

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, 17 December, 1980**

**Time — 2:00 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS  
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Second Interim Report of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee dated November 21, 1980.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the effects in various ways upon the Province of Manitoba by way of the closure of the Tribune, can the First Minister advise what was the reason that the Government of the Province of Manitoba failed to provide the Kent Commission Inquiry on Newspapers with a submission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, the government gave consideration to the question of the Kent Commission and in terms of reference of that commission and decided that on balance, other than restating the problem which was the effect really of most of the submissions that were heard, that there was no need for a formal presentation as such. We did, however, have an informal meeting with the commission by way of a luncheon that was tendered for the three commissioners while they were here and had the opportunity for informal discussion with them at that time.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then I ask the First Minister, what advantage could there be in an informal kind of meeting in which various suggestions were obviously made by the First Minister. I assume that wasn't only a luncheon meeting but that suggestions were made, rather than a brief being submitted in public, so that all Manitobans would know the contents of same and the position adopted by the Government of the Province of Manitoba an open submission.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is the one who said suggestions were made. I never said they were made at all.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then the luncheon meeting was even more useless than I might have thought earlier. Can the Minister of Government Services announce when he, as the Minister on behalf of Autopac, will be announcing the new Autopac rate schedule for the year 1981?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, as a former Chairman of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is well aware that it's at this time of year that the situation is being reviewed and I'm anticipating recommendations from the Chairman and the Board of Directors of Autopac at any time about any restructuring of the rates in the coming year. There likely will have to be some increases considered and consider the situation in our other provinces across Canada, particularly in the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the days are fast running out prior to which the registration notices, billings, must be forwarded to the motorists of the Province of Manitoba, is the Minister indicating that he has as of this date received no recommendations from the Chairman of the Board of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation or no submission as to proposed rate increases?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware that when an announcement can be made the announcement will be made. In this particular instance he need not remind me of the time that the corporation requires to send out the appropriate billings, which I understand come out sometime on or about the middle part of January.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister of Government Services. In view of the information which has been received of criminal charges being laid as against a tow driver for Auto Rescue Limited along with other various towing companies, in view of the fact that Auto Rescue Limited apparently has sole responsibility for all towing pertaining to Autopac within the City of Winnipeg, can the Minister advise whether there is any investigation under way or will he be charging anyone with responsibility for an investigation to ensure that Autopac and Autopac's users have not in any way, shape or form been effected by any alleged criminal conduct pertaining to the towing trucks involved?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I have sufficient confidence that the General Manager, Mr. Dutton, at Autopac would have notified me immediately if there was any reason for the corporation, or indeed for government, to pursue any action in this regard. I have received no such notice from Autopac and make the assumption therefore that some of the current problems relative to towing did not occur

with respect to the operations of Autopac and/or the towing firm that they do business with.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, if I may interrupt, I would like to, at this time, introduce to honourable members 120 students of Grade 9 standing from the Bruce Junior High School, under the direction of Mr. H. Mann. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

We also have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the Westdale Junior High, under the direction of Mr. Williams. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

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

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

### ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

**MR. LAURENT J. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. Can the Minister tell us how many new day care spaces have been approved since September, and how many of those are presently being operated?

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

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been a total of in excess of 424 new spaces, a combination of new and after school, as well as home day care spaces have been allotted since September 15th.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I take it then that they are all in operation right now?

**MR. MINAKER:** No.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Could the Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, how long does it take to have an application processed for a group day care?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I can't at this time, but I'll get the information for the honourable member.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Following yesterday's unhappy events a number of people have questioned me regarding a statement that the First Minister made to the effect that the former member for Wolseley would not be receiving any part of his indemnity, and I have been asked to ask the First Minister to confirm that, in view of the fact that the former member for Wolseley and was recognized and was given an opportunity to speak, will he be receiving all or part of his sessional indemnity, or any other allowance?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the question that this House will have to decide, but as I indicated

last evening, Mr. Speaker, just to make that point clear, that's not something that the Premier turns on or off, it's a decision that is made by this Legislature. For those who were moaning, what I indicated last night, Mr. Speaker, was that the government would be bringing forward legislation for the consideration of the House at this session which would make it impossible for the situation that we saw yesterday to result in the member receiving any emolument or indemnity for his brief appearance in the House. I made that quite clear, and I am happy to repeat it today, but that will be a decision — government will bring the bill in — it will be a decision that the House will have to make based on that bill.

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

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question on another subject is directed to the Honourable Minister of Education and refers to The Public Schools Act. When will the Minister be bringing the regulations forward, when will they be made public, please, regulations in connection with the new Public Schools Act?

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to inform the member that those regulations are available as of today.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** He didn't give me the question to ask, Mr. Speaker. Referring to Section 41(4) of The Public Schools Act, Mr. Speaker, which reads: "Every school board shall provide or make provision for education in Grades 1 to 12 inclusive for all resident persons who have the right to attend school", can the Minister tell the House, please, what specific steps are being taken to make sure that this is complied with?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I think that would probably take a little more time than you would be prepared to give me in this instance, but I can assure the honourable member that there are a number of programs that have been initiated by this government and, of course, supports that have been initiated by this government that will make that quite feasible.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can tell us when he intends to call a by-election for the constituency of Wolseley.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, after all of yesterday's discussion, I would have thought that, as we can apprehend it at the present time, there is no vacancy in that seat.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister — I guess I cannot blame him, but I have nobody else to blame — has created the anomalous position of a member, who is not a

member, what are the duties of this member and if he has duties and I don't wish to be mistaken, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that he should receive a sessional indemnity because I don't think he is a member? But if the First Minister says he is a member and has obligations to his constituents, can he tell us what he intends to propose about an indemnity for the service that he says that member, who he says is a sitting member and for the constituency for which he will not call a by-election, what does he propose by way of indemnity for this person?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I think that as and when the government is in a position to bring forward proposed amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act to cover that and other situations relating to that particular point, the situation will become clear. I point out to him that while it may be perceived by the honourable member as being an anomaly, if my recollection or information is correct, the former Member of the House of Commons who was tried and convicted of an indictable offence back in 1945-46, Fred Rose, and so far as I am aware did not have any appeal procedures to free him because as I recall habeas corpus was suspended, his seat remained in that position with no member, that is, with him still being the member for the seat but not in the House of Commons for I think the better part of a year or so until, as I am told, the final appeal procedures have been matured, and then the House was in a position to act. And did act, as I recall, by a motion of the Prime Minister, seconded by the then Minister of Justice, the Right Honourable Mr. St. Laurent, declaring the seat vacant and calling for a by-election after the appeal procedures had been exhausted.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I note that that House didn't act until after the appeal procedures had been exhausted. I think that we have somewhat of a different situation in that I believe that Mr. Rose was incarcerated throughout. Mr. Wilson is not incarcerated, the First Minister says he is a member, and supposed to be doing things, I suppose for his constituents, although, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to again underline I do not think that he is a member, nor do I think that he is entitled to a legislative indemnity because he is not a member, and that's why I asked that a by-election be called. But will the First Minister tell us, does he propose, because yesterday he seemed to suggest that there would be no indemnity, if this man is a member, he is not incarcerated, ostensibly therefore responsible to his constituents, does the Minister propose that there is going to be some type of remuneration for this obligation?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development. The company

referred to, or known as Pennex Limited, publishers of the magazines Enterprise West, Winnipeg Woman, and I believe more than 20 other publications, has now gone into receivership. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he or his department were aware that this particular company was experiencing financial difficulties, and also whether his department offered any technical services, and other type of assistance to this particular firm?

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

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, our department was made aware of the problems of the company that the members suggests or mentions was having. We have been in contact with them. We have offered at any time our staff that's available to assist small business to advise on any type of problems that they may have. We also will make available to them people that are experienced in their business in any way we can to assist them to be successful, unfortunately we weren't able to do that.

**MR. EVANS:** Well can the Honourable Minister advise whether his department is maintaining a file or a list, or some kind of documentation of other companies that may be on the verge of bankruptcy or on the verge of moving out of the province, and whether if such a file exists could he advise us, is it a file perhaps of firms that may be considering closing up within the next three months or the next six months or whatever.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, we have no way of knowing, unless they come to us, their thoughts, or we have no way of knowing their problems until they come to us. Many times when we make, you might say, our regular calls on many companies, we are informed of problems and we are sometimes able to assist them before they become too serious. As regarding a file of people going bankrupt, that is available through my honourable colleagues' offices, the people that have filed bankruptcies. We keep track of those the same way as we keep track of companies that are continually opening in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and I might mention one in Stonewall, Bristol Aircraft, 4.5 million investment in the new rocket plant, 69 jobs that we're very proud of, and you know who announced that, Mr. Speaker, it happened to be through a DREE grant, Mr. Sargent, the MP, was very pleased to announce that.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, while we read of some failures and bankruptcies and closures, we don't hear of all of them or at least not all of us hear about them, and I understand the Association of Medical Basics in Selkirk has recently announced the closure with 30 to 35 jobs going down the tube so to speak.

**MR. LYON:** 30,000 new jobs in Manitoba than when you were in, how do you explain them?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to explain how Manitoba has dwindled in its share of job creation in this province, this country of ours in

the last few years, there's no doubt that we have dwindled in the number of jobs created in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister, unfortunately in view of the large number of failures and closures and businesses moving out of the province, would the Minister consider devising some sort of early warning system so that he and his department and perhaps his colleagues would have some advance notice of what might be occurring and would be in a better position for all of us to possibly help these or certainly to help the employees that may be adversely effected?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the company that he mentions in Selkirk, Manitoba, his own leader and Member for Selkirk was aware of it at least two months ago. I corresponded with him on the subject and brought him up-to-date on all the questions that he asked me about the situation of that company and its procedures that has been gone through the past two years, and it is all available. Maybe he should speak to the Honourable Member for Selkirk about it. Mr. Speaker, the main reason for the one in Selkirk, it's unfortunate to have to say, was bad management.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify for the honourable minister, the receivership was only declared two weeks ago. They may have been considering receivership but it was only declared two weeks ago. I would ask the minister . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Can we now proceed with the question period. The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a question.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I would ask the Minister again if he could advise the House whether he and his department would consider setting up some sort of early warning system so that we are better prepared, all of us, collectively, to cope with business failures, bankruptcies and closures in the Province of Manitoba, an early warning system.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is repetitive.

**MR. EVANS:** He didn't answer.

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm at a loss to understand what the member means. If he wants to send me a memo explaining what he really means, does he want us to put an ad in the paper saying, please warn us if you're going broke. What early warning system does he want me to put forward? We have many companies come to our department with problems and when they come to us with problems, or in our regular calls we discover any problems with business, we are only too ready to assist them in every way we can.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour, and while we're

on the subject of plant closures and businesses going out of business and notwithstanding the humorous remarks by the Minister who had just spoken, I would ask the Minister of Labour if he can indicate to the House if he has been advised of any notices of mass termination by employers in the province that are currently affective, in other words, he has been advised of the mass terminations under the provisions of the legislation but they have not yet taken place.

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** I'll try to be as correct as possible, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we have any notice of any major closures as the member has asked the question. Now, he wandered a little bit in his question, maybe he'd like to rephrase it somewhat.

**MR. COWAN:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will assist the Minister. What I had asked the Minister specifically if there has been any notice given under the provisions of the legislation that are currently affective, whether they are foreclosures or mass terminations.

While on my feet, I'd like to also ask the Minister if he can indicate if there is any formal mechanism that has been set up between his department and the Minister of Economic Development's department so that those ministers are both aware of these notices of mass terminations in a formal way when they are provided to the Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** In answer to the first part of the question, it's "no" to the best of my knowledge. That was first part of the second question. The second part of the second question, the Minister of Economic Development and myself confer on a regular basis.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I'll assume, as the Minister did not indicate that there is a formal process, that there is no formal process and I would ask the Minister of Labour or the Minister responsible for Economic Development, either one, if they can indicate if their respective departments have undertaken a study of the effect of layoffs in the Manitoba economy and I ask the question because the information that we have available is that nearly one-third or approximately one-third of those people who are unemployed in the Province of Manitoba today are unemployed because of job loss and thereby it becomes an extremely significant problem for the government. I would ask him what action they are taking in respect to developing strategies and methods to protect the interests of workers and, as well, to protect the interests of Manitoba as a whole in regard to this increasing number of laid off unemployed workers.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the facts are somewhat fictitious if the member is talking about one-third of those unemployed. If he wishes to supply me with that type of researched factual evidence, I would be very surprised if he could produce such a document, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services and ask him if he can indicate the cost of the new sound system.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to provide that information, although it might be more suitable to discuss that during the course of my estimates.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the very poor quality of sound in the Chamber, and the fact that hecklers apparently have equal volume to the person who is officially recognized, and the fact that earphones and headsets are now required as never before, I wonder whether the Minister will be asking for a refund of any expenditure over 2 cents.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, as with any new introduction of equipment, there usually is required some time to get some of the bugs ironed out of it. I must say that the early commencement of this session, I don't know who recommended that the session should start on December 11 but that early recommendation put me into a bit of a position here with the sound equipment just barely being in. The staff did not have the time to do the normal testing which they are now doing. I understand that some of the problems are that the speakers, most of them are up in the public galleries, we'll probably have to bring some of them down on the main floor to help the distribution of sound but I can assure the honourable members opposite that it's in everybody's interest that we get the system working. When it is working to its full capacity I'm sure that it will be as good and better than the one that we had. We have, of course, the extra provision for earplugs for all members now with the new sound system which we didn't have before and also, of course, the provision, should it be called upon for instant translation in different languages available to us with the controls that are now attached to each desk.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to assure us, as he has, that the quality of sound will be improved and I also ask him whether he would attempt to eliminate the need for earplugs other than for members who may be in a particular spot in the Chamber or be hard of hearing. There should be no reason for a person with normal hearing to be using an earplug or a set of earphones.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I accept and acknowledge that the system is not working to its best. It's been drawn to my attention by you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, and by other members from the very first day that we returned to this Chamber. We will be working on the system to bring it up to the level of service that I think we should expect and deserve in this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I was going to direct this question to the Minister of Transportation but, in the absence of the Minister, perhaps I could direct this to the Minister of

Agriculture. My question relates to the movement of grain to the Port of Churchill. In view of the fact that we were fortunate in having the MB Arctic load out over a million of bushels of grain this fall after the season closed in the Port of Churchill, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture has had or will be having any communication with the Canadian Wheat Board as to whether that space can be filled before the next crop season rolls around in the Port of Churchill.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, my concern has been over the past few years more of the lack of movement of grain to Churchill than that that is moved because it seems that yearly or annually we have a difficulty with certain powers that have the authority that haven't been able to fully furnish that port with adequate amounts of grain to fully utilize the port. We will further be discussing the utilization of the Port of Churchill, that meetings that we plan to have in the near future, and that point that the Member for Rock Lake raises is a very valid one. I think that there is the capability within the system to have that port full of grain during the winter months so that when the navigation does open up, that they can in fact start loading boats at the beginning of the season instead of waiting until the latter part of it.

