

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Monday, 22 December, 1980**

**Time — 8:00 p.m.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** The Honourable Member for Brandon East has 18 minutes.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe when we adjourned for the supper hour we were discussing the performance of the manufacturing sector and as I was suggesting to my colleagues in the Legislature, and particularly to the Minister of Economic Development, if he is concerned about what is happening to manufacturing, what he has to look at is what is happening to the value added dimension of manufacturing. You have to look at really how much value is being added in the manufacturing sector on an un-inflationary basis. Mr. Speaker, if you do this, as the Conference Board has done, and look at it over the years, you will find that in 1970 to '77, that eight-year period, the real output of manufacturing in Manitoba averaged 5.9 percent whereas in the past three years the average is 1.5 percent, the substantial drop. But, nevertheless, I go back to my original observation, the relevant observation is to relate what's happening in Manitoba to the Canadian scene, to the national average.

As I suggested at 5:30, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba rate during the NDP years in government approximated one-and-a-half times the Canadian average output of manufacturing. In other words, Manitoba grew at one-and-a-half times the rate, one-and-a-half times faster than the Canadian manufacturing sector did, whereas in the past three years according to the Conference Board statistics, we are growing at only four-fifths of the Canadian average. We are not maintaining our position in relation to the national situation. So I suggest to my Honourable Minister of Economic Development, my colleague of ours in the House here, that he should get his economists to take a look at what is happening to the real output sector by sector and so on. If you go down the list, you can look at other indicators; you can look at housing starts. Again, during the NDP years, we average 4.1 percent of Canadian housing construction. The last three years we have averaged only 3-1/2 percent of Canadian housing construction.

Retail sales: Manitoba grew at roughly 90 percent, 89.1 percent to be specific, Mr. Speaker, of the Canadian rate whereas in the past few years we've dropped to 70 percent of the Canadian rate.

In terms of unemployment, our average unemployment in the past three years, the average annual unemployment figure is 5.8 percent, up somewhat from the 5 percent that was averaged in Manitoba during the NDP period in government.

Now let me say this, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the rest of the country, our unemployment situation is slightly better in the past three years than it was during the NDP period in office. When we were in office, our average unemployment was 78 percent of the Canadian rate, now we have dropped to 74 percent of the Canadian rate but I ask what is the

reason for that? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we compare better to the Canadian average is simply because of the large exodus of people from the labour force in Manitoba. The fact is that our labour force has not grown. The Member for Minnedosa can laugh but ask any economist who is examining the Manitoba economy and they will observe the same thing. They will observe probably the reason our unemployment rate isn't higher than it is shown by the labour force figures, is simply because we've lost such enormous numbers of young people, such enormous numbers of potential workers in the province. Well, I certainly do believe it.

I'd like to mention for a moment, I'd like to touch upon job creation because I know that's a favourite topic of the Honourable First Minister and members opposite. From my research, indeed, it is true, the average number of jobs created per year under the NDP government, or when we were in government, was 7,300. The average creation in the past three years was 9,700. It was up. It was up and I am not denying that, I'm not suggesting for one moment, I will accept those figures as I accept it for the rest of the analysis. But the important point is always to relate it to what's happening on the national scene and here we can see that job creation in Manitoba has slipped in relation to the rest of Canada. When we were in office, we obtained 3.2 percent of the jobs created in the country, 3.2 percent. The past three years, our average has slipped to 2.9 percent. So even though we've got more jobs created per year we are experiencing a smaller percentage of the national pie, if you like, of job creation, the national employment pie.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, the reason we've had an upsurge in job creation in this country of ours from coast to coast goes back to the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. The fact is that about three years, three-and-a-half years ago, the Canadian dollar began to slip in value and as the Canadian dollar is devalued it gives us automatically, protection for our Canadian industry. So, therefore, Canadian manufacturers, Canadian processors can sell more competitively on world markets because we can sell more cheaply than before because of a cheap dollar and also we can sell more competitively within our domestic market within Canada because foreign imports now look much more expensive vis-a-vis Canadian-made goods and that phenomenon, the devaluation of the dollar, has given a shot in the arm to employment creation in the province of Manitoba. That has got to be the major reason for that.

