behalf of my family and on behalf of all of the people of Rossmere, to thank Edward Schreyer for a job well done and to wish him well in his current position as Governor-General. The constituency of Rossmere is one of the largest in Manitoba in terms of population. People whose roots go back to nearly every nation on earth reside there. The largest groups hailed from the British Isles and Europe. Rossmere counts among its people a substantial portion of those Mennonites who came to Manitoba from Russia. I count myself among the thousands of Rossmere residents who are children of parents who escaped to this great province from Russian dictatorship during the 1920s.

We also have in Rossmere a great number of Mennonites who have come to our province from the right-wing dictatorship in Paraguay. Probably half of the Chilean refugees of Fascism, who migrated to this province, reside in Rossmere. Rossmere residents then, Mr. Speaker, have some awareness of, and an absolute distaste and abhorrence for dictatorships, be they from the left or the right. I'm dealing with this, Mr. Speaker, because of certain innuendos and statements made by members on the other side during this past week. I refer specifically to the speech of the Member for Morris and a comment by the Member for River Heights with respect to totalitarianism. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that not one single solitary nation on this earth, not one, has moved from an elected social democratic government to a dictatorship. Batista, Chiang Kai-shek, . . . , . . . , . . . , all of them had one thing, in fact, they had two things in common, other than leading their countries into a dictatorship and being dictatorships. The first was they were right-wing, the second thing they had in common was their people were not free under their particular rule. Our people are proud of the record of the New Democratic Party in support of freedom, including economic as well as political freedoms.

Some years ago I had the privilege to get to know John Schreyer, the late father of Edward Schreyer, our current Governor-General. I vividly recall his anger, in the mid 1970s, as he told me about the Tories taking the vote away from German Canadians during the First World War. The Governor-General's father lost his right to vote in this country as a result of



Friday, 29 February, 1980

actions taken by the predecessors of the Conservatives. The New Democrats, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, need no lessons in freedom from the Tories.

The constituency of Rossmere is, in relationship to most other districts in this province, relatively fortunate. Many of our citizens acquired their homes prior to the price of housing substantially rising. We have more parks and green spaces than many other urban areas, especially when we compare Rossmere to the downtown area. A few of our residents have the opportunity to view the now tamed Red River, which flows along the most westerly borders of Rossmere. It is a shame that in times past so little riverfront land was retained for the benefit of all of our people. Our riding has few of the downtown problems of single parent families, of migrant families, or violence which plague certain portions of the city. Yet I was sent to this House, Mr. Speaker, not to tell you of the wonders contained within Rossmere, but rather to do what I can in concert with the other members of this Assembly to make this great province a better place in which to live.

Therefore, I would like to refer you to several matters which are of current concern to the people of Rossmere. There are several local issues which I will mention to the House. The first is the matter of the Bergen cut-off, which is an abandoned CPR rail line, running east through the heart of Rossmere, from the Red River to Lagimodiere Boulevard. This property was transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway in January of 1930 by the ideological predecessors of this government in Ottawa. The land was transferred for railroad purposes and yet the Canadian Transport Commission tells me that the CPR abandoned the line in 1928, a full two years before it received title to that property for railroad purposes. One can only speculate as to why this was done by the federal government at that time. But as a result Rossmere residents have been bowing to the CPR, morning and night, for 52 years since that abandonment, driving under the railway on Henderson as they travel to and from their place of work. During all these years the CPR has paid no taxes on that property and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that its continued ownership of that property is in contravention of all laws of human decency. I would hope that all members would be of assistance in ensuring that this traffic hazard and symbol will be removed shortly.

I regret to inform the House that the market gardens in the northern part of Rossmere, which probably most of you remember, have now disappeared. In their place stand apartment blocks, townhouses and residential subdivisions. They are a monument to the mistakes of the past, both the previous government and the current government. However, if one were to ask practically any resident of Rossmere, Mr. Speaker, what precisely is the overriding issue of the day in our area, I believe that the answer would be that people are concerned about the direction in which the economy of this province is heading at this time. Practically everyone in the constituency has a friend or relative or acquaintance who has been required to leave this province in search of employment in the last several years. People in all areas of our riding are affected. Many of our residents have lost their homes through mortgage foreclosures. Bankruptcies are up substantially.