**MR. EINARSON:** A second question, Mr. Speaker, which relates to the agreement between the CP and CNR that is related to what is known as "the Churchill hinterland area", the grain area that finds its way to the Port of Churchill. I wonder if the minister could inform the House whether or not that agreement between the two railroads is going to be maintained for the next crop year.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm unable to report whether or not that interchanMR. EINARSON: A second question, Mr. Speaker, which relates to the agreement between the CP and CNR that is related to what is known as "the Churchill hinterland area", the grain area that finds its way to the Port of Churchill. I wonder if the minister could inform the House whether or not that agreement between the two railroads is going to be maintained for the next crop year.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm unable to report whether or not that interchange agreement that was in fact put in place to accommodate Churchill this fall will be continued on with, however, I do believe that the railways that are servicing the Port of Churchill are now finding other products to move into that port and may take some of the load off the backs of the farmers as far as the responsibility of full utilizing of that particular port.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture in reply to my leader's question about the forecast of net realized farm incomes that he gave for Manitoba in October

were somewhat different from those that have been published. Is the minister now prepared to acknowledge that those figures that he presented in two releases in October were inaccurate and totally false and misleading to the business community and farmers of Manitoba?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I responded to that question yesterday. But as I said yesterday those figures came from the Statistics Canada, those figures were just merely passed on through our department to the public and, as I indicated, we are reassessing those figures that were given to us and will be making corrections and putting out the information that we have further checked and assessed.

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm that the figures that he gave out to the public of Manitoba were his own figures and not the figures of Stats Canada with respect to the realized net income. And if they were not, could the minister indicate which publication did he quote from quoting those 1980 farm income estimates which were out by over 100 million, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that it'll be again repetitious. The figures that were used in the releases were Statistics Canada figures. The method of calculating the estimate, and they are estimates, Mr. Speaker, they are estimates, the method of calculating those estimates was changed from the year previous. When I have more information on those figures I will release them to the House and to the members; they are somewhat lower but again I will reiterate, they were Statistics Canada figures.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, could the minister confirm that the latest figures from Statistics Canada, which were revised downward from their earlier figures, from 318 million to 279 which is roughly a 40 million drop, and the figures that the minister used were from 318 million to 410 million which is an increase of roughly 90 million. Where did he get those figures which were totally misleading and made the impression to the public of Manitoba that agriculture, which in rural Manitoba is in serious trouble and to give the impression that there is no need to bring in any relief to the income situation of Manitoba farmers by the very figures that he has given and mislead all the people of Manitoba?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, again I did indicate to the House that as we had those figures available there will be an explanation of why and where they came from and on the basis of which they were calculated. But let me just further elaborate, Mr. Speaker, some of the other things that have been said and things that have been done. The assistance programs that have been put in place have been well received by the farm community when it came to transportation programs and pasture programs, greenfeed programs. We've seen some estimated 50 million to be paid out of Manitoba Crop Insurance which is somewhat less than which was initially estimated, Mr. Speaker. We've asked for the federal government, who the Minister of the Canadian Wheat Board is one of the

pals of the Member for St. George, to increase the initial price of wheat to alleviate some of the difficulties, to give farmers some of their own money. Mr. Speaker, we realize the difficulties that are in rural Manitoba and we are, Mr. Speaker, working towards alleviating some of those problems with programs and with measures that were taken. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the intention of the government to implement the recommendation of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee that a single assessing authority be established?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I have just received the second interim report from the Assessment Review Commission and am currently studying the recommendations that are printed therein and I will be bringing recommendations forward to government in due course.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I note that on Page 7 of that report it is indicated that only the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce opposed this amalgamation and the committee therefore stated that a single assessing authority would be acceptable to the majority of the ratepayers in Manitoba. Has he made the committee aware of the fact that Winnipeg does contain the majority of the ratepayers in Manitoba?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated I am currently looking at the recommendations printed therein and will be studying it.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Economic Development. Recently, I'm sure he's seen the ads in the papers by the Federal Business Development Bank indicating that bankruptcies, business failures in Manitoba are up by 65 percent and I'm just wondering whether his department co-operated with FBDB in preparing those ads and whether he has any comments on them?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the percentage it went up in 1977 was 115 percent and, Mr. Speaker, it went from 53 to 114, and we've gone from 97, 90 to 137, Mr. Speaker, are the figures. If the honourable members wish to examine more closely those figures they'll find that Manitoba is 4.5 percent of the population of Canada and we're only 2.2 as far as bankruptcies are concerned. We're better as far as our population is concerned. When you take it in the 10,000 businesses in Manitoba versus per 10,000 businesses in other provinces we stand fifth across Canada, we're right in the middle

across Canada regarding bankruptcies, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members want to take percentages, they had 114 percent increase. Mr. Speaker, we examine the figures very closely, we know where they stand, we don't like this situation of bankruptcies of any kind, whether there up one percent we don't like it but we certainly have more knowledge of the facts than the honourable members have taken the trouble to look into.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it appears that I've touched a sore nerve. I wasn't asking for 1977 statistics. (Interjection)— No, I didn't say a sore head, I just said a sore nerve. What I did ask was whether he had any comments with respect to that specific ad and whether, Mr. Speaker, it was the government of Manitoba which had some input into that ad, but while he was providing us with figures possibly the Minister could provide us with the figures for the last full year of an NDP administration, as compared to the last full year of a Tory administration and tell us the number of business failures.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** In 1977 the NDP were in power until October 24, Mr. Speaker, and in that time they went from 53 to 114 which is well over 100 percent, if that's the figure the honourable gentleman wants.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** My question is directed to the First Minister in the absence of the Finance Minister, Mr. Speaker, in view of the high interest rates that prevail at the present time and the serious effect they are having on small business, farmers and wage earners in the province. I wonder if he might inform the House what actions the government is taking to try and assist in solving this particularly acute problem.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, as members of the House may know, is attending a meeting of all of the Ministers of Finance of Canada, including the federal government, today and I know what his intentions were, namely, that he would be proposing and others would be joining in the proposal, that the federal government adopt a new method of fixing the interest rate in Canada, so as to help, if possible, the precipitive rises which have been occurring recently, which have been having precisely the effect that is described by the Member for Minnedosa.

We realize, as I'm sure all members of the House do, that in terms of financing of small businesses, of farms, financing of inventory, of cash flow and so on, that the interest rate policies that are being followed at the present time are causing hardship to individuals as well, and the only responsible way, I suggest, Sir, in which action can be taken in this respect is for the federal government, in concert with the provinces, to work on a national policy which will ameliorate that problem. And he is making representations today, along with his colleagues in that regard because it is acknowledged as being one of the serious problems at this time, notwithstanding

the fact that we had a drop during the summer they're now going back up, and notwithstanding the fact that the lag between the American rate and the Canadian rate has widened, I believe, by one point. And we will, of course, await tomorrow to see what the results are from the pegging of the rate tomorrow.

But that is a brief report. I'm sorry that the honourable members of the NDP don't find this of interest, but I'm sure the people of Manitoba do.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The time for question period having expired, we'll proceed with the Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Inkster, and I apologize to the Honourable Member for Inkster. I am not certain of the exact minutes left in his speech. This is an estimate only.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** My friend, the Member for St. Boniface says my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, and he indicated that there was going to be a kerfuffle about that today. I think that we have probably have had all the keruffles that we can stand for a period of 24 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the middle of my speech yesterday and I told some of my Tory friends during the afternoon that I thought that I was making some miles against the Conservatives. I thought that I was getting to some of the more serious points. And then, Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted and I thought to myself, Mr. Speaker, would they go that far, I mean, Mr. Speaker, I've heard of dirty tricks but isn't this carrying it too extremes, Mr. Speaker? What happened yesterday, surely the Conservative friends are complimenting me too much as to my effectiveness when they would go to that extreme, Mr. Speaker, knowing that I was probably not going to be here today, to try to interrupt my remarks. Well, Mr. Speaker, I too, have gone to extremes, I'm back and I'll try to pick up approximately where I left off.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the one major announcement which was definite is something that came about as a result of the policies of the previous administration. A second one which seemed to be indefinite, but which was more definite than the others, that is the potash, was there long before the previous administration. I have to give credit to the Roblin administration but credit, Mr. Speaker, for maintaining a public potash resource, part of which has been removed to the people of the province, and I, being one of the shareholders will be one of the people who suffer equivalently, from us by the Conservative administration. And then I said, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the balance of the announcements, all of which are pie in the sky, are to rescue a Conservative administration that feels that it is finished, that it is not at the middle of the end or the beginning of the end but the ending of

the end, and they have made those announcements, Mr. Speaker, to try to restore their electoral position in the Province of Manitoba.

And just as the honourable member should remember, that in 1966 two definite announcements, and very big ones, the Nelson River Development and the CFI, came during the election campaign, or virtually during the election campaign, and resulted in a drop of votes to the Conservative party and a drop of seats and the finishing, the virtually finishing of Duff Roblin as Premier of the Province of Manitoba. You can rest assured that these pie in the sky announcements, Mr. Speaker, will have the same effect because, Mr. Speaker, what the Conservative party has lost, and I'm even quite surprised because I never suspected of my friend, the First Minister, what it has lost is that it has lost its conviction. And the statement in the Throne Speech that is most important is the one that says, Mr. Speaker, my Ministers do not believe that government can afford to stand back, as though what happens in the economy were not of its concern. Within our mixed economy, government has a variety of roles to play in encouraging development and ensuring that developments which do not take place serve the interests which do take place, serve the interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Now what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservatives have now declared, they've thrown up the white flag, and they say unconditional surrender; and they will, Mr. Speaker, because they have to, go back to the worst form of economic development. I respected the Member for Lakeside, I respected the Member for Morris, the First Minister who said that the business of the economy is for individual and corporate businessmen to invest their capital, make money, create jobs and everybody gains, but that government becoming involved is a problem. That was conservatism, Mr. Speaker, it had a sound of conviction. I don't happen to believe in it, but those people who believe in it and carry it forward do have in my mind credibility, at least insofar as philosophy is concerned. What has happened to this government, it has declared, Mr. Speaker, bankruptcy — that's a good word in view of the fact that it's on the increase, just adds to the percentages — and has indicated that it's going to go through the worst form. They've used these announcements, Mr. Speaker, to titillate the fancies of the people of the Province of Manitoba that things are not as bad as they seem. And that's a kind of insidious use of an announcement, it's a use that a political party engages in when it has nothing substantial to offer but it's not the most insidious use, Mr. Speaker. The most insidious use is yet to come and I predict that it will come with regard to the Alcan announcement because there will be a no aluminum company in operation in the Province of Manitoba, nor will there be a definite commitment to an aluminum company in the Province of Manitoba prior to the next election. During the next election there are going to be titillating remarks about the Conservatives bringing in an aluminum company and these will be coupled, Mr. Speaker, — and I say this because I know what has historically taken place — with the suggestion that if the government changes the aluminum company does not come in. There will be, Mr. Speaker, quotes from the managers of the

aluminum company who will always say, Mr. Speaker, we are not involved in politics, we will not comment on a political campaign but if you're asking us whether we look to the economic climate of a province or we look to whether or not there is the kind of government under which we can flourish or which we cannot flourish, certainly we do, Mr. Speaker. All of this based on zero and all of it intended, Mr. Speaker, to effect the democratic process of the Province of Manitoba as between and as of vital importance — where will the government of Manitoba be, Mr. Speaker? Will it be the decision-making process be in the hands of the people or will it be in the hands of those people who say that if you have the kind of government that you think you want you won't have Alcan, and that's what's going to come, Mr. Speaker.

And at that point, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends on the right-hand side because that's the big issue — what do you say? Because I know from time to time, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks that come out, oh yes, we are going to provide a good climate and don't worry and we are going to be nice people and you can come in. You can say that, Mr. Speaker, or you can say what drew me to the New Democratic Party, that if there is a viable, economic operation in the Province of Manitoba, we are not going to be dependent on whether or not Alcan comes in or Alcan does not come in — the people of this province using their resources, using their expertise, using their initiative, are prepared to say that there will be no diminution of economic activity within this province and if the public has to do it, the public is capable to do it and the public will do it. and that's the only answer, Mr. Speaker.

If there is any other answer forthcoming from the New Democratic Party then the New Democratic Party does not exist. As an alternative in the province it can get elected, it can become the Liberal fork to the Conservative spoon, but if it does not, Mr. Speaker, — as Mr. Trudeau was elected — it's not going to be difficult for the alternative in government to be elected in Manitoba in the next election. As I have said on numerous occasions, looking at the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, anybody can beat them. But when one looks at the New Democrat does one say anybody will beat them, because anybody is not enough. That kind of government, that kind of electoral success is never success for the New Democratic Party or for the people who have gone into it.

Mr. Speaker, just as the New Democratic Party in the last election had a lack of conviction in putting forward its public programs, its public mining program, where we were 50 percent owners of every new development that started in the Province of Manitoba and where we had abandoned, and it took us some years to do it, the policy of going into businesses when they fail, which was not our policy, it was a Conservative policy, it was a Liberal policy, and we kept it up just for the very reason that I say that we were not convicted, did not have conviction. But in the last three years, Mr. Speaker, we said that we would go into viable business, we would not pick up only the bad paper, and in those four years of the MDC, Mr. Speaker, the last four years, we started to make money and of all the businesses that we had difficulty with, only one that was started after 1973



had any problem. That was Evergreen Peat Moss in which we were 50-50 partners with a private enterprise company, and that happens. As the Minister of Economic Development now knows, it happens.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party has declared its bankruptcy and now we are waiting to see what kind of alternative will be in the Province of Manitoba, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, if the New Democratic Party is not for public ownership as a vehicle for the purpose of maintaining the economic development of the Province of Manitoba and not relying on the intimidation that you're going to get from Alcan, you mark my words you'll get it, then it stands for nothing and there may as well be a Liberal Party on this side of the House or a Conservative Party or a Social Credit Party.

I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, hoping against hope that is not the case, but I think, Mr. Speaker, I have perceived some peculiar psychology within the New Democratic Party. I remember, Mr. Speaker, in the Steinkopf incident where a man, a member of this House was disqualified by law from sitting if he did certain things, there were allegations made against him. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party as a group were saying, oh, we can't say anything bad about Mr. Steinkopf, we won't even run against him in the next election and didn't field a candidate, Mr. Speaker, but yesterday as a block to a man. Is that something upon which you form a party position? When you start forming a party position as to whether a person should be kicked out of the House, when you start forming a party position as to whether you will permit a doctor to remove my blood without my consent and send it to the police and that becomes a party policy position, which you expect every member to get up and vote for, you're not reflecting a solidarity of strength. A strong party could let people vote any way on those issues. The very fact that they have blocked on that kind of issue, Mr. Speaker, indicates a problem for the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba on one issue is not the greatest problem that we have in our province. Because, Mr. Speaker, on this one issue and in their last year they can do a great service. We can always get rid of the Conservative Party. We can beat Mr. Lyon and will beat him, but we cannot beat those people who now say that they have a right to pass a law with 145 seats which will govern us and which nobody can overrule in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Conservative Party can play a service to this province in its last 12 months of office because, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party can help the people of Manitoba take a position against a proposal, Mr. Speaker, which will take out of this House, by the way, the right possibly to expel one of its members, which was exercised yesterday — and although I disagree I say that the House has that right — the right to deal with censorship; the right to deal with abortion; take out of the Parliament of Canada the right to deal with abortion; the right to deal with questions of hate literature; the right to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the question of expropriation of property and the operation of business; all of those things can potentially be taken away from us by what the government of Canada is now doing and

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative party can play a service.