But as I say, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately of this wave of job creation that's occurred in the past three years, our percentage of that total pie has shrunk from 3.2 to 2.9 percent.

Mr. Speaker, you can go up and down the numbers, up and down the fundamental economic data that's provided for us by the Conference Board in Canada and by Statistics Canada and I think you have to come to the conclusion that we have done relatively worse during the past three years than we did in the preceding eight years. Now I know one response of the government will be, well, why don't

they take the last three years of when they were in office and compare it with the three years that we've been in office.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think the legitimate exercise is — and the people of Manitoba want to know — what happened to the economy when the NDP were in government compared to what is happening to the economy now that the Conservatives are in government. But the fact is, the interesting observation I would make, Mr. Speaker, no matter which three years you pick, the real domestic product, that is, the real economic growth indicator, that bottom line number, real domestic product, the percentage change in it, is higher in any three-year combination that you choose of the eight years of NDP administration than it is under the three years, '78, '79 and '80. So even if we did take '75, '76 and '77 as an average — it's 2.2 percent incidentally, those last three years — 2.2 percent compared to 0.2 percent experienced now under the Conservative administration.

So I answer the comment made by the Minister of Economic Development in the afternoon. He said, well, the Conference Board will revise figures and does revise figures. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, they do revise figures and in fact the historical data we have here is the latest revision but I think once you go back in time you find the revisions are less likely to occur. Where I have greatest trouble is looking at the forecast information of the Conference Board in Canada because the Conference Board, as the Minister of Finance must realize by now, is always on the optimistic side. If they make any error in forecasting, they will always tend to err on being a little overly optimistic as to what happens. But I'm looking not at forecast, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at data that is compiled on what has happened to the Manitoba economy. As I said, no matter which way you take a run at it, no matter which of the fundamental economic indicators you look at, you find that we have slipped badly, compared to the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest then that the Conservative economic policies that have been propounded by the First Minister and his colleagues have simply not worked. The philosophy of the least government being the best government is simply not working in the province of Manitoba. We have entered a Tory no-growth tunnel and we don't seem to be able to see the other end of the tunnel.

I know the Honourable First Minister is a devout admirer of the iron lady of Britain, namely, the Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. Margaret Thatcher has something in common with our First Minister, both of them are adherents of the economic philosophy of Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. Both, as I understand it, are monetarists; both have a similar set of economic policies that they think are the right policies for national economic growth. And, Mr. Speaker, as Margaret Thatcher is surely bringing down the British people, bringing down that great nation, the nation that my forefathers came from, that great nation down the road of economic disaster, so is our monetarist philosopher across the way here, bringing the people of Manitoba, the province of Manitoba along a similar road of economic disaster. Fortunately for us, Mr. Speaker, he's only a First Minister of a provincial government

and not a national government, so he's much more limited in how much damage he can do. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba now know that they've had three years — you know it's very easy to blame previous governments, it's very easy to blame the federal government, it's easy to blame the weather — as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I know this will be a favourite recitation about the lack of growth this year.

The year 1980 is the first year that Manitoba did not experience economic growth since the dirty Thirties of the great depression. Our rate of growth wasn't in 1980, it was minus 1.2, our economy shrunk. I know the First Minister will perhaps be on his feet later saying, well it's because of that bad drought that we had, that agricultural drought that we had but, Mr. Speaker, if you talk to the economists on the Conference Board of Canada you find, yes, the shrinkage of the agricultural sector had something to do with it, but also, Mr. Speaker, more important was the lack of activity in the construction sector, which was even more serious, and also the diminution of the output in the manufacturing sector. So you have, Mr. Speaker, you have not only agriculture but you have manufacturing, you have construction and also wholesale, retail trade sectors also contributed to this minus 1.2 figure.

So Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has created a record for Manitobans. He has created a record for Manitobans. He has now been head of government which has been in office and experienced the first decline in our economy since the dirty Thirties.