Under the former government, businesses complained about taxation, about the mineral acreage tax, succession duties, gift taxes, high corporate taxes, personal income taxes, which were above the national average at higher rates of income, mining taxes and other taxes. No one likes to pay taxes. On the other hand, many of small business people, especially the building contractors and construction people, would prefer to pay high rates of taxes on income as opposed to no tax on no income and that is what is happening now, Mr. Speaker. They find themselves in that position because of a government which has changed direction substantially from previous Conservative policy, past policy, even of Conservative governments, has been interventionist at least to some extent. Current policy is total inactivity on the economic front. Current policy is a belief in Adam Smith, neo-Conservatism they call it. He might not even do what they're doing.

Current policy is a belief that there is an invisible hand writing a message on the wall and the people of Rossmere know that there is no hand. They know that there is no message and they know that the wall is going up, the construction is happening in other provinces, not in Manitoba. The notion that business decisions made by many individuals, each for his or her own benefit will, when added together, create the best of all possible worlds is wrong and I urge this government to heed the warnings, even of its friends, such as the editorial writers of the Winnipeg Press, and to become involved in this economy and to start considering planning in this economy.

I urge the government to get on with the business of developing our hydro-electric resources in the north. I urge the government to consider capital projects, such as, for instance, improvement of our urban transportation system. I urge the government to invest

substantially in senior citizens' housing and nursing homes. There is a real need for this kind of investment. It will become more urgent year by year. Our senior citizens deserve no less; I remind the government that they promised, in those heady days of 1977, that they would end the lineups at senior citizens' homes. I recall the campaign at Rossmere very vividly, and what do we see in today's paper, Sigfried Enns, the Director of the Concordia Hospital, indicates that 25 percent, yes, he's got 25 percent of the beds in his hospital devoted to nursing home care while this government does no building. And certainly, although it's indicating that it's planning on doing some in the future, it's plans are not adequate.

This is cutting into medical care in this province and this is causing great expense, in terms of care of senior citizens and that is not even dealing with the human aspects of giving these people dignity and a place to live in.

There are other problems in the province and in Rossmere. Our senior citizens are having ever more difficulty paying their property tax bills, while large corporations pay less in taxes. Our single parent families are having difficulty with day care, while mining companies no longer pay mineral acreage tax. Our traffic problems are increasing yearly; our new areas receive poor bus service; our main arteries, toward downtown, are clogged with cars standing and traffic jams guzzling scarce fuel. Street clearing is sparse; our sewer system is not upgraded; basements are flooded; property tax has increased; municipal services are declining, and they're declining rapidly. Unfortunately, too many people are, Sir, too many people are. Police and fire fighting services are not being upgraded, and estate and gift taxes were eliminated, and this by a government that talks about tough budgets, this by a government that says the last federal budget wasn't tough enough. Tough enough, tough on whom? Let's start asking who's belt should be tightened and I suggest to you that the people of this province believe that the wrong belts are being tightened right now.

Education, education authorities chop away at education programs. School closures are threatened; special needs of children are required. Native children's education needs are shelved. Inner-city, inner-city education needs are not being met; teacher morale is declining. Homeowners are being crushed by increasing education taxes combined by unconscionable mortgage interest rates, which the friends of the government opposite had something to do with over a period of about six or nine months, and if the Province fails to keep its promise of 1977 to meet 80 percent of the foundation grant payment for education in the province, and in fact, that amount is going down, the percentage is going down every year.

Our architects, our engineers, carpenters, boilermakers, students leave the province while the Ministers of the Crown quote statistics, and tell us that statistically somehow everything is fine. You know very well it's not fine. --(Interjection)-- They say they're sleeping well at night, yes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with some of the problems and concerns that I have. I'm sure, providing that we, in this Assembly, are prepared to work together, solutions can be found. I look forward, with a great deal of pleasure and anticipation, to working with the other members of this Assembly to improve the quality of life in this province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, it's with pleasure that I rise to participate in the Throne Speech Debate of this the fourth session of the 31st Legislature. I extend sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, not merely through custom but through sincerity on the the resumption of the duties of your high office. I am sure that you will continue in the fine manner you established in the first three sessions of this 31st Legislature, preserving order and decorum through the deliberations of this Assembly with the dignity, the impartiality and the good humour to which this House has become accustomed.