And I put it to the First Minister, and I'm sorry he's not in the House, that at the moment he does not appear to have a contingency plan as to what happens if his court action fails and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that nothing is going to be resolved in the court action. The questions will either not be answered in a way as to be meaningful, or if they are answered, they will have no effect on what the government of Canada does, and certainly perhaps will have no effect on what the Parliament of Westminster does.

But we do, Mr. Speaker, we do have a contingency plan and I am putting it forward to this First Minister, who doesn't happen to be here and I ask him to consider it. There is a contingency plan. Mr. Speaker, all of the years we've talked about having to throw off — what do you call it when you are hanging on to the mother's apron strings of Great Britain, and this is the last apron string, patriation — and Great Britain has behaved, Mr. Speaker, in the last 30-40 years in any event, in such a way as to not do anything to interfere with internal politics in Canada and therefore they are somehow of the opinion that they have to do whatever Canada asks them to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the court action fails — and I say it will fail, and even if it doesn't fail, it should be a contingency plan — the Province of Manitoba should go to Great Britain, on Great Britain's own terms, that we should convince Great Britain that we are asking them not to interfere with the internal politics of Canada. That insofar as patriation is concerned we have absolutely no objection to it, that the Constitution should be patriated, but then, Mr. Speaker, the other changes that are being requested should be obtained under the same rules as Mr. Trudeau says will apply to what you have to do afterwards. If you're going to have to get a majority of the provinces, having a majority of the people in this country, to change the Bill of Rights, at very worst, Mr. Speaker, we could ask that 50 percent of the provinces, plus 50 percent of the people should be in favour of enacting the Bill of Rights. What could be more fair, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, you know I have started off and there should be — and this is going to be a tough one, Mr. Speaker — there should be an all-party committee because the question of a Constitutional Bill of Rights is not a party issue. Those people who are starting to talk against the opponents of entrenchment as reactionaries, are going to put into the reactionary class, many many New Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I know that virtually half the people on this side have been against an entrenched Bill of Rights and to suggest that they are reactionary is silly, and to block them and to say that we have to maintain unity on this question is silly. There are people on that side, Conservatives, who believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights and therefore, if I take the Member for St. Johns at his word that we should dialogue and consideration and discussion, I expect that everybody is going to be able to vote without a party block on this issue. I expect that some New Democrat who I know is against an entrenched Bill of Rights, will second the motion that I have on the Order Paper and we will have a full discussion on it, Mr. Speaker.

But I'm going to suggest something even better. I'm going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Committee won't hear them, but if Mr. Lyon, plus members of each party who happen to be and against — and I include in that Independents because I want to go — should go to Great Britain, absolutely, talk to the parliamentarians because they won't let you appear before committee, but each parliamentary caucus in Britain has its own committee and they will hear you and all you have to do is convince them, Mr. Speaker, that their own policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of Canada is what is being requested.

We are asking them not to do this because we know that they don't wish to interfere and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, to the Conservative administration that they plan, immediately, such a view because I believe, Mr. Speaker, the situation is turning around. It's interesting you know, some of the people who say that they are for an entrenched Bill of Rights, they say, we are for an entrenched Bill of Rights because it prevents the tyranny of the majority and if you will look at the polls you will see that the majority are in our favour. They want the government to enact the Bill of Rights because they say that the majority is for it. Mr. Speaker, that's interesting, the majority is turning around. And do you know why it is turning around, Mr. Speaker? Because people are starting to understand what is being said.

You go to a person who believes in the free right of a woman to terminate her pregnancy and you say, do you believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights? She says, yes. And you say, what should be in an entrenched Bill of Rights? I believe that there should be in an entrenched Bill of Rights, the right for a woman to terminate her pregnancy at any time. She is added up as a statistic of somebody who believes in an entrenched Bill of Rights. Then you go to a right to life person and you say, do you believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights? They say, yes, I believed in an entrenched Bill of Rights. What should be in the entrenched Bill of Rights? I believe that it should be in the entrenched Bill of Rights that the right to life of an unborn child is protected from the moment of conception. Two statistics in favour of an entrenched Bill of Rights. Both of them don't believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights. Everybody who appears before that committee, Mr. Speaker, and if you start watching it you will see it. They all believe that their rights should be entrenched.

Mr. Speaker, I have a revelation. I now believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights. I've been converted. Of course you have to put into it what I say and number one of this entrenched Bill of Rights, and I want to ask any of you if this is unreasonable, whether what I am saying —(Interjection)— no, it won't even go that far. It won't go for anything that I am solely for but for what everybody is for. Number one of the entrenched Bill of Rights: that no parliament should be able to pass a law that cannot be modified, changed or repealed by another parliament. Shouldn't that be entrenched in a Bill of Rights?

Secondly, that no parliament shall delegate to a non-elected person the power to enact social — for all time — to enact social and economic policy for the people of this Canada, which cannot be undone by that same parliament. Do you agree with that? That should be in the entrenched Bill.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, Clauses 1 and 2 shall be interpreted by parliament. Now I'm in favour of an entrenched Bill of Rights. And what have I said, Mr. Speaker, what have I said that if I did not go to a citizen in the street and say to him, do you believe that this parliament should be able to pass laws which cannot be changed by another parliament? He'd say, of course not and they would say, of course not, Mr. Speaker. But we have 145 parliamentarians, not one sitting west of the City of Winnipeg, who presume to say for all time that the laws that they are passing have such great wisdom, as to preclude them being changed by any other people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been entrenched Bills of Rights and there are in other countries and in most unitary states, they are very easy to change. The amendments are easy to come by, which is not the case in Canada, but they have not been enacted in that way. In the United States, for instance, the entrenched the Bill of Rights came as a result of amendments to the Constitution and they needed the requirements which are now imposed on future changes. Is that what's going to happen to these changes? No, Mr. Speaker. So I say that Sterling Lyon — excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba does not happen to be at the moment the worst threat to either social and economic change in this province, he's not the worst threat to social and economic changes. The worst threat to social and economic change is the proposed entrenched Bill of Rights. The Premier of this province is not the worst threat to democracy in this province and to the political process in this province. We can beat the Premier and, by the way, he accepts that. I respect that the Premier of this province thinks that he is 1,000 percent right, but he also says that if you guys beat me, you are entitled to do what the public has elected you to do. Mr. Trudeau says, I am 10,000 percent right and if you beat me, I still prevail. Now, I certainly respect Lyon or the Premier of this province in that respect, more than I respect the Prime Minister of this country and therefore, Mr. Speaker, and given the fact that he's only got a year to go or thereabouts, I say that on his strongest point, which I say this issue at the present time is his strongest point —(Interjection)— at the present time is his strongest point that he co-opt, and I immediately put in my application, a committee of this House of people — after all, we know that the pro entrenchers have got the government of Canada and the Senate who are going to pass a resolution, so there's no difficulty in them making their wills known, but there is a difficulty for others of us.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting, I wanted to appear before the Parliamentary Committee in Ottawa. It's not like here where anybody can appear. They pick on groups, Mr. Speaker. If I had formed myself as the Canadian Association of Disaffected New Democrats, I could maybe have got on their list. (Interjection)— Oh, yes, there are more than one. I could maybe yet — I mean there is Frank Syms, there were other people, but if I could have formed — then they said — or if I could have said the Canadian Association of People of —(Interjection)— mentally retarded, my friend says. I could even get on, on that basis. But I applied to appear and this is

what they said, Mr. Speaker, they now say, and it's never been an election issue, after all, Mr. Trudeau never went to the public and said he's going to entrench a Bill of Rights in the Constitution. What had happened, Mr. Speaker, is they said that five individuals could come; two to be chosen by the Liberal Party . . .

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, two to be chosen by the Liberal Party, two to be chosen by the Conservative Party and one to be chosen by the New Democratic Party. Can you tell me, Mr. Speaker, where I fit in? There's absolutely no way.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** You don't even want to fit in, sir.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I tell the Member for Fort Rouge that my participation for 18 years in a political party and the manner in which I did it, if you want to obtain information as to whether I fit in and whether I worked in, you can obtain it from the people in this House. They will disabuse you of what you are saying, disabuse you of what you are saying.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that I wanted to go, I still want to go, I still think that Great Britain, we can be saved by Great Britain by them doing exactly what they have always done, do not interfere in Canadian politics. We don't want a colonial power and, Mr. Speaker, I have not regarded myself as living in a colonial country over the last 52 years, that's all my life. I've never really noticed that there is any problem. When everybody is running around saying that what we know is some people want one thing and some people want another thing, but nobody is for the status quo, Mr. Speaker, they forgot me. I am for the status quo until you show me that what you are doing is better than the status quo. When you show me that what you are doing will more serve the interests of the people of this country — Mr. Speaker, I put that proposal to the First Minister, I hope that some of my colleagues will see to it that he gets it because I certainly am serious in putting it forward.

Mr. Speaker, the one other thing that amused me — I've just got a few minutes so I'll try and deal with it quickly — that two years ago they suggested that the economy was a shambles, that it was impossible to govern. And in the first year they gave up 73 million in tax relief. They said they did; it was not quite the truth but they said they did, coming into a province where it was a shambles, where it was bankrupt. Immediately they reduced taxes, 73 million, that's what they said and now they say, Mr. Speaker, that Hydro is in good shape. Two years ago, they had a commissioner say that 600 to 800 to 1 billion — use any figure you want to — assault was made on our Hydro program. Then they froze rates. This company, which is in terrible shape, they froze rates for five years and now it's in good shape.

Mr. Speaker, it brings to mind the story of a fellow who was at a field day, a track and field day. He was talking to his friend and he said that yesterday his son was in a terrible accident, both legs were broken, his hips were displaced, his ribs were crushed, his lung was punctured, his face was

completely lacerated, his spine was broken and all of these things happened to him yesterday. The fellow said, what's he doing today? He just won the decathlon. He just won the decathlon in this meet. Now that's what's happened, Mr. Speaker, to the Hydro. There has been a miraculous recovery, a miraculous recovery, overnight, Mr. Speaker. Hydro, after freezing rates for five years and after having been put into terrible shape, it is now in good shape. What was done, Mr. Speaker? What was done? Absolutely nothing which indicates that the fellow did not break both his legs, that he did not hurt his spine, that he did not puncture his kidney, that he was in solid health and he won the decathlon, Mr. Speaker, because he had been well trained, well looked after, well conditioned and in good health. That's what the economy of the province was before it was taken over by this bunch.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. GARY FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I begin by offering to you congratulations on the resumption of your high office in this Chamber. I am confident that you will continue to preside over the workings of the Chamber with your customary fairness and impartiality and good humour. You have obviously been put to the test early on in this Session and have come through again in good form. May I also extend to the Premier and members of his Executive Council congratulations on providing again this year their brand of leadership, which includes a commitment to a government that's willing to work diligently to accomplish worthwhile goals for the province, to restore order, confidence, and the principles of sound management to our provincial economy.

May I also say to members opposite, and all members in the House, and indeed in the gallery, guests and visitors in the gallery, my good wishes in the forthcoming holiday season, for those who celebrate the Christmas festival, and also to all Manitobans, my very best wishes for 1981, may it be a year of health and happiness and may they have the time to enjoy all the things that they treasure in life here in Manitoba.

This is an interesting opportunity for me. Last year I had the privilege of moving the Throne Speech, and of course in that privilege come certain formalities and traditions that have to be acknowledged and those formalities and traditions perhaps limit the range and scope of one's debate on the Throne Speech, and so I look upon this more as a first opportunity to address a Throne Speech, in the normal debating form, and I'm looking forward to it, because during the past months since we last met, there have been some very interesting and exciting events in Manitoba and I intend to cover all of them, or as many as I can in addressing the Throne Speech, because I think they are all intertwined. But I do have to acknowledge that I feel somewhat like Rodney Dangerfield in standing up here, because yesterday I was scheduled to speak and of course the intervening events didn't allow it, but of course greater things took place and more important events, so here I am today.

Some of the interesting events, of course, that have taken place in recent times include the

response of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the Throne Speech. It has finally conveyed to me the meaning of the acronym NDP, No Definite Policies, because, Mr. Speaker, the Leader gave us no definite policies in his response to the Throne Speech. In fact, I don't think he even understood the policies that were presented in the Throne Speech. He certainly didn't acknowledge an understanding if he had one. He set about to criticize the Throne Speech for what it did say or didn't say, on a variety of issues and he entirely missed the point. But I'm not surprised at that because members opposite have demonstrated in their No Definite Policy stance on so many issues, that there's no agreement on anything. There's no understanding against them, let alone of anything else that transpires in this House. You could tell right from the minute he stood up the day that he addressed the Throne Speech, he announced to us that the members of the opposition were foregoing their opportunity to have a question period. Right after that, of course, we found out that they hadn't agreed on that, and there were members opposite who did not go along with that statement.

Later on in the day, there was an understanding that because the Leader was giving his response to the Throne Speech, that the members opposite would not participate in the debate that day. Of course, the Member for St. Johns showed us that there wasn't an understanding on that side. And so, again there doesn't seem to be any real agreement amongst them, so it's not unusual that there shouldn't be any policies that they stand behind. (Interjection)— Well, okay, the Constitutional issue. There's another one. How about that for an agreement on the other side. A definite stance except that it's not really very definite. There are a number who have not taken a very firm position and in fact some, who I suspect, will not be able to achieve agreement when this finally comes to a vote in the House.

And, of course, we have their approach to small business. They've told us over and over again, how they are in favour of small business, that small business is really, in their view, very important to the Manitoba economy. At the same time they suggest to us that if they're returned to office that they're going to reinstate rent controls. And, of course, I don't have to tell you about their stance on ownership of farm property. I don't have to tell you about their stance on — that's government ownership of farm property I'm speaking of — their stand on oil development, or mineral resource development.

Well, you know, not all of these kinds of ventures, farming, resource development, not all of these ventures are carried out by just large corporations. There are many small enterprises and operations who carry on activities in those fields, and I suggest to you that those are the small businesses that you suggest that you are in favour of. You are the people who brought in the corporate capital tax, one of the most damaging and disruptive and negative taxes that this province has ever seen, it's greatest effect on small businesses, but the friends of small business they say they are, opposite. No Definite Policy, Mr. Speaker, that's what I suggest to you.

The Leader of the Opposition told us about all of the promises that had been made and broken by

members on this side. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's review some of them.