Mr. Speaker, I know I've only got a few minutes left, I'd like to just conclude by referring to energy and because while we are very saddened by the lack of growth, the lack of job opportunities and the loss of people and our declining total population, I must also comment that our Premier also wants to bestow upon us even higher inflation than we have experienced already in the province of Manitoba. He wants us to support Peter Lougheed and the Alberta government to go more rapidly toward world price levels for oil. Mr. Speaker, the price of imported oil today in Canada is roughly 38 to 40, I believe, and the price of domestic conventional oil laid down in eastern Canada is roughly 18 a barrel. There's a difference of two to one.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to move rapidly to that world level we would have even more rampant inflation in Canada and Manitoba than we have today. As a matter of fact, every time the price of a barrel of oil goes up by 1.00, the consumer price index goes up by one-half of one point. So without getting into the arithmetic of it, Mr. Speaker, I say the Premier of this province is certainly betraying the interests of Manitobans when he gets on the podium and says, we support the province of Alberta in going toward world oil prices, because what he's saying, we support the reduction in the standard of living of the people of Manitoba, because that's what it means, that's what it's equal to. You raise the price of oil, you have more inflation and therefore the standard of living of the people of Manitoba is reduced, and every time you do that you take money out of the people's pockets in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I only hope and pray that the Lougheed-Lyon economic policy on rapidly rising oil prices never comes to pass because the oil price we have

in the world today is artificial, created by a cartel, it doesn't reflect competitive supply and demand conditions and it doesn't reflect the real cost of production.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, one note on financial mismanagement. I like to think of the Assiniboine Community College as a symbol of the mismanagement of this government. The Assiniboine College is one block from my house in Brandon and the people there, the staff and the faculty and the students at the Assiniboine College, have been waiting for three years in crowded conditions. They're finally going to get a building which is going to be cut back and it's going to cost the taxpayers some money, millions of dollars more and after we've got 500 to 600 million more debt, that was the reason for freezing it in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is just about passed and I know the First Minister is going to be on his feet defending his government and attacking us in his usual style. I only hope that he doesn't continue in the same vein that I've heard him in the past where he said in the words, "The NDP was born to be in Opposition". The NDP was born to be in Opposition. The corollary of that, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservatives were born to be government and, Mr. Speaker, that is the height of arrogance. Well there they go, Mr. Speaker, an arrogant bunch, an arrogant insensitive bunch, incompetent managers leading the province of Manitoba down the road of economic disaster and wanting more inflation to boot. Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of that gang over there that are belowing like a bunch of yahoos right now interrupting me, the incompetence of this group is matched only by their arrogance.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to participate in this debate tonight and to perhaps conclude the discussion that has been taking place on the amendments moved by the Leader of the Opposition some days ago expressing his non-confidence and I take it the non-confidence of his colleagues, although one can never be sure these days whether he speaks for his colleagues or not, in the Throne Speech.

At the outset, Sir, I should like to pay my respects to you and to the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of committees for the work that all of you do in maintaining order in a House which, from time to time, is not the easiest Chamber in which to maintain order. I should like as well, although may I say, Sir, that by comparison with other Chambers across the country that I've had the opportunity to visit from time to time, that we are very civilized by comparison with some of the others. I think, Sir, that is a tribute to you and to those who serve in the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of committees with you in the presiding work that is done by you.

I should like as well to thank the Mover of the address, the Member for Minnedosa, the Seconder, the Member for Springfield, for their contribution to this debate and getting it launched so well as they did and in the positive things that they had to say about this province and about its people, because while we may from time to time, all of us in this House, like to puff ourselves up and think that we

speak for the people, I tend to think, Sir, that the people of Manitoba tend to speak better for themselves from time to time than perhaps their elected representatives. Certainly the achievements of the people of Manitoba speak for themselves and those in this Chamber and those who from time to time echo in this Chamber, who would belittle the achievements of the people of Manitoba, are running down a false trail because they are not attacking the government so much as they are attacking their fellow citizens in Manitoba. So I am delighted to have the opportunity to respond to some of those statements tonight, to pay tribute as I will to the Leader of the Opposition for the contribution that he made to the debate and to that of the Member for Fort Rouge whom we all note with regret has suffered an injury which has I hope only temporarily discommoded and disabled her. In that connection may I, through her, offer to her party, congratulations on the election of its new leader and to wish him as much success as one politician can wish to another of an opposite stripe, as he undertakes the responsibilities of leading the Liberal Party in Manitoba.