I also extend a warm welcome to the three new members of this House: The Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Rossmere, and of course my new colleague, the Member for River Heights.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the three new Ministers who have now taken their place on the Executive Council. During the past two years, as their caucus colleagues, I have come to know and to admire their particular strengths, and I know they will make a marked contribution to this House, to this government, and to this province.

I also extend congratulations to the Member for Virden on his election as Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. I've also come to know and respect the Member for Virden over the past two years. He has a reputation of being somewhat of a

loner, and that he is particularly cautious about spending a dollar. I am sure that if any member really needed it, the Member for Virden would give him the shirt off his back, and the key word, Mr. Speaker, is 'really needed it'. However, the Member for Virden would probably rather be caught with his hand in the till than have any of us think he was a nice guy. After observing for two years the dedication and common sense which the member serves his constituents, I know the members of this House will be well served during our many hours of Committee work.

May I also extend belated congratulations to the Member for Selkirk on his election as leader of his party and hence Leader of the Opposition. We wish him a long and happy career in his new position, though I temper those good wishes so as not to infringe upon any decisions the people of Selkirk might make at the next election.

The Member for Emerson earlier alluded to the boat he is steering. I don't know how many leaks it has sprung, but there do appear to be some problems. One member of the crew, while he may not have had to walk the plank, has certainly been cast adrift - although he is perhaps more certain of his direction than the rest of the boat. When he was Opposition House Leader, the Member for Inkster provided the colour and the spirit and indeed the very heart of his party's activity here in this House. Since his departure, we are seeing a pretty drab lot. Mr. Speaker, we now seem to have the bland leading the bland. And if we subscribe to the theory that good opposition makes good government, then this government in front of me is going to have to go it alone.

A number of the members opposite have indicated some pride and satisfaction in the outcome of the February 18th election. As a Tory, of course, I am somewhat disappointed by the outcome. I would simply caution the members opposite that an increase of about 2 percent in popular vote has given them two more seats here in Manitoba. On the national scene, the results were also not to my liking. The people of Canada exercised their franchise and made their choice. So be it.

However, Mr. Speaker, not in the twenty-five years or so that I've paid attention to these things have I seen and heard the sense of unease or alienation felt by my neighbours and constituents since the February 18th election. Never in that quarter-century or so have I heard the wave of western alienation, and indeed mutterings about western separation, than I have in the past few days. And these mutterings and talk about western separation comes from people who are every bit as loyal and dedicated Canadians as any person in this House.

I trust that the election results in eastern Canada are not being interpreted by eastern Canadians as a licence to raid western Canadian resources. Or, more particularly, the continued privilege of receiving Alberta and Saskatchewan oil at less than half the world price. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the new Liberal government in Ottawa has a monumental task ahead of it. Not only must they negotiate appropriate energy prices with the producing provinces, but their activities and attitudes must also address that widespread feeling of alienation that I observe at this time.

I know my government is going to work with the federal government in Ottawa in a most constructive fashion to deal with these issues. I was proud, of course, to actively support the Clark government in the campaign leading up to the February 18th election. Mr. Clark and his government presented a budget that was a courageous and I believe necessary attack on the problems facing our nation. The opposition of the day found that budget wanting, and as is their right and is indeed their duty, defeated the government. The campaign which followed gave the opposition parties an opportunity to place concrete alternatives before the people of Canada. However, Mr. Speaker, I found the approach made by the Liberal Party to the people of Canada for re-election was both cynical and hypocritical.

The NDP, to their credit, did state a policy on energy; namely, create a state-owned oil company and automatically all our problems are solved - a Pollyanna solution, to be sure, but at least they stated it.

The Canadian people have disapproved of the Clark government's solution, but I shall be watching and listening. I will be very interested in what people are saying six months from now, two years from now, four years from now. I shall be looking forward to discussing this matter, and any others, with my friends opposite in this House or on the hustings.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be appropriate to call it 5:30 at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30?

The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.