The promises such as reduced taxes. What did this government do? It came in, reduced personal, corporate, small business taxes. Increased the level of exemption to those on the corporate capital tax. Got rid of that nuisance, that punitive, inheritance tax; the mineral acreage tax; all of those things. We're carrying out the promises that our government put forward in coming into office.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— we promised, Mr. Speaker, that there would be lesser involvement of the government in the business of the private sector. We promised that there would be a reduction in spending. We came into government and we immediately took steps to reduce the size of government, to reduce the spending of government, to bring spending under some semblance of control. What do we get over there? We get No Definite Policy. The only thing that we can be sure of is that they're going to change their mind some time between now and the next election, or after the next election, depending on what happens.

All you get is a definite maybe, Mr. Speaker, and is it any wonder. I've heard of lame duck governments such as we have in the United States right now, but I think we're faced with a lame duck opposition at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that there wasn't any investor confidence in this province when the members opposite were in power for eight years? And the Leader of the Opposition suggests that there should have been a massive turnaround in the three years of government that we've had. He suggests that after they spent all of their time and energy and directed all their policies to driving out investment, to discouraging people from starting businesses in this province, that all those things should have turned around overnight, or at least within three years.

They, on the one hand, argue that we're doing nothing to stimulate housing construction, that we should be encouraging more and more housing construction in this province, and they suggest they're going to come back with rent controls, which would have the exact opposite effect, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder what's happening on the other side, how there is No Definite Policy on anything that's put forward.

Take a look at some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition said in his address the other day. He said that the Throne Speech totally ignored the native people. The Throne Speech states, and I quote "recognizing the need for increased employment and economic activity in northern Manitoba, my government is negotiating a new northern development agreement, to replace the expiring Northlands Agreement". That is one of the single most important things affecting economic development in the north, Mr. Speaker, and we are committed to negotiating that agreement, so that it benefits all northern Manitobans, and particularly native people. This is on top of the existing policy, which we as a government have, of stimulating private initiatives and greater economic viability in the north. Policies such as contracting road construction to Indian bands, through the Highways and Transportation Department of my honourable

colleague. Expansions of the lending policies of the CEDF, to include Treaty Indian projects. These are means of encouraging our native population to have a greater economic status in the Province of Manitoba.

But, of course, obviously the Leader of the Opposition wasn't listening to it. And he had a prepared speech. I give you that as well. He had a prepared speech. He suggested that we're doing nothing about Garrison. I have here, Mr. Speaker, press release after press release, telling you what the Minister of Natural Resources and indeed the Premier of this province have been doing, putting on the record, where it counts with every member of the US government, where we stand and what we believe should happen with respect to Garrison. But he ignores all that.

Northern roads, he suggested nothing is being done on northern roads. There has been a considerable upgrading of northern roads under our government. Provincial road 391 is an example. The total winter road mileage in the north is greater now than it was before. This all to do with northern road construction and he ignores that entirely.

He suggests that nothing is being done in the Port of Churchill. My colleague, the Member for Rock Lake, got up time after time in this House. I have two press releases from the Minister of Agriculture in which he discusses the grain handling issues in Victoria, with great concentration on Churchill and what the advantages it has and what the importance of Churchill could be to the agricultural community in this province. Totally ignored.

Here's another one of April 13, the Minister of Agriculture stated the position of this government again on Churchill. "Downey proposes steps to boost Churchill's use". But of course, I don't expect the Leader of the Opposition to pay any attention to that. He had a speech that was prepared, ignoring totally what went on in the government; ignoring totally what had been done; ignoring totally what the Throne Speech said was intended to be done, and he just put forward a position just as he's done in the past. And I suggest to you that the people of this province should expect more leadership from him and from his party. It's said that a good opposition makes good government and I suggest to you that we're not getting our assistance from that side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

But there are many, many interesting things that are happening in this province, but there are exciting things as well. For instance, since we last met we had the announcement from the Mohawk people that they had exercised their option on the Minnedosa Distillery. We are going to have in this province, the first plant producing fuel alcohol in the entire country. By April 1, the intention is to distribute gasahol through western Canada and soon, hopefully, the entire country. This is going to provide a ready market for over two million bushels of grain, for the producers of Manitoba. It's going to be a contribution to getting off petroleum oil and into renewable energy sources. That's in concert not only with our provincial energy policy but the federal energy policy. A very exciting development, Mr. Speaker. But members opposite aren't interested in that.

What else has been happening around the province. Well, there are other interesting

developments, the Titanic has a new captain, Doug Lauchlan is his name, I think, —(Interjection)— I understand that he was here the other day in the gallery, I thought that was appropriate because he probably still had his parachute on. He's operating, of course, in the true Liberal tradition. He's just arrived in our province after 20 years of absence and he's telling everybody what should be done. He has no knowledge of what has gone on, no knowledge of what should be done, but he's telling everybody what's wrong. He's telling us what's wrong with the government, he's telling us what's wrong with the opposition, well, on second thought I guess he does have a few things that he understands. But in any case, he came into the province and he told us what was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately entered into this old wife's tale again of the diversion of funds for health care spending in this province. I have to tell you that I thought that issue was laid to rest when Mr. Justice Emmett Hall reported earlier this year, just a couple of months ago. The essence of his report was that the statements that had been made by, I believe it was Monique Begin, the federal Minister of Health and members opposite during various debates to the suggestion that we were in some way not operating according to the intention of the federal-provincial agreements for health care funding, was totally laid to rest. They were totally false in the view of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall's report.

More so than that he gave us various figures that were very, very interesting because he said that health care spending in this province is the second highest in relation to our total budget, as a percentage of our total budget, of any province in Canada. I think that's a pretty commendable position to be in. He also indicated that our supply of hospital beds, nursing home beds, and total care beds in relation to our population is well above the national average. He indicated that our comprehensive children's dental care program and our excellent fly-in medical service for residents of the north are so good that they might well be emulated by other medical institutions in other provinces. Now is that an indication of a government that's ignoring health care in a province? I suggest not, and I suggest that it's a mark that the Leader of the Opposition ought not to be proud of for him, after having this information because indeed it was disseminated, I think, widely to persist in trying to have that falsehood spread in Manitoba and I think that it's wrong. The honourable federal Minister at least had to apologize and indicate that she was wrong in the contention that she had made. But in this case the Leader of the Opposition continues with this misapprehension and he continues to try and spread it publicly which I think he should be criticized for.

The other thing of course that I wonder about is his suggestion that they will in addition to reinstating rent controls, that they would if re-elected to government ensure that there was no private sector involvement in the social service delivery systems of this province. In those particular instances he was suggesting that they would force out the private corporations from personal care homes and from day care in this province. That bothers me, Mr. Speaker, it bothers me a great deal

because I wonder if he's suggesting to us that the public sector has a corner on the market for care and compassion. I think that that's what his intent is. If he suggests that, Mr. Speaker, how far is he willing to carry it? Is he going to say that doctors who opt out of Medicare ought not to be covered, ought not to be allowed to be in practice in this province because if he is he is treading on dangerous ground. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, where is going to carry that to? Is he next going to say that dentists, because in effect they operate under a private sector system, they are sole practitioners who institute their charges directly with the patient and under no government supervision, is he going to suggest that next it's the dentists because they're delivering social and health care services in this province? Are they the next to feel the lash of the New Democratic policies? —(Interjection)— What next, sure are we going to say that nobody who's in the field of education ought to be there? Well you tell that to the people in the United States where the best standards of education are found in private universities. You want to talk about the Yales and the Harvards and the Stanfords and all of the universities in the United States, Rice, they're privately funded universities. Are you going to suggest that they ought to be driven out of education entirely? Well I'd like to know that and I'm sure the people of this province would like to know that.

When you talk about having a corner on the market on care and compassion in this province I want you to tell that to the people who support the United Way, the major corporate donors who not only give substantial sums of money but who give loaned representatives to go out and call door to door and spread the message and the good word of the United Way — tell them that you don't want their participation in social services in this province — tell that to the variety clubs and the Lions with their telethons — tell them that you don't want any private involvement in the delivery of social services and health care in this province because I'm sure they'll be interested to know that.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that bothers me about all this, somebody once told me that we had three classes of people in society — there are taxpayers, there are tax avoiders and there are tax consumers. It seems to me that the policies that are being proposed by the Leader of the Opposition all involve converting people in those first two categories into the latter category of tax consumer. I want to know who's going to pay the taxes in this province. If you take over the private industries who are involved, if you take over the private operators in the personal care homes, you're going to do two things, you're going to take some taxpayers off the tax rolls and you're going to add them to the tax consuming part of our economy. I suggest to you that if you continue, that sooner or later there aren't going to be too many sources of income for this province. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, you're going to have to raise those funds by other means and it seems to me that the members of the opposition are going to have to come clean and tell us where do they intend to raise that money? Are they going to raise taxes? Is that what they're going to do?

**A. MEMBER:** Sure they will.

**MR. FILMON:** Well, you better let us know because which are they? Are you going to impose new taxes?

Succession duties, are they coming back on again? Or are we going to bring new corporation capital taxes so that the small businessman is going to have to participate?

**A. MEMBER:** Sales tax.

**MR. FILMON:** Is the sales tax going to go up? They're going to print money, the Member for Brandon West tells me they're going to print money — that's perhaps a novel approach to it but not one that I would put past them. —(Interjection)— Things can only get better, says the Member for Elmwood. Well, I suggest to you that if it's under these policies things will not get better.

Mr. Speaker, there are other exciting things happening in this province and the Throne Speech tells about them and they're future-oriented developments. We've talked about Trout Lake and the many millions of dollars that are going to be poured into the Manitoba economy as a result of that. The Member for Inkster, he told us about the fact that Trout Lake and the potash were all things that had been developed before or established before and that the Province of Manitoba owned 50 percent of them.

**A. MEMBER:** 49 percent.

**MR. FILMON:** 49 percent, except that we had 49 percent of nothing. We had no operating mines, we had no operating developments and we had 49 percent of nothing. I'd rather have 25 percent of a viable operating mine that's paying money into our economy than 49 percent of nothing, and we were getting nothing and now we're going to have hundreds of millions of dollars and hundreds of jobs in the province as a result of eliminating the mineral acreage tax, eliminating our involvement so that there was an incentive for other people to spend money and develop these resources and that's why it is.

The Member for Inkster also suggested in his speech that they had learned from their mistakes in investing in private corporations. They weren't only taking over losing corporations and propping them up with tax dollars from you and me and every one of our taxpaying public but in fact they were making better investments in the last few years. They had picked their investments a lot better. But he doesn't tell you about the King Choy Foods and he doesn't tell you about the Saunders Aircraft and he doesn't tell you about all the losers, which they've had before and they will still have because they as government didn't know how to operate business and should never have been involved in operating businesses.

He suggests to you that the economy is a shambles today — that our handle on what's happening in the provincial economy is not very strong. Let me tell you about what happened in late 1977 when the Member for Seven Oaks came before this House as a Minister of the Crown and told the House in September of 1977 that the projected deficit for this province in the fiscal year was 25 million.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member says that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks came before this House in September of 1977, this House was not in session in September of 1977.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I acknowledge the Honourable Member for River Heights, might I just ask the co-operation of the House. With the new sound system and the banging of the desks and the rattling of the papers it makes it very difficult for me to be able to pick out the member to be reprimanded for making all the noise. So I would ask a little bit of co-operation from the members of the House.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize for engendering so much enthusiasm with the exciting things I have to speak about with regard to the Throne Speech today. I note that the Member for Inkster did not deny that the statement was made. I apologize if it was not made in this House. The Member for Seven Oaks indicated that we were facing as a province a projected deficit of 25 million in September of 1977. One month later, or perhaps six weeks after the election to office of this government, we found that the projected deficit was in fact 225 million. That is what I call an economy in a shambles.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, again, the honourable member said that I accepted the statement, the Member for Seven Oaks is not here but I know he did not make that statement. Mr. Speaker, he made a statement that the operating deficit would be 25 million. The capital deficit was announced several months earlier at 100 million for a total budgeted deficit of 125 million, not 25 million.

**MR. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that they were only out by 50 percent in their estimates but that was after a great deal of management and cost cutting by the government, yes, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Member for Inkster did bring to the House that is of great importance and it's one that I know that all members are interested and concerned about is the constitutional debate. Perhaps this may be the single most important issue of our lifetimes as members of the Legislature. I think that there are a number of questions that have to be asked, questions that are on the lips and in the minds of so many of us, the foremost of which is why is this being pushed so quickly? Why are we abandoning all the other concerns that we as a province, we as a country have, the health of our economy, the sagging dollar, the rising interest rates, rampant inflation and unemployment and all of those things in favour of pushing through this particular item? In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, our leader is attempting to respond to the issue that's being forced upon us by the government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, in addition to being the single most important issue I believe that it's probably the single most understood issue because it's being clouded by all sorts of arguments

that are being put forward. There's a suggestion being put forward, and I won't say who's behind it or what their motives might be that to oppose the constitutional package of the federal government is to be opposed to patriation. Simple patriation is not the question, it's been said before and I'll say it again, I believe that all of us can agree on patriation of the constitution — to bring it home is something that I doubt that any Legislature of this country will oppose. What we need to agree upon is how to do it. The second issue that's being totally confused is the issue of the entrenched Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It's being laid out as a simple opposition to the protection of human rights and freedoms. If you are opposed to this entrenched Charter, ergo you must be opposed to the better protection of rights and freedoms. I suggest to you that that is doing a disservice to this entire debate because again you will find total agreement on the need always for better protection of human rights and freedoms amongst all of us in this Chamber. But you have to look at where it's coming from; you have to look at how it's being portrayed.

I quote to you from the debates of the House of Commons from Page 3356 of Hansard, Mr. Speaker. "I believe this debate once again shows how relevant and valuable an institution Parliament is. I, for one, am very glad that the debate has finally come to its proper home. The debate about the Constitutional laws of this country is now outside the arena of the federal-provincial conference and in an arena where the full range of opinions and views in all regions can be heard, expressed, debated and discussed." That's a very noble statement. That sounds as though it comes from somebody who is really interested in listening to the views of all Canadians on this particular issue. It's a statement, Mr. Speaker, that was made on October 7 by the Unemployment and Imitation (sic) Minister from this area and a very noble one, indeed, except that less than two weeks later, after fewer than one-quarter of the 124 members of the opposition had spoken, closure was imposed. Parliament didn't hear the views of all Canadians because you know as well as I do that the majority of those members in the opposition come from one entire region of this country and their views were not adequately heard and the debate did not adequately provide for them to make the views of their constituents and of their regions known.