It is not my intention, being as close as we are, I think within 48 hours of Christmas Eve, that great family festival which we celebrate at this time of year, to be anything but, I would hope, infused with the spirit of Christmas. It is because of that infusion that I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that I will make very little comment about some of the remarks that I've just heard from the Member for Brandon East. He made some mention of the fact that I was a monetarist, as he understood it. The Honourable Member for Brandon East is well known to understand very little about economics and so we'll just leave that as it is because I wouldn't want to ask him to be the one who would give my children a definition of what a monetarist is or what a hard money person is, or what a soft money person, or what indeed a Freidmanite is or what indeed a Professor Von Hyek is, or indeed even a Galbraithian, even though he might be closer to that rather extinct school than perhaps any other to which he would pay fealty.

I did notice however, in passing, that he made some mention of energy pricing in Canada and betrayed thereby such a fundamental lack of understanding of that basic policy in Canada that it really deserves no comment from me, or I dare say from anyone else who begins to have a glimmer of understanding of what is happening in this country today, because of the energy policy that is being blindly pursued by the federal government, aided and abetted by the members of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa. Anyone who in 1980, in the dying months of 1980, can stand in any arena in Canada and say that the energy policy that is being pursued by the Government of Canada is one which the Government of Manitoba should join, is either a fool or a knave. And I say that, Sir, being infused as I am with the Christmas spirit because that is so axiomatic and so apparent to everyone that I'm surprised that my honourable friend from Brandon East would even dare to more into that sort of an area of quicksand, apparently for his intellectual understanding.

If he had taken the trouble to read recently, as a number of us have, a paper that was turned out by

one of the senior partners of Richardson Securities here in Winnipeg, on the energy problem in Canada, he would begin to realize just how faulty are his understandings of that problem. And I'm not one who would ever stand before this Chamber or before the people of Manitoba and say that Peter Lougheed is always right. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, without in any way adopting or approving of the price regime that he and his government have espoused to the Government of Canada, that he is much closer to being right than anything I've heard in the debate thus far from my honourable friends. And we know how conveniently they get in and out of bed with the Liberal party in Ottawa, so we can well understand how their minds have become somewhat strained and distorted by that bedroom caper that they perform from time to time on any matter of principle that seems to come along.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal any further with any comments made by the Member for Brandon East because I perhaps have said more and I wouldn't want unduly to puff him up, to let him think that anyone thought for a moment that anything he said was taken seriously on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention, although he is not here, the particular offering of my friend the Member for Inkster, who made as usual the kind of a speech that one would expect to be made by the Leader of the Opposition. As an Independent, as he is now, Mr. Speaker, the member enjoys a certain licence to scatter his barbs and some of them are indeed sharp, and they are scattered indiscriminately within this Chamber. And if those barbs are sometimes painful to those of us on this side of the House one can only imagine how they must register with the honourable members opposite when he strikes home against them because he knows them so well. He knows so well what motivates them; he knows the kind of institutionalized envy that activates all of their major philosophical underpinnings and understandings of the policy in this province. And so, while from time to time we accept the bars of the Member for Inkster, and they land well, we know the particular kind of pain that they must cause the honourable members opposite because his contribution to the debate is an extremely valuable one, and one that has an intellectual integrity that is very often lacking in the kinds of other comments that are made from the Official Opposition.

I feel a special pang, Mr. Speaker, in the knowledge that my colleagues and I have disappointed the Member for Inkster by not adhering to that caricature of our beliefs that he from time to time sketches, in a much more brilliant way than is ever done by any of his former colleagues. He was disappointed, he said, that we continued to acknowledge a role and a responsibility for government within our mixed economy, as indeed we do and as we always have, and continue to be determined to play that role and to meet that responsibility. And I'm sure that he would have been more comfortable, in a partisan sense with us, had we been the kind of mindless do-nothings that he would like us to fit into as the kind of caricature that he and some of his former colleagues paint from time to time.