Further, in that same debate, the statement was made, "In the end, this is the place where the choice should be made. It is not to be made around the table by 11 people who, though they represent regions, do not in any way represent the full range of opinions and views within those regions. As one of the western members of the government benches, I think it is very important that I express this other point of view which I, together with hundreds of thousands of western Canadians, believe was not expressed at the Federal-Provincial Conference last September." Again, that's what was said in the House of Commons by Mr. Axworthy.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Gallup Poll that was recently published indicated that Canadians overall are opposed two to one to unilateral patriation of the Constitution and even more in greater numbers in western Canada. So I suggest to

you that Mr. Axworthy should be "a little perplexed" because that's what he said when he heard those results, because he had found support increasing for the federal package. That's what he said. I think he ought to be a little perplexed and I think we ought to ask what is the position of the New Democrats on this particular issue because we have some very strange statements being made by them. (Interjection)— Here we have it, it's titled "Historical Highlight"; I could subtitle it "Your Laugh for the Day", but I quote, "Every generation has its historical milestone. J.S. Woodsworth persuaded MacKenzie King to legislate Unemployment Insurance and Old Age Pensions; T.C. Douglas gave us Medicare; John Diefenbaker gave us the Canadian Bill of Rights; Lester Pearson gave us the national flag; Trudeau gave us our national anthem and is planning to give us our Canadian Constitution. When the dust has settled, however, posterity will remember how Ed Broadbent won resource control for the west." Now if that isn't an opportunistic and totally incredible statement to be made by the Member of Parliament for Dauphin constituency, it's unbelievable. We always had resource control in the west before this proposed federal package. It's not a question of somebody giving it to us, it's a question of stopping somebody from taking it away from us and Ed Broadbent isn't the man who will do it. It's the Premiers and the people of this country who are violently opposed to that proposition that are going to stop the Prime Minister from taking resources away from the provinces. It has nothing to do with Ed Broadbent.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we would be doing this country a great deal better service if we got off these blind alleys that we are being taken down by the federal hype campaign. You know, you have seen the billboards that say your Constitution, make it right, make it better, make it ours, all those slogans, and get on to the matter of patriation, yes, but how? And protection of human rights, yes, we're in favour of it but how are you best going to accomplish it because I suggest to you that if you asked people in this province and across this country the question, are you in favour of the best possible protection for your human rights and freedoms? They would say, yes, but as the Member for Inkster indicated, that best possible protection already exists under our present democratic parliamentary system of government in Canada and we don't want somebody to take it away from us and that's the whole pointed issue in this whole debate and it's time we got on to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I've talked a lot about these interesting things. I haven't covered all the exciting things because they are already in the Throne Speech but just in case the members opposite need some refreshing, we are talking about resource development in this province at a level which has never been seen before in this province. We're talking about using our hydro-electric energy as a primary instrument of economic development in this province, not using it merely as a means of creating jobs on the public payroll and increasing our hydro rates at the expense of all Manitobans. We're talking about taking that energy, taking that readily available renewable energy and using it as a primary instrument of economic development to attract

energy intensive industries like Alcan, not only a smelter, but for aluminum castings, like production of hydrogen and all those things that will create millions of dollars of private investment and jobs. Jobs for Manitobans, that's what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the exciting developments go on and on and on. The western electric power grid, the rapeseed crushing plant the CSB are putting in at Harrowby, the gasohol and all those things. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very positive Throne Speech. This is a Throne Speech that looks to the future and tells Manitobans that there are better things to come. It's a Throne Speech that I am proud to support and, Mr. Speaker, I commend it to all members of the House. Thank you very much.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As always it's a pleasure to participate in this, the first major event of any legislative session. Of course, I welcome your reappointment to your high office within these Chambers and give you once again a pledge that I will attempt to continue to work together with you in order to maintain the order, the decorum and the dignity of these Chambers and, as in the past number of years, I will, from time to time, welcome your advice and welcome your protection from the members opposite. It looks as if this year, Mr. Speaker, I can offer you my protection from the members opposite from occasion to occasion also. I give you assurance that I will do that to uphold the dignity and the honour of your office and to ensure that you are able to participate in your role as capably as is possible.

I believe that role, Mr. Speaker, of maintaining the dignity and decorum of this office is going to be a bit more difficult this year because there is a theory and thesis and I think it's well accepted that the partisanship of politicians increases as does the proximity to an election. I think that what we have witnessed on Monday of this week, the unusual events of the members standing to attack personalities more than anything else, to attack people more than policies, principles and programs is only indicative of the type of Session that we are going to have. I, Sir, look forward to working in these Chambers to provide the type of legislation which is beneficial to Manitobans but I do not look forward to that type of Session, so I hope that we have seen the worse of it and that it will get better from now on. But I think there is a reason for that sort of action on behalf of the members opposite and that is, they find themselves in a curious position. They should be defending their record of three years but it is an indefensible record. They are unable to defend that record and they are able only to attack personalities, so we will need more goodwill than usual and I think that it is only appropriate, given the season of the year and the fact that we are fast approaching Christmas, that we make that pledge of goodwill and I, Sir, am honoured to be able to make it to you at this time.

While speaking to you directly, Mr. Speaker, I hope that you can take into consideration the sound system or the Minister of Government Services can take into consideration the sound system and some of the problems that we are experiencing with it. It



makes it somewhat more difficult to perform our functions here. I noticed today I had the earphone plugged in and all of a sudden we had a screeching hum which I think was uncomfortable if not painful to most of us. I just encourage whatever efforts can be made to ensure that that sound system does in fact be improved.

I would also like to offer the customary congratulations to the mover, the seconder of the Throne Speech. It was a pleasure to hear them speak and I look forward to hearing them more often during this Session than in the past. Having said the customary and the expected, I'd like to immediately discuss the Throne Speech.

I believe, Sir, that the significance of this Throne Speech is more one of omission than what it contains. I believe that it is a parody on a Throne Speech at best, and at worst, it is an empty document that lacks any sort of concrete economic analysis or concrete analysis of the social problems which face all of us as Manitobans, as Canadians and as legislators. Because they have not addressed the problems or the issues, it is impossible for them to come up with the solutions and so we have a Throne Speech that is subsequently void of any sort of comprehensive planning or any type of overall strategy which it is incumbent upon the government to provide in a Throne Speech. What they have attempted to do with this particular speech, I believe, is to camouflage it with grandiose plans, the mega projects about which we hear so much. They tell us that we should share their hope; that we should share their optimism and that if we don't share that hope and optimism that these projects are going to come to pass very shortly, then we are in some way doing a disservice to the people of this province. Well, I will tell them, Mr. Speaker, that not only do we not share all of their hope and all of their optimism, but neither does the public share that hope and that optimism. They are not fooled by the sweet talk and the sugar coatings of a Throne Speech that is virtually empty of any substance. They have been fooled or perhaps they haven't been fooled but they have certainly seen the bird-in-the-bush offer of the government on numerous occasions past and they are not going to be fooled by it this time.

You know, we have heard it all before, the grandiose plans, the mega projects, the bright sunny days, blue skies budgets, we've heard it in other Throne Speeches. We've heard it in the Pollyanna budgets that they have brought to bear, that have not borne fruit and we are conditioned to the disappointment that we have experienced from time to time. I hope that you will pardon our scepticism but I do believe it to be earned and I believe, Sir, that even our disbelief might be earned.

At this point I think it's important to address some of my remarks to the contribution just made by the Member for River Heights in the Throne Speech. I welcome him to this, what he considers to be his first active role in the Throne Speech Debate. I would just, without trying to analyse and discuss all the points he brought forward in his speech, try to disabuse him of a misconception that he apparently has and that is that his government was the first government to provide CEDF loans to the Treaty Indian people in Manitoba. It was his government

that took that right away from the Treaty Indian people of Manitoba and then subsequently under pressure from the Treaty Indian people and under pressure from their friends and under pressure from this side of the House was forced to reinstate that right. So in fact, Sir, —(Interjection)— and the Member for Rupertsland does correct me and he says that they have only reinstated it partially and that is a fact. So what we have in that instance, for the Member of River Height's edification, is a situation that is worse as far as the Treaty Indian people of this province are concerned than it was three years ago, and I think he should be made aware of that so that he does not make that mistake again.

I believe, Sir, given the reaction and the actions on the government side, that we can only make the assumption that they are in fact aware of exactly what their Throne Speech is, and as well, they are aware of what it isn't. And they're embarrassed by it all. And I think that's why they had to resort to the embarrassing behaviour of Monday, which only acted to further discredit an already weak Throne Speech. It was not to their benefit to have done that, but having done that I think they have only indicated that they are in fact extremely embarrassed by it all. And they will continue to suffer that embarrassment because there is certainly more to come, until they suffer the ultimate embarrassment, in not so short a time I hope, of losing the next election, of having thrown away the largest electoral majority in this province since the early 1900s, by exactly the type of actions, and exactly the type of rhetoric and verbiage that we saw in the Throne Speech of a couple of days ago. And they should not only be embarrassed by those failures, they should be shamed by those failures. They should be shamed because they have been unable to create the type of economic climate, and all due credit to them, Sir, in which they very strongly believe, and in which I believe, they very strongly want.

So giving them that motivation, which I think is an honourable motivation, Sir, I among others, and the people of this province, I can assure you, are extremely disappointed with their latest effort. At best it is a fuzzy rendition of the First Minister's personal philosophy. An 18th century approach to government, the usual combination of laissez-faire economics and right-wing social policies. A First Minister who is suspicious of any progressive group and by that suspicion cuts himself away and isolates himself from a good portion of the population. But that is the yoke they carry. That's their albatross and I assume they're willing to carry it. The Jeykl and Hyde mixture, Sir, of Adam Smith and Ronald Reagan, if I may. And I believe, Sir, in all due respect, that that is what is going to cost them that largest electoral majority in many years in this province. I know it has given them a speech which is plagued with the usual vagueness, in both approach and in language, a tragedy of a document, Sir, that lacks the analysis and is an avoidance of problem stating, and thereby problem solving. And there are serious problems in the Province of Manitoba, and in all fairness to members opposite, they are not all problems of their own making. Many of them, Sir, are national in scope, for which we have to thank a Liberal federal government, who has been able to

correspondingly mismanage the Canadian economy as much as the Conservative government in this province have been able to mismanage our own economy.

But some of them go beyond that, some of them are global in scope and in origin, and so we cannot blame the government for them because they are going to spill over into the economy of Manitoba, regardless of whichever government is in power at any given time. But we can, Sir, assess and blame for having failed to lessen the impact of those problems on the people of Manitoba, for having failed to put in place the type of countermeasures that are necessary to deal with problems which originate from outside our borders. And I will give them credit that the role of the province is limited in this respect, but they have failed even to live up to that limited role.

Inflation was a subject which they brought to the attention of the government when the sides within this House were switched, time and time again, as if the provincial government had a role to play in the inflationary process that was taking place, and perhaps, Sir, the provincial government does have a role to play to attempt in some way to lessen the impact, but we know that inflation in Manitoba today, is as high, or is higher than in many other provinces and many other cities, and I'd like to place that remark in the northern context. Because, Sir, while inflation is an onerous burden for any working family to carry in the Province of Manitoba, it is especially onerous for those of the north. The figures are not as accurate as I would hope them to be, but I have been informed that it costs approximately 22 a month more to feed a family of four in northern Manitoba than it does in southern Manitoba. So you can see right there that the impact of rising food prices on people in the north is going to be significantly greater than the impact on people in the south.

So they have refused to come up with any sort of initiative or innovative programs to deal with that, whether it be in the northern context or the southern context. They've sat on their hands. But, Sir, if the wages that the working people of this province were being paid, were able to keep up with the inflation and the increases in the cost of living, then perhaps they could be a little more lackadaisical in their actions in regard to dealing with inflation. But wages have increased less in this province than in most provinces. We are the only province with net out-migration. And I direct your attention again to the northern context of Gillam and Churchill, two communities, Sir, which are suffering, those tragic effects of out-migration, that accompany a loss of population and we will go into some detail on that throughout this session and perhaps later in this Throne Speech if time permits.

But those people who are leaving this province, Sir, are not only the northerners but they are the young and the skilled, because they are the most highly mobile people in our society. They are the people who are able to leave when the economy deteriorates. And we have in fact, families being torn apart because this government is refusing to take the type of comprehensive, and the type of positive action which it is incumbent upon them to take. And I don't say that without specifics in mind, Mr.

Speaker. I had a young man, a man my own age, perhaps a little bit younger, come to my house the other day and say that he was having to travel to the Yukon to get a job because he'd lost his job in northern Manitoba and he was having to leave his family behind.

There are very real personal tragedies that are resulting from this government's inability to govern. And today, in the question period, and I can assure you in many question periods to follow and throughout this Session, we discussed plant disclosures and layoffs. And they continue, Sir, unabated. We can again refer to the northern context of Thompson, and the layoffs that we had at Inco, when this government first came in power, a slap in the face to this government, who had come in power. I remember the rumours that circulated and percolated through the mine in Thompson before the last election. They said you know if a New Democratic Party government is elected to office in the Province of Manitoba, there will be massive layoffs in this mine. And we weren't elected. We were not elected and there were massive layoffs at Inco. And if, Sir, if that isn't a rejection of the government's policies, I don't know what is. But in fact we are seeing Inco operation in Thompson, closed down this summer, for a period of time, because of the type of economic climate that has been created, not only in this province, but throughout the Canadian context.

So they are ignoring the plant closures. They're refusing to acknowledge them in some instances. We found out today that the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Labour are not even consulting on a formal basis to try to develop a strategy, to protect the interests of Manitoba and to protect the interests of the workers involved.

So we see that they do very little in that respect. And those layoffs and closures are creating significant problems, social problems, Sir, that extend throughout the entire economy. And we've talked about them before, we'll talk about them again. But I'll tell you the Throne Speech did not talk about them. The Throne Speech did not mention the layoffs. The Throne Speech did not mention measures that might be taken to ameliorate some of the problems that are created by that type of unemployment. No, no, Sir, they are ignoring it and continuing to ignore it.

And the environmental quality of this province continues to deteriorate, again it is a problem that is not entirely of the provincial government's making, but let them take more positive action than they have taken. Let them show more initiative than they have taken to date. Let them be more innovative in their approach. And they refuse that responsibility, Sir, and for that we all suffer.

Within the workplaces themselves, workers continue to suffer accidents and occupational illnesses, and yet we have a reference to workplace safety and health in the Throne Speech, and it consists of one very vague line. They have one line, workplace safety and health in their Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. And I can suggest that that only shows a lack of commitment to the type of programs which are so obviously necessary.

And we have seen the lack of initiative in respect to northern problems, Sir. There have been some

suggestions, and they're little more than suggestions in the Throne Speech, that action is going to be taken. But, in fact, they do very little to deal with the types of problems that northerners face, and here I will differ with my earlier statements. Many of the problems that northerners face are brought on because of the provincial government. They have to bear the responsibility, because their treatment of northern Manitoba has isolated that part of the province from the rest of the province and has alienated the people in northern Manitoba, to an extent that has not been seen before for many, many decades, Mr. Speaker, and I know of what I talk, because these people have come to me and they have told me about those problems and we will discuss that, throughout the debate.

The list of what they have failed to do, the list of their failures to react positively is too long for one speech but I wanted to put on the record a series of what I consider to be significant problems.

The government has options. It has ways of dealing with these types of problems. They are legislative in nature, some. Some are regulatory in nature; some are the development of support mechanisms; programs and policies. Yet this government, because of their laissez-faire attitude, because they are locked in an ideological time war, refuse to provide that type of leadership, refuse to provide progressive policies and programs and for that we all suffer.

They have consistently refused to develop an active interface with society, Sir, on behalf of the citizens of the province.

The First Minister, his colleagues on the Cabinet bench, the members opposite, sit on their hands, Mr. Speaker, and with a Trudeau-like shrug of the shoulders, they cast Manitobans to the winds of fortune. They tell them to rearrange their priorities. Less fresh food on the table. Less meat on the table. Let them eat less of the good products, if necessary let them join the breadlines; at least the families will be together, if we are to believe the stories that have been in the media recently.

Mr. Speaker, there's a new movie in town, oh I don't know how new it is, I just saw it the other night. It's called "One Trick Pony". And what it is about is a rock and roll singer, who is very popular in the '60s and in the '80s refuses to change his style or his technique and because of that is driven from the business because he only knew the one trick, the hard raunchy, rock and roll. And because he was unwilling or unable, as it may be, to meet the demands of the new audiences of the '80s, he had to stop doing what he knew best.

This government, Sir, is a "One Trick Pony" government. Let the private sector do it, that's all they know. Let the private sector do it. Don't tamper with the engine that fuels the economy, Sir, and like the rock and roll singer, because they refuse to meet the challenge of the '80s, and if there's one thing obvious from the Throne Speech, it is that, they do refuse to meet the challenge of the '80s. They will be driven from the government. (Interjection)—The Minister responsible for Government Services says, oh no, but then let him prove it, Sir. Let him prove it by developing the type of policy and programs, which will in fact meet the type of problems that we face today.

It's time, customarily, to reflect on the events of the past year, and in this case, the past three years, during a Throne Speech debate. It allows us the opportunity, I hope and I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, to discuss that in the context of the Throne Speech before us. And I would like to, Sir, talk about some of the problems that they avoid and discuss some options and possible solutions. Because while we do not accept what they have done, we do believe that we can provide them with some insight, and the benefit of our advice, and they can reject it if they will and if they wish. But the fact is I feel responsibility to provide them with the type of advice which may in fact, help them become a better government, because we are going to have to live under this government for at least a few more months.

And I'd like to direct specific attention to a number of specific areas which are indicative of the type of problems that we face and may provide examples and lessons on how to deal with those.

Inflation and wages, of course, is one that affects every individual in the Province of Manitoba.

The health and safety of our workers in the workplaces, is another issue which I think should bear some discussion in this debate.

The protection of the environment, is another area.

And of course conditions in northern Manitoba is another concern which is going to be brought forward.

I will bring forward many of these concerns, and my other colleagues, of course, will bring forward other concerns because there is not enough time in one Throne Speech to address yourself to all the issues to which you might wish to speak, as the Member for River Heights indicated in his speech.

But let us examine the area of wages and salaries and inflation very briefly and let us put it in a very specific context, Mr. Speaker, and that is the minimum wage earner, the low wage earner, because the test of any government is how it treats the less strong segments of its society. That is a test, and the minimum wage earner is a classic example because they lack economic clout, because they are for the most part unorganized and therefore lack the power of the union behind them, and for those reasons they need special attention from the government. It is the Tories that have turned their back so obviously on the low wage earners in this province. Because working poor, minimum wage earners, low wage earners, they're all inter-related. You can't keep the minimum wage arbitrarily and artificially low as they have and not have that effect extend throughout all of the low wage economy.

Since September 1st, 1976 which was the last change increase in the minimum wage under the New Democratic Party Government, there has been less than a seven percent increase in minimum wage earnings for Manitobans. But at that same time, during that same period, the cost of living has increased by over 40 percent. So what we see is a significant drop in the standard of living. We see in fact the minimum wage earners suffer a standard of living that is reduced by a full one-quarter because of the government's refusal to provide them with a decent wage. They are worse off, Mr. Speaker, in both relative and absolute terms.

Manitoba has lost its previous standing that it held in regard to the minimum wages in other provinces,

about which this government used to boast I might add. They would say, what's the problem, well, we're third or fourth, but now they're much lower than that, and in fact they are getting lower and lower as the other governments react to the needs of low wage earners and increase their minimum wage.

When the government took office, Sir, the minimum wage as a comparison to the average industrial wage was close to 50 percent. Now it's closer to 43 percent, so we see the type of burden that the government has imposed upon the low wage earners in this province. But they're not the only ones to have suffered under a Tory government, Mr. Speaker. All working people have suffered a loss in real income since October 1, 1977.

Because of the low wage policies of the government combined with the inflationary pressures, it has been insured that Manitoba workers are unable to maintain the standard of living that they have been used to. I use the period October 1977 to July 1980 as a statistical basis not out of convenience, Sir, but because it is necessary due to the method of keeping statistics by Statistics Canada. During that period wages increased by approximately 22 percent, prices increased by 28 percent, and if you round the figures off you have a difference of about five-and-a-half percent. In other words, there has been a loss of five-and-a-half percent to every worker in this province on a statistical basis. That means that Manitobans are losing hundreds of dollars every year directly because of the low wage philosophy of the government members, and it's part and parcel of the Tory philosophy, Sir, to keep the wages down because they believe that in fact they have to develop an artificial competition within this province as compared to other provinces so they will keep the wages down, they'll allow the prices to increase unimpeded. Such was their goal, such was their accomplishment, and that is the reason that you see the Private Members' Resolution on the Order Paper concerned with increasing the minimum wage, because we believe it is time that the government took some positive action and if we can help them to take that positive action, either through persuasion or pressure, we will certainly do so.

The issue of wages is pertinent only to those who are lucky enough to be working right now, because unfortunately it is a matter of luck. (Interjection)— Well, the Minister of Government Services tells us that it's 30,000 new jobs since the government took office. Well, Sir, let's look at the employment lottery that they have created with those 30,000 new jobs. Let's talk about the past year, let's talk about the most recent experience that we have. In the past year, Mr. Speaker, only one out of every three Manitobans entering the labour force have found jobs because there was only one job for every three of them who wanted to work. Those are the facts and if they want to dispute them they can go to Statistics Canada.

Earlier today I talked about the fact that I believe that 7,000 Manitobans were out of work because in fact they had lost their job — job loss. The Minister of Labour stood up and he said, I don't think those facts are right. He even used the word fictitious and he challenged me to prove it to him. Well, it didn't take long, at least it didn't take me long, Sir, I'm not

certain what research capacity he has. But it's in the Statistics Canada bulletin entitled The Labour Force, and if you want to look at it, Sir, you will find that in October, which is the latest one available to us and it's a fairly constant figure so I feel comfortable in using it — 8,000 Manitobans were out of work because they had lost their job or they were laid off. If he examines the experience of other jurisdictions who have done more and better research on this than they have felt necessary to do, he will find out that approximately 90 percent of those are off because of a layoff, not because they voluntarily lost their job, not because they were fired, but because of an involuntary layoff. That would mean that approximately 7,200 workers in Manitoba are suffering unemployment because of the type of policies which they have brought forward, which have resulted in the bankruptcies, which have resulted in the plant closures, which have resulted in the shutdowns throughout industry, and they have to accept responsibility for that figure, which approximately equals one-third of the work force, which is what I tried to tell the Minister earlier today I hope he will read this speech and find that that is indeed the case, and if he wishes to contradict it well we'll have that discussion at another time.

Last year, 3,000 new jobs created in Manitoba. It's an abysmal record, Mr. Speaker — 3,000 new jobs, 9,000 people entering the labour force, so two out of every three unable to find their jobs. And they boast, and they brag, and they puff their chests and they talk in proud terms about the job creation record they have. Sir, it is one of the worst in the country. That is nothing to brag about, that is something to be ashamed of, that is something to be embarrassed by, and that is why I think we see them attacking personalities when they should in fact be discussing the type of problems they are afraid to admit that they have created those types of problems — problems of those magnitudes — and they don't know how to get out of the bind that they put themselves in because of their laissez-faire dependence upon the private sector, Sir.

Manitoba couldn't even ride the national wave in regard to job creation and that's why Manitobans are moving out of this province because it's better in other provinces. It's better economically and it's better socially. The jobs aren't here, Sir; the wages aren't here; they're not able to keep up their standard of living in this province. So we have a deplorable record of job creation. We will be talking about that record, and in specific plant closures. We want to discuss in a rational and realistic way, because we hope to be able to persuade the government in this regard to the problems that are created by plant closures for both the economy and for the individuals. The closures pose an interesting problem or an interesting question I should say.

If the Alcan project, which they have talked about in the Throne Speech is a mega project as the Throne Speech and the words that have been uttered out of this Chamber by the members opposite are correct, because 700 direct manufacturing jobs are gained. If the potash development is a mega project because 400 permanent jobs, — and let me just interject here, Mr. Speaker, we have learned that no jobs are permanent — but if 400 long-term jobs are created,

if they are, so isn't that correspondingly the closure of Swift's or the Tribune or Maple Leaf Mills, and the massive layoffs in the construction industry, because of their policies, mega closures. If one is a mega project because of the numbers involved, is something else that is of the same magnitude not a mega closure, Sir? I ask you that the question because it is a pertinent question, because there is no reference to the closures in the Throne Speech nor is there any reference about what they want to do about it, what they intend to do about it. I don't think they should include in the Throne Speech their failures, but I think they should at least include their ideas on how they're going to deal with those failures and we see nothing.

The record must be clear, Sir. We are not opposed to industrial development on this side, as an opposition or as a government welcome industries and resultant jobs provided that they comply with commonly accepted health and safety, environmental and societal standards, and I think the government members do the same. I don't think they want jobs that are not in the best interests of all Manitobans, whether they work in a plant or live around the plant. So if in fact those jobs comply with those criteria, the record must be clear that we do in fact support them. We would like to see them proceeded with in different ways from time to time, but we are not anti-industrial development, but our concern goes beyond that, Sir. We are concerned that they may not come to pass and I think we have every reason to be so concerned given the record of the government, but we are also fearful that the government is so desperate at this point in their tenure for any sort of industrial activity that they are willing to accept any sort of bargain, any contract. I'll tell you industry is aware of their desperation, Sir, and they are driving the type of hard bargains and that concerns us. So we are fearful that they may in fact be selling out Manitoba potential for the sake of a few jobs to balance an equation sheet which they feel will get them re-elected.

Sir, I think the mega projects are really beggar projects. I think they're going on their hands and knees to industry and begging for anything, and when they do that they are not doing that with the best interests of you and I and the people of this province in mind. They're doing that in their own best interests because they think it'll gain them an election which it will not. There is a government on the ropes and we know it's on the ropes, Sir, and the industry knows it's on the ropes. So let us make this assurance to the public, Sir, that we will in fact be supportive of their measures where deserved, but we will be critical when necessary and we will operate with the best interests of all Manitobans at heart and at hand.

I'd like to address in specific what has happened and what has not happened in northern Manitoba in the past three years, Mr. Speaker, because if times have been hard for the wage earner and a person wants a job, and if times have been hard for the small business owner which we have seen, and if times have been hard for the farmer and the pensioner under this government, then times have been unbearable by comparative standards for the people of northern Manitoba. And the Throne Speech does very little to redress the legitimate

grievances of northerners. (Interjection)— Well, the Minister for Government Services says, "Do I want them to be able to heat their homes, do I want to be able to see lower energy costs in northern Manitoba?" Indeed I do and I'd like to make reference to that pipeline, the Trans Canada Pipeline, which they talk about, which will supply natural gas service to Thompson and southern and northern Manitoba communities, if we are to believe what they say in the Throne Speech; if it is to come to pass and that's a big "if" which circulates throughout the Throne Speech. (Interjection)— The Minister asks, "Has he ever let us down?" — I don't believe it's necessary to answer that question. But we do welcome any reduction in energy costs, in heating costs, but we reserve the right to question this method of accomplishing that reduction. We want to see some facts; we want to see some figures; we want to see studies, cost benefit analysis; we want to be able to make the decision on our own, if in fact this is the most economical and the best way to go about it. We will be demanding that sort of information and I hope that the government can provide it. We commend the initiative but we are going to reserve judgment on the methodology.

I will take another opportunity because I see my time is getting short to talk to the Minister responsible for MHRC about the supply of propane to the community of Churchill because that is an area which demonstrates that government does not always have the best interests of the people of the community at heart, and we will talk about that.

The Minister of Transportation talked about the boom in mining activity in the Lynn Lake area and indeed there is exploration and indeed there is talk about a new mine coming in there, the Agassiz gold mine, but I think the Minister of Transportation if he wants to see that activity, should hop in his car and drive that Thompson to Lynn Lake road to see what that's about. That should concern him because this government has done so very little to improve the road conditions in northern Manitoba, that it is necessary for him to see firsthand, the type of deplorable roads which are existing in that part of the province today. We expect action on it; perhaps, not from that government but we do expect action soon after the change in government, Sir.

We want to talk about many of the other problems, and we will, facing northerners because they refuse to talk about them. The problem in supplying doctors to communities, the problems they are experiencing in the Northern Patient Transportation Program, the increased airfare and reduced schedules of flights in the communities. Their hydro policies, we have less of a commitment in this year's Throne Speech for hydro development than we had in the past two Throne Speeches. They are covering their bets. They are covering their bets because they are worried, Mr. Speaker. In the couple of minutes that are available to me I want to assure you that we will be discussing these in detail by resolution, by debates such as this, during the question period. We will be bringing not only the concerns for it but we will be bringing forward our ideas and our suggestions.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to show you a wine glass that I have brought . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Exhibits are not allowed in the Chamber.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you about a wine glass that I came across recently and it is a wine glass that has inscribed in it in one area "Win in '77" and on the other area it says, Mr. Speaker, "We can offer a gentle government based on common sense", and signed by Sterling Lyon. Well, Sir, if they have offered us anything, it is not a government based on —(Interjection)— a gentle government. The last thing this has been is a gentle government. A government which has alienated almost every progressive segment of the society and every part of the society that wants to see a better Manitoba because they refused to take action. The people of this province, having sipped from that wine glass in '77, Sir, and having suffered the last three years of broken promises, broken pledges and a deteriorating economy will have to make a decision soon whether once again to take a drink of the heady wine that the First Minister offered them in '77. I suggest to you, Sir, that once bitten, twice shy, they will be far more prone to put back in place a New Democratic Party government that has their best interests in mind and will act positively and forcefully to continue the type of progress which we were able to accomplish under our administration previously.