Despite our concern for his comfort, Mr. Speaker, we continue to believe that the private sector is

immeasurably the best part of our society in terms of the creation of wealth, and we continue to understand that in Manitoba we do not elect governments to stand by idly and watch the economy come what may or, on the other extreme, to dominate the economy in the way that members opposite prefer. We're conscious that we were elected to provide leadership within the development of our economy and to help to provide that atmosphere within which the private sector could create that kind of growth and that kind of wealth within our provincial and within our national economy which governments, of whatever stripe, can then come along and tax in order to provide those services, fundamental and otherwise, that the people of this province, and indeed the people of Canada, require at this time in our development as a nation. And we intend to continue to provide that kind of leadership, even if that does make it difficult for some of the honourable members opposite to fit as easily into their sometimes curiously black and white visions of the world.

I would like, as well, to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for what some might have described as his spirited offering on this debate. I was particularly flattered that he turned so often for inspiration to one of my old speeches. And I must say to him, Sir, that I had fully intended to return the compliment in my own remarks today, but I must say, on reading his speech I searched in vain for inspiration. Not only the speech that he delivered in this House on that occasion, but all speeches that he's ever delivered, you know, from the beginning of time. I've searched for want of inspiration in any of his speeches, through his years in government and throughout the course of his current office. But I do appreciate the compliment that he paid to me and I promise him, Mr. Speaker, that I will, should the opportunity ever arise, I will strive to reciprocate if I can find anything ever inspiration in anything that he ever says.

I notice that one of my colleagues was referring to that play on words that we have heard from time to time of parliamentary speakers. I think the original statement that has been parodied from time to time is that a person stands in the House as a wolf in sheep's clothing. My colleague the Minister of Health, after listening to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, described him as being a sheep in wolf's clothing. But, Sir, I was reminded as I read of that exchange of what Mr. Churchill once said of Clement Attlee who was a philosophical forebearer of the present Leader of the Opposition here in the House of Commons in Britain. He described Mr. Attlee as being a sheep in sheep's clothing and I think that that perhaps is even more accurate than anything we have heard in this regard on that particular parody.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had respect for Lord Attlee as indeed I think Winston Churchill did. I think it was on another occasion when Mr. Attlee was the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, described a taxi driving up to the front of Westminster with the Prime Minister in it, and the Member for Selkirk will begin to understand that when we approximate his talents to those of the Leader of the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, The Right Honourable Lord Attlee, we're not in any way demeaning or criticizing his

talents at all but rather we were making comparisons which sometimes do appear to be invidious.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say to the Leader of the Opposition that within our system there is sometimes a certain disproportion between the resources available to governments and those available to the oppositions, and we on this side of the House with the support of the full-time staff of the government, labour for months in the preparation of basic programs and the Throne Speech in which that program is set forth and then in the matter of only a few days by the Leader of the Opposition as I was once called upon to do, has to stand up and respond to the Speech. But, Mr. Speaker, I think even the Leader of the Opposition will agree that since he has fulfilled that office we've attempted on this side of the House to work with him and with his colleagues, in terms of improving the space, improving the staff that is allotted to the Leader of the Opposition, and I felt some contentment in the fact that as he worked through the weekend of his reply he could at least take some comfort from the fact that he was able to do so with greater support from his staff than he and his colleagues ever provided to us when we were in the reverse position.

**MR. JORGENSON:** He never improved the quality of the speech though.

**MR. LYON:** The Minister of Consumer Affairs has taken the words out of my mouth. It's a pity that there wasn't some further manifestation of that improved staff help in the speech that was given by the Leader of the Opposition. But I am happy that out of the discussions that we have had with the leader and his colleagues since we last sat, that we have been able to agree that all members of the House are going to be provided with significantly increased office space once again and a continual upgrading of facilities and we sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that these better facilities which we are sure that he and the members of his party will occupy for a long time, will permit him to carry out the responsibilities of his important office with greater ease and may I say with greater effectiveness than has been manifested thus far.

As well, Sir, we should note that these gradual upgrades that take place in this instance represent a further follow up of the recommendations that were made to this House by Mr. Justice Gordon Hall in his report earlier this year. And, of course, I'm sensitive of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition will probably come back with his rapier-like wit and say, well we are only preparing space for ourselves in the event of an election taking place in the next 21 months, and that we're merely on this side of the House ensuring that the Opposition has better space because I can hear the ringing tones. He will say that the government will be moving into the space. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that very remote danger is sufficient reason for us to deny the leader's need and request for additional space and resources and once he is comfortably ensconced in his new quarters, we will do our utmost to spare him the necessity of another move for a good many years to come, except of course any moves that will be precipitated by the internal machinations of his own party against which, Mr. Speaker, I can give him no guarantee whatsoever because they are constant,

unending and ever present in that party that prefers to call itself a collection of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this reasonable agreement that we've been able to reach on the basic question of facilities, to help the leader do his important job, will contribute to the kind of reasonable debate that we have, I think, in this House and the kind of civility that we should be striving for in the Chamber at all times, a civility which if each of us is to be entirely honest, we have all failed from time to time to maintain and to cultivate to the degree that we would like in recent years.

So in keeping with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make only a few comments directly replying to a few points that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition and then to discuss with him the one major point of public policy concern to which he did allude. I understand that there will be those in this House who fail to discern any major point to my friend's speech and that is completely understandable when one re-reads it. Since it did come wrapped in a kind of rhetorical licence but as I will reveal in a moment there was a point to the speech even though it perhaps eluded many of the observers in this Chamber.

The Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition chided the government and particularly me at some length for the importance that we have placed on the efforts that have been under way in Canada since the Quebec Referendum, to reach agreement on the patriation and the amendment of the Canadian Constitution which is of course the basic law of our land. He even went so far as to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we were using the constitution to avoid our responsibilities in other areas and, Mr. Speaker, if that were true it would indeed be a serious failing on the part of this government or any other government. But, Mr. Speaker, that thought can be quickly dismissed because, as with many thoughts in his speech, it simply is not true.

A large number of the economic measures that we will deal with throughout this session demonstrate from the Throne Speech and will demonstrate as the session proceeds, that we are not preoccupied as is the whole apparatus of the federal government, with the constitutional problem. But we do believe nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, that the constitution is crucially important. We believe in bringing it home to Canada by agreement and we believe that that is greatly to be desired. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, to refresh the memories of my honourable friends opposite I know who must be somewhat confused by listening to one of their patron saints, the Premier of Saskatchewan talk and then listening to the leader of their national party whose hem they kiss from time to time, noticing the great divergence and view between these two great Canadian socialists on what is the fundamental problem.

I merely suggest to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, that if he sees fit to criticize me or the government of Manitoba with respect to the posture and the stand that we have taken on the Canadian Constitution and on the unilateral efforts by the present Prime Minister, to enforce upon the Canadian people and the Canadian provinces something which in the good time and the

mellowness of their understanding they would come not to approve then, Mr. Speaker, he is condemning first of all, the Premier of Saskatchewan, who has been one of the foremost spokesmen in opposition to this unparalleled attempt by a federal government to rewrite and to centralize a government in Canada. At the same time he may find out, subject again to the machinations of the national New Democratic Party, that that great bastion of strength that has 20 or 21 percent of the popular vote in this country, that has some 20 to 30 odd members in the House of Commons of 260 or 270, that the CBC and other of the media sometimes pay too much attention to for all they represent, he may even come to find out that that group which on the one hand says this, and on the other hand says that and is trying to divine a course for all true socialists in Canada, really doesn't know what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. So I suggest that he be a touch more careful and a touch more accurate, and may I say a touch more understanding because he is trained as a lawyer, in the discussions surrounding the constitutional question in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we believe the constitution is important and as I said before and I repeat myself, we believe bringing it home, patriating the amending formula, patriating it with an amending formula, by agreement among the provinces is extremely important and greatly to be desired. Mr. Speaker, we perceive that the federal efforts thus far to change the Constitution, without the legally required agreement of the provinces, represents a very real danger to our whole federal system, to our parliamentary form of government, to all that most Manitobans hold dear. I say to my honourable friend that if he hasn't perceived or come to understand that as yet, then he, in occupying the office that he does, he had better rather quickly come to that understanding because this is of fundamental importance. If he wants to see his name, writ large, and those of his party, writ large, on the columns supporting the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, in what he is attempting at this moment to perpetrate on the people and on the nation of Canada, then so be it, but let him be forewarned by me in this Chamber now that he had better be prepared to be counted on that particular list in the history of this country and God forbid the people whose names appear on that list. That's all I

This is not an issue, Mr. Speaker, where you can play the business of wetting your finger and putting it up to read polls. This is a business, Mr. Speaker, where principle, p-r-i-n-c-i-p-l-e, counts for a fair amount and I suggest that my honourable friend start referring to the principles that he believes in, in this country. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of principle; it's not a matter of reading the polls as they come out, morning or evening; it's not a question of saying, well, am I going to garner votes in this part of Manitoba or that part of Manitoba; it's a question of historic principle and I would very much welcome a statement from the Leader of the Opposition when he makes up his mind on this topic as to where exactly he stands with respect to the Trudeau initiatives on the Constitution.