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to express my appreciation for being able to join in Throne Speech Debate. I wish to compliment the Mover and Seconder on their participation in moving the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to compliment you in your continued position as Speaker of the House. After the drama that we experienced here yesterday, I would assume that everything will look a lot easier for you after this and I would expect that you will be ruling again in your usual creditable way in giving us guidance in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate my strong support for the Throne Speech that was tabled before this House. I do not have the ability of the flowery dialogue that the Member for Churchill has and maybe saying many words and not saying very much substance. However, Mr. Speaker, when he talked, the Member for Churchill made reference to the Throne Speech's empty document. I would like to make reference to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, the reply to the Throne Speech, and in my opinion that was a very empty document that was written into the record.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in his one-and-a-half hour dialogue in this House here made reference to broken promises of the Conservative government and that the people in the province and specifically in the Emerson constituency as he referred to from time to time, were unhappy. I would like to relate some of the positive things that have happened since our government took over in '77. I want to, because of the lack of policy really that the Leader of the Opposition indicated at that time, I would like to wonder and ask him whether these are things that they will re-implement again. For example, number one, and I have a list, Mr. Speaker, I want to get them on to the record: the removal of the state tax, are they going to bring that

back in? The removal of the mineral acreage tax, are you bringing that back in again? There are smaller items, like the bailing out of the Whitemouth Co-operative which was a company that was formed through the previous government where they sort of sucked in 12 farmers to operate a grazing co-operative. When they had them into hock up to their eyeballs, then we finally had to step in and bail them out. I'm referring to items that happened in my constituency and the effect it has had there. Are you going to increase the personal income tax, the small business corporate tax? Are these things that you are going to increase again? There was very little mention of any policy in your reply to the Throne Speech. In fact, I wonder how you are going to be facing the people without a policy in the next election which could be coming soon.

The other thing that I would like to mention here, the removal of the yoke of the Beef Assurance Program. The Leader of the Opposition is getting excited when we talk of election and he well should. He well should be excited because that will probably be the termination of his term in office. But I want to just refer back again to the Beef Assurance Program that was established by the then previous Minister of Agriculture and I referred to it as a yoke and it was a "yoke" around the beef farmers of Manitoba. We struggled with this thing for almost two years before we finally got that yoke off their backs.

The things that I wanted to compliment our government, our Ministers with, is the handling of the flood program last spring in '79, and this year we were faced with the drought problem. In both cases, proper programs had been set up; they have dealt with the issues well. The one problem we've had with the drought program is that the feds decided to jump into this program and did a very capable job of screwing it up. I want to clarify that to some degree. When we initiated the Feed Assistance Program, first, the feds said they would participate, then they withdraw and say they won't. Then they want to set up their own program; then they come up and say they will offer every dairy farmer 140 per cow for assistance and every beef farmer 70 for a cow. Right now, where we're at is at 70 per dairy cow, 70 percent of the herd that they will keep. One farmer gets it and the next one gets refused, side by side. The next one gets it again, the next one gets refused and this is being handled incidentally through PFRA and for the federal government. The farmers and I'm sure the members — mind you, there aren't very many rural members on your side of the House, but those that are there — must realize what is happening as well. Why haven't you raised the question in the House till now? The Member for Ste. Rose sits there and looks innocent. I'm sure you have the same situations in your area as I have in mine but you have not spoken up on the matter.

Another positive thing, Mr. Speaker, the sale of Crown lands' policy that we have had that we presented to the leaseholders of the province that are leasing Crown lands. Are you going to be cancelling that program as well? If you intend to cancel it, then you should indicate that to the municipal people in the local government districts that you plan to cancel the sale of Crown lands.

Then we have the famous role of MACC under your government, when you changed the role of

Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation from borrowing money for young farmers to buying up the farmlands of Manitoba. (Interjection)— State farms is exactly. Are we going to go back to that program? Are you going to be promising this in your election promises next time around? What our Minister of Agriculture has done, he has changed the role of MACC around to the point where we don't buy farmlands, we sell farmlands, back to the farmers where it belongs and we borrow them the money for that. We give the young farmers a chance to start on their own, instead of leasing it almost like in the Communist countries of Russia where you get a little plot and you work it.

Now, Bill 86, the Member for Inkster's favourite Bill. One thing I have to say for the Member for Inkster, at least he is honest in his opinions which most of you people are not. You do not indicate your true feelings; you do not tell the people that you are going to re-implement some of these things but the Member for Inkster indicated during Bill 86, he says, "The Crown should buy the land, the farmer's place and then lease it to them because of the high capital cost." At least we know where he stands. I don't agree with it but at least he states his opinions on that. Bill 86 and I'm sorry that — four members, rural members, there is only one rural member here but that the critic for Agriculture is not here. You people voted against Bill 86.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin):** The Honourable for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** I don't think it's parliamentary to comment on the absence of a member from the House. I think that's an unparliamentary remark.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Coming back to Bill 86, it was a traumatic move made by the Minister of Agriculture, a gutsy move, and you voted against it. You voted against it and when you come to the rural hustings at the next election, we will remind you and the people will remind you and we will return. I'm still going on the items based on the Leader of the Opposition's statement that "broken promises". We're just going down the line of the things that have happened on the positive side. We have a land-clearing program in the southeast, an intra-subsidized program. We have over 300-and-some-odd applications in my constituency alone for the clearing of lands, yes, brushing, breaking.

**A MEMBER:** Why are there so many people unhappy in your constituency? Everything is so much . . . there is so much sunshine . . .

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Well, we'll get to that. The time is coming, the time is coming and I will explain. But what has happened in the southeast constituency, eight years of your government with your members sitting there and you ignored it. Finally, you can ask the people themselves and I've attended many meetings out there. Finally there is the positive reaction happening in the southeast.

Another thing, the Minister of Agriculture allowed, he allowed the beef producers to form their own organization instead of the heavy hand of government the way you like it, they established their own. We have now the Cattle Producers Association in place, you don't hear the grumblings anymore. There is peace in the agricultural front.

Now an item of major nature in the southeast corner, the Agro-Man Agreement with the SPADA group. SPADA, incidentally, I mentioned it before. It's the Stuartburn-Piney Agricultural Development Association, organized by themselves. No government involved. What they have done though, they have participated in federal and provincial money in the operation of it but they established on their own. They have over 20 projects related to the area in terms of cash crops, land-clearing programs, etc. Hey, they don't need anybody of us there. They are looking after themselves.

Another item of major nature in my constituency and some of these have affected the total province. Some have affected maybe my constituency more than others. The Minister of Education's Tax Rebate Program. Would you believe that in the LGD of Stuartburn, 68 percent of the people do not pay 1.00 tax, 68 percent do not pay 1.00 tax and members opposite yell of the high taxes and that is nothing compared to what is coming when the Minister of Education finishes with his program this year.

Mr. Speaker, there are many of these items that I could go on and on and on. When the Leader of the Opposition talks of broken promises, you know, we could go on with including roads, the village of St. Malo. Fourteen years they asked to have their treets paved in town. We completed a program this year. (Interjection)— He says, I'm happy. Schools, low rental buildings for the senior citizens, arsenic removal. The Member for Inkster well remembers that. We finally came to head with that. I'm not saying that he didn't try at his time but we finally accomplished it. There are things like sewer and water installations in communities, specifically in my hometown where sewer and water was installed by the previous government and we had to reinstall the whole thing because of the way it was handled at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says that people in Emerson are unhappy and I wish to deal with three specific points that he raised during the nomination of the NDP in the village of St. Malo. "The poor quality of the opposition", he states, "will put their boots to Sterling Lyon." That brings an issue to mind right now as to the quality of leadership which I will touch on a little later.

It's stated here, "Pawley criticized the Conservatives for freezing the construction of personal care homes, while spending money on constant and repeated TV advertising, such as ad shows", etc. etc., you know. "The NDP government would resume construction of care homes." You're late. You're late. The Minister of Health has indicated that we have 840 beds, en route, either in construction or being —(Interjection)— they know that. A budget of 30 million is slated for personal care homes.

Now I want to just relate a few more facts. You talk of, you know, oh pardon me, I've got to cover this a little bit. The Leader of the Opposition

indicated that they would look after the senior citizens with tender loving care. Tender loving care. In 1977, the last year they were in power, they spent 52,994,000 on loving care. In 1979-80, this is on operations, our government, spent 68,835,000 and it's gone up to 78 million now, in tender loving care. What kind of tender loving care are you going to give? You, you spent half the money in the personal care homes that we have.

Further reference, Mr. Speaker, "A New Democratic Government would also tighten the Farmlands Protection Act, which has been loosened by the Conservatives", Pawley said. "He promised the NDP would ensure the province's farmland remains in the hands of Manitobans." Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1978, our present Minister of Agriculture tightened up the Farmlands Protection Act. We reduced it from 160 acres of non-foreign ownership to 20 acres and that is called up loosening up in their minds.

Mr. Speaker, it worries me a little bit when the Leader of the Opposition, whom I almost always thought he was a relatively reputable man, and stuck to the facts the way they were, you know it must be frustration that it is leading him to distort the facts. It must be moves of desperation.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more things here that I want to relate to. There has been mention made by the Leader of the Opposition and members in the back about the out-migration of people from Manitoba. Yes there is. Unfortunately there is. The figures are bandied around by the economist from Brandon, who says, 17 thousand, 17-1/2 thousand, I don't know what it is, and that out-migration until October of this year basically works out to 3-1/2 thousand unfortunately, but, Mr. Speaker, they will be coming back when we adhere to the Throne Speech the way it was read, with the industries that are going to be established they will be coming back.

Interesting points that the Leader of the Opposition raised, this was at the nomination meeting, I'm still referring to that. I'm sensitive about that, because when a man of his nature comes in there and misrepresents facts I get very nervous. It states here, "The province has experienced a population drop for two consecutive years and there has not been an additional job created in the past year, he charged." The Member for Churchill himself stated 3,000 jobs have been created. The facts are what bothers me. When you come out there, Sir, — pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I should address the remarks to you — when the Leader of the Opposition comes out there and misdirects facts hoping to win popularity in the constituency of Emerson —(Interjection)— Ah, he says they are unhappy. We will make them happy, Mr. Speaker, they will win the election for us again.

Mr. Speaker, it has been unfortunate that the economic conditions across North America have created problems, the high interest rates — the Minister of Finance is in the east right now hoping to maybe help resolve some of it — The high interest rates affect every small businessman, every farmer, we know that. The Leader of the Opposition would like to contribute that to our party here, provincially, as if we control the whole economy of North America.

Reference is made to businesses that go bankrupt. I had a funny thought the other day, Mr. Speaker. I

almost got the impression that they were, you know, frustrated that they were not in power because with all these businesses going broke, they could be buying them all up, you know. I think the indication still comes from the Member for Brandon East that the moment somebody's in trouble, government jump in, buy him up. That's the impression he left with me today. When Swifts was in trouble, what did they indicate? Buy it up. That's what put you guys out of government to begin with, messing in private business.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity while we're talking a little bit of philosophy; ours is different than yours, and that is the way it should be I suppose. I have a little item that I'd like to read into the record here. It's written by a Bob Heskith from Toronto on November 6, and it states, "We are on an anti-business binge. Every corporate mistake is being underlined from a defective can of tuna to an oil spill. Large companies leap to their own defence against accusations in the public mind that are not much more than excuses for slow technological advance. The crusade against business is obscure and unfair campaign that is hurting the public. The deficiencies of business are nothing when compared to the excesses of unions with a monopolistic power to paralyze, deprive customers and choke cities, transportation systems and mail delivery."

He goes on. I won't read the whole thing, just certain items here. "There is no evidence that a shift to socialist or maximum regulation society would make people any wealthier or happier. Replacing big business with big government is hardly a progressive step. In country after country economic controls and nationalization have been disastrous, yet the big anti-business lie finds acceptance, and this is the one that they're using. Increases in wealth in this country have resulted because of activity by business and individuals, not government. Government can't even guarantee the delivery of letters. Government is top-heavy with waste and bureaucratic over-kill. Can government really expect to do a better job of developing resources" — And this is for the Member for Inkster. "than companies with years of experience and expertise." I was hoping somebody would say, well would you want to file that paper. I will anyway. It ends up with, "My friends will tell you that I'm not a capitalistic creature." this is the writer, "The opportunity has never presented itself, however, that doesn't stop me from shuddering at the thought where the country would be if big business was run by government. There would six cashiers instead of one at every supermarket checkout counter, which would mean it would not only cost us more money, but would take a hell of a lot longer to pay for it, an aggravation that none of us need." —(Interjection)— Who wrote it? Bob Heskith of Radio Station CFRB, Toronto. (Interjection)— Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker, I was anticipating that and hoping for that, and if it's possible I'd like to have everyone of them have a copy.

Mr. Speaker, some personal comments that I'd like to make. We have a young country here. We are 113 years old. This country was built on private initiative. My parents came from a foreign country. All they asked for was the opportunity to work and develop here without government interference. What has



happened, we have finally created a society where now it's seemingly impossible to operate without government. There used to be times, we didn't have crop insurance, no other fringe benefits that we now have the benefit to get from government, people looked after themselves, including the elderly and the sick, but we have destroyed that, and we are destroying it more and more all the time. By destroying that initiative, we are going down. Because of social policies our country is weakening and suffering. What bothers me more, Mr. Speaker, things are a little tough right now; we've had issues like the flood, the drought, high interest rates. Are they that dramatically tough? The people in this country will pull up their socks. We have people coming right now that are moving in from other countries, and are pleased to be here. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that over half the population of the world would love to be in Canada, and here we have the members opposite spouting doom and gloom. Going to hell in a handbasket type of approach. And you know what, how do you expect to go to the people in the next election with that kind of an attitude? You know what? You don't deserve even the members you have in here now with that kind of attitude.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments to make about the Leader of the Opposition. I don't mean this as a personal thing. I really feel sorry for the Leader of the Opposition because his actions in the last while have been actions of desperation. He can't even keep that crowd of his together and show strong leadership, and when he has to come out in a constituency like mine and make radical misrepresentation of facts — I've got to be careful about that, and that's what he did, but the people are realizing what's happening. I think their own members are, because when that Throne Speech was being read out you could see the cave-in starting. It bothers me a little bit because I think many of you are hoping that things that we indicated in the Throne Speech are not going to come about, and if you were true Canadians and true Manitobans, you would be applauding and voting for the Throne Speech. If you vote against the Throne Speech, and these things do happen and we are positive they will happen, you will have to account to the people of Manitoba.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to participate in the debate on the Throne Speech and I notice that the regular Speaker is away and I would extend my congratulations to him however. He's sitting in the loge at the moment, but I would extend my compliments and congratulations on his assuming again the most important office in our Assembly. I know it can be very trying at times and it's unfortunate that yesterday it was one of those trying times, however, I assure him that I was disturbed as much as he was, I'm sure, on what took place yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I would have much rather have not seen what happened yesterday. It would have been better not to have happened, and I hope that we can forget it as soon as possible, for the remainder of this session.

I'd extend my compliments also to the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne,

although I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm rather disappointed and I'm also elated with the Throne Speech. I'm elated because to me it's confetti. It's just like going to a wedding where they throw confetti to celebrate, but nothing there, Mr. Speaker. It flies all over the place, but no substance really, it's really very very light.

Some of the things that have been mentioned in the Speech have been repeated twice or three times. I was very pleased to see what has developed in the short while we've been here, and I'm just wondering, before I continue, I'm just wondering why we are here at this particular time? We were advised to be here on December 11, which we did, and, Mr. Speaker, there are some of us that realized that we would break off for Xmas and the holiday season, but we certainly expected to be back early in January. Now I'm not sure whether we are going to be back or not, but I understand that we may not be back until some time in late January or February, Mr. Speaker. Now I can understand that perhaps the government is not ready with its program and its estimates and its bills, and maybe they're not ready for that, Mr. Speaker, but I'm wondering if that is the case why were we not called on the 20th of January to come in. If they wanted to have an earlier start I just cannot see the logic of coming here for two weeks and going back home and then not to be called back till sometime late in January or February. Some of us, Mr. Speaker, have had to undertake some dislocations to come here, some of us have made arrangements for the entire Session. We have had to find accommodations, which we're going to have to pay for regardless of whether we're in office here dealing with the business of the province or not. I think that as far as I am concerned, I don't know, there must be a reason, but I would sure like to know what is the reason that we were brought here. Is it to take the heat off?

**MR. BARROW:** Explain.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, we knew — my colleague from Flin Flon says explain, yes we should hope that there would be an explanation. I believe the Minister of Government Services commented this morning that he didn't know who had organized this early Session but I would sure like to know how that came about, and I'm serious about it because it seems to me it would have been more logical to come here at the end of January, the 20th of January and go right through and let's get it over with and go home, an early session.

But I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, maybe we might have an election called in January. Are we going to have an election called in January? Well, we hope so, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case but I would doubt it, but after reading the Throne Speech and seeing what has developed here, I've been here for perhaps eight or ten years and I have yet, I believe, to see too many speeches from the government side take up from the Leader of the Opposition, of the official Opposition, and one after another and after another and after another, Mr. Speaker. This elates me, makes me happy, that's the part that I'm happy about and not only that we saw evidence of desperation, Mr. Speaker, but we saw personal attacks by every member that rose to speak — personal attacks against the leader, my leader and

the Leader of the official Opposition. Now I deplore that kind of tactic, Mr. Speaker, but I am pleased and I am sure my leader is pleased. I'm sure he's pleased that they're doing that because it tells you something — it tells you something — it tells you that you have a government who is desperate and they are now turning to personal attacks rather than deal with the problems that are facing this province. Mr. Speaker, that is what's happened. When we left the session last spring one of the last comments that I made when I spoke was that the government was desperate looking for issues to go to the people, it sees perhaps another year in office or less or more perhaps, but election in the offing, without any issues. Certainly the government can't go to the people and say, look, we promised you good management, good government and good administration and no more waste and no more taps or waste all over this province — that's what they've said, and they sure can't go back to the people and say, see, we've delivered the goods, we've held to our promises. Because that did not happen, Mr. Speaker, the people are becoming aware that their debt has gone up, and I believe the Member for Inkster did comment on that in his comments, that the province was bankrupt in 1977 according to the Premier. What has happened in three years, Mr. Speaker?

**A. MEMBER:** Mega bankrupt.

**MR. ADAM:** Mega bankruptcy, mega bankruptcy, that's what's happened, eh? And for every mega project that's coming in, and we hope they all come about, as long as they're brought in in such a way that it is not the people that will have to pay for these mega projects. We hope that they're all successful. I'm not sure whether they will be and we hope they are. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, it'll take many mega projects, many Alcans, to make up for all the many mega disasters that took place in the last three years — many, many shattered lives, Mr. Speaker, along the way. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been many.

So we look at a Throne Speech that is nothing but confetti, nothing definite, nothing for the immediate future and as I said we hope — it's, you know, pie in the sky future coming in. We hope that they'll come but five years down the line is too far Mr. Speaker. We have to have something more concrete than that. While those may be benchmarks for the long term may be fine, but I mean, what do we do between now and the next five years. Because that is the most crucial time that we're going to have, between now and the next five years. I realize that there are external forces that face many countries, particularly in the free market system, which is a difficult system to operate even in the best of times. But I say that this government has aggravated those external forces.

I do not believe that they've been firm enough — they haven't been firm enough in speaking out against high interest rates and high energy costs that is one of the root causes, the root causes of the problems we're facing, not only this country but many other countries. But I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are some countries in Europe for instance, that are faced with the same problems as we have as far as high energy costs are concerned,

countries like Belgium, Holland, Austria, West Germany, that don't have any oil resources of their own, they have to buy every barrel of oil that they use. Yes, the price is high at 3 a gallon, 2 a gallon. Yes, the price is high but, Mr. Speaker, they are compact countries. In one day you can drive from one end of the country to the other, and they probably spend less for transportation than we do because of the fact that they don't have these tremendous distances to cover to get from one place to the other such as we have here in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just dwell on that for a moment because some of these countries — most of them have planned governments. They are social democratic governments, Mr. Speaker. Inflation rates in those countries that I have just mentioned, even though the energy costs are at the world price, the inflation in those countries because of proper planning and proper management, inflation is five, six, percent. Unemployment is maybe two, three percent. Interest rates five, six percent, Mr. Speaker, in those countries. But they have proper planning, Mr. Speaker, and with proper planning you get results. This is where this government has failed because they do not have any plans, they just say let's back off. Less government is the best government and let the chips fall where they may, and we are seeing where they are falling, Mr. Speaker. They are falling all over the province without any proper planning.

So unfortunately the government is hand tied, hand-cuffed, because of their philosophy. They have a philosophy that restricts any attempt to provide sound economic direction for the province. This has been proven. When ever we have elected Conservative governments the same thing has happened. You can look all over the place and that's what happens. Mrs. Thatcher is — they're demoralized. The Cabinet is demoralized — information that we have coming out of England. They are demoralized completely because the policies are not working and I can imagine that's happening in this Cabinet as well, because they ask themselves, how come that our policies are not working? I am sure what we see happening in England is happening here because the policies are identical.

I'm not trying to be critical, I am just saying that those policies are no longer working in the twentieth century. They can't work any more. They should have worked in the older days, because I just heard the Member for Emerson say that it's the social policies that have destroyed this country, and I think that — I'm not paraphrasing exactly but it's because of the social policies that we have created these problems. A few years ago in the '30s, in the dirty '30s, in the early 1900s, we had in the early 20th Century — we never had any of these programs. We had no Medicare; we had no Pharmacare; we had no Welfare; we had no DREE; we had no Family Allowances; we had no senior citizens pension, it was a free enterprise paradise. What happened, Mr. Speaker? There were no roads; there were no schools. They had the little red school and in some cases there were no schools; where I was raised there wasn't. There was no water or sewer. There was nothing. It should have been a boom. If we are to take the Member for Emerson's comments at face as being correct, everything should have boomed.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't boom and it never started to boom until the war started. That's when things started to boom, when the public started pouring in money to the system. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that's what we should do to create prosperity because I think it can be done otherwise. And I'm not saying that the government should pour in the money that has been spent for war where we built battleships and aircraft and they were sunk and they're down in the bottom of the sea and many planes are in the bottom of the Zuider Zee and so on. I'm not saying that we have to go that route, but we have to have much better planning than we are now.

We look at the Throne Speech and we see the government backing off. We see them saying that well, the government's role has to be flexible, so we see here an expediency that the government is really concerned about what's happening. I am sure they must have looked at some of the polls that have been taken and they are a little bit upset at what's happening. So they go around, and I am sure in Cabinet they must be going around and asking themselves, what is wrong with our policies. I am sure they are sincere. They think that their policies are the way to go and they must be wondering what's happening, what's going wrong.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that they have to take a different approach to what the traditional Conservative policies have been over the years and of course the policies of this government is much more laissez-faire attitude, if I can use that. If we want to compare with Alberta, which is going into public ownership on an ongoing basis, and I don't hear any criticism from members of the government side about the Premier of Alberta buying up airlines and getting into the development of energy, and into the oil tar sands and so on. We don't hear the government. If we were to follow our Premier's advice here, Alberta would buy off Manitoba before very long. They would own it, lock, stock and barrel. That's what would happen. I don't want to get into that at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I'll maybe make a few comments on the Member for Emerson in which he said there was confusion on the drought. Of course he was critical of the federal policy and I would be critical too, because it was very confusing. But I would also say that the provincial program did create a lot of confusion as well. There was a lot of confusion in it as well, I'm sure you will agree, because we do have people who have had benefits and others right next door who have not had benefits under this program. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something. There was a program; the Feed Program was probably the best one of all. That was probably the better program of all the programs that were proposed on the Drought Program this year. But the program said, you know, in order to be eligible for the Feed Program you had to seed after the 20th of June, I believe it was. But I happen to know that there were accommodations made, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there were some that couldn't qualify because they had seeded too early and were later brought into the program, Mr. Speaker. There are reports coming back to us on that. So there has been some abuse of it, Mr. Speaker. I'm not saying that it has been rampart but there has been some

abuse, there has been some confusion. In fact I have a letter to the Minister of Agriculture now to look into one particular case where he was advised — well, the Minister is bending his ear, but I've got a letter into the mail for him on one particular case where a gentleman was told that he could pasture his — under the Feed Program — and later he found out he was disqualified because he had pastured his feed program. So there has been confusion. On Crown Lands the member spoke about the policy of Crown Lands, Mr. Speaker. The one that has been successful are those lands that belong to the municipalities. Those agreements have gone through fairly well, but there are others, Mr. Speaker, who are having trouble —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I don't have any Crown land personally. All the land that I own is my own privately owned lands and I don't have any Crown land.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are people who have applied since last February to obtain those Crown lands and they still don't have them, Mr. Speaker. And they haven't even had a response. They have sent in their deposits and there have been cases — I'll give you another example. There has been one case, to my knowledge, where I advised the person, look, the policy has been changed, that's fine, the government has the right to do that. And you can now apply for this land. You know there's one case where the government employees have gone out and have tried to get bids from other people on that particular piece of Crown land, Mr. Speaker. So there has been a lot of confusion and there's been a lot of disappointment on some of those programs. Now the member says you know, that the Minister of Agriculture has allowed the cattlemen to form their own association. What a bunch of tommyrot. Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers were never allowed to start their — you know, the Minister has done nothing to try and help them to start their own voluntary program. He's forced them in. He's forced them into a program whether they want to or not and that is the Manitoba Cattleman's Association. —(Interjection)— That's right, you introduced a legislation here and you told every livestock producer in Manitoba, you belong to this, and you're going to pay, and you pay. And you can get out, sure you can get out at a future date. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking at that program to see whether it shouldn't be changed or not.

I would like to see a program where freedom of choice — let's free Manitoba, let's free Manitoba. That's the words the Premier used in 1977. Let's free Manitoba, the first thing that the Minister of Agriculture does is bring in something compulsory. You've got to belong or else. Let's free Manitoba. That's not what happened. It's let's flee Manitoba, eh? Let's flee. And they're still fleeing, Mr. Speaker, they're still fleeing Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Well, I wouldn't know, Mr. Speaker, I never opted out. I never opted out. I have advised everybody that I spoke to, if the heavy hand of government is going to force you into this, stay in it, control it, and take over. Make it run to your benefit. Get some of those Conservatives out that have been appointed by the Minister. Let's get them out. Some of them, I'll tell you, are pretty shady characters too. Some of them are shady characters.

He spoke about the land protection and restrict land to foreign ownership, Mr. Speaker, and they're

saying, oh, yeah, we restricted it. You know, you didn't restrict it at all, you opened it up. And when you did that, you did it by allowing Canadian corporations to own land. That's where you made your error. That's where you made your error because those foreign buyers are all coming in under the guise of Canadian companies. That's how they're doing it, Mr. Speaker.

And the Minister can't even find out who the owners are, he doesn't even know who they are. He can't find out because it's so well covered and he is responsible if that program is being abused, if there are more foreign buyers now than there were then, he is responsible. The Minister is responsible for that.

Now the member says, you know, that we're preaching doom and gloom. Mr. Speaker, I was here for eight years and I've listened to the opposition and I remember very distinctly the leader then, Mr. Spivak, who is no longer here, advise the people, don't come to Manitoba. Don't come here because it's the highest taxed province in the country. Don't come here. Go somewhere else. And I heard that for eight years. So don't come here and talk about the way we criticize it, we do have some grounds. We do have some grounds for criticism, you know. I am concerned at what's happening in the rural areas of this province. I'm very concerned about what's happening to our rural communities. I know it's been a difficult year as far as agriculture is concerned. We know there has been a drought, and later on in some of my areas there's been a flood. I know some people who have barely, were not able to get on their land and some of them had remarkably good crops in spite of the fact that we started off with a low precipitation, we had no rain, it was bad, and in spite of that there were some areas that had a bit of rain and we had some very good crops in some areas but unfortunately this fall we had far too much rain and they were not able to get on their land so there are some problems there.

I would like to see an updating of the Manitoba Crop Insurance. Now, I don't know how it's going to be done but I do know that we have to have a look at it. It's got to be upgraded to meet the needs of today's farming because, Mr. Speaker, the costs of inputs are just horrendous and you can talk about expanding markets and more revenue, and you can do all you want but unless you can have some control on the costs of inputs, and I think the government hasn't spoken up strongly enough on this point, as the costs have gone completely out of reason as far as agriculture is concerned. Costs of fertilizer, cost of implements, and I don't have to tell members of the government because they know what's happening with the costs, and it's gone completely out of reason. We have to talk about this and we have to look at it because we're not going to have an agriculture unless we're going to find solutions to that problem.

The interest rates, of course, have a tremendous impact on the farming industry. It has a very high effect on small business in the rural areas and they are an integral part of the rural life, rural community, and we have to come up with some programs, more than we have in the past. We have to come up with some programs to assist the small businessman to ride over these humps and these fluctuations of

market and of the free market system, I might as well say because that's what happens. You have your ups and downs.

The cost of energy, I have to oppose the approach of the government when they say they would like to see the cost of energy go up to the world prices, at least close to the world price as soon as possible — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I think it is a poor position to ask our farmers to pay the world price for energy. I think it's terrible to do that. They just cannot absorb those increased interest charges and energy costs. It's going to come back to haunt you if you support those policies. We have to look at that very closely because I think it's not a good policy.

I'm not trying to make excuses, I don't want to side with the — I deplore what's happening in Canada today. The east and west division. I think it's terrible. I get very upset when I hear our leaders, leaders of our country, almost, not openly, but almost promoting western separatism. I think that that is a sad situation.

On the local scene, Mr. Speaker, I want to be critical of the Manitoba provincial gas tax, because I think what has happened here is that we have a bad situation where the world price of energy has gone up out of reason and will go up still further I expect. On top of that we have a government, a government who is going to piggyback additional costs on those high prices for energy. And every time a barrel of oil goes up a dollar a barrel, there will be another 20 percent added to the cost. Piggy back taxes. Taxes upon taxes and taxes upon taxes. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, as far as Petro Canada is concerned, I hope that we have PetroCan and we keep it and we expand it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government should have done more. What happens in our rural areas is, for instance, the town of Neepawa lost the Neepawa Food Processors and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this subject next comes up, the honourable member will have eight minutes.

The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Thursday).