We have been very concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the specific federal proposals for a Charter of Rights

will result in lessened rather than increased protection for the rights of Canadians and, without dwelling on that for any length of time, and I choose not to do it at this time because there will be a formal resolution before the House before too long, Mr. Speaker, in which we can engage in this debate. I would point out that the current federal hearings on the Constitution are highlighting one of the serious shortcomings of such an entrenched Bill of Rights, in addition to all of the objections that were registered by seven of the ten Premiers of Canada at the First Ministers Conference in September last. If my honourable friend or if those occasional sycophants in the press who echo his words wish to say from time to time, as I think one said not too long ago, that Lyon chose the wrong side of the Constitutional debate because the polls do not favour his position. I say, Mr. Speaker, as clearly as I can to my honourable friends so that there will be no misunderstanding in his mind or the minds of others who would try to make some cheap partisan advantage out of this, to hell with the polls. It's not the polls that count when you are deciding, in principle, the kind of a country you are going to have. If my honourable friend wants to devise his policy with a poll in one hand and his finger wet to the wind in the other he can do it that way, but we would rather prefer, and I think seven at least of the Premiers of Canada would prefer, and I dare say there would be more than that, all 10, would prefer to deal in principle. My honourable friend will find, if God forbid he ever is transferred to this side of the House, that he must deal in principle over here even though he doesn't have to deal with it over there.

Mr. Speaker, we have been concerned as well that one of the effects of the entrenchment of rights in the Constitution is to create two orders of rights and already we're hearing that debate in Canada. First-class rights and second-class rights, if you will, and that's becoming clear as more and more groups look at the proposed Charter and see that rights which they consider important are omitted. Rights are consigned to the second-class rights column and so we have had representation for the Charter to be lengthened to include rights for children, to include rights for the handicapped, and a whole range of native rights, employment and other economic rights, women's rights, rights for the aged and so it goes. This problem is not soluble, Mr. Speaker, no matter how many rights we add to the list to be entrenched in the Constitution there will still be other rights that we haven't perceived at this time, rights which Canadians now enjoy and value or that they may reasonably hope to enjoy or to achieve under our parliamentary system, rights that would fall outside the pail and be consigned to the second-class column.

Now that may be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Liberal Party and to their Socialist friends in Ottawa, and apparently some of the friends that they are picking up in the Socialist Party of Manitoba, but it is not acceptable to seven of the 10 Premiers in this country, one of them being a Socialist Premier who made, I think, an eloquent contribution to the debate before the committee last Friday when he spoke on this very topic. Unlike my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I think that is important and that it deserves to be full

discussed and appraised by Canadians and that it deserves the conscientious attention of the governments of Canada as the government that I lead has given to it and will continue to give to it, notwithstanding anything that the members opposite may say.

My friend also indulged in a little what I would describe as rhetorical overkill, Mr. Speaker. I tried him gently for that, if I may, because I gave him — and I don't intend to repeat it this year — I gave him last year, from the benefit of longer experience in this House than he has had, some advice about the good sense always in not trying to make quick tricks in debate in this Chamber. But I see that advice didn't register, Mr. Speaker, so I merely ask my honourable friend in the interests of time to read back to what I said to him last year. The message is still there; the message is still right. The message will do him good if he will pay some attention to it. He referred, for instance, Mr. Speaker, "to the greatest betrayal of hope and confidence that Manitobans have ever had". He referred "to children in soup lines at the Salvation Army". He referred, Mr. Speaker, to Winnipeg as a catatonic city; he referred to me — I'm quite happy to have him refer to me as he referred at length to that speech I made in 1977 — I was the happy slasher; he referred to a government of autocrats with monthly Cabinet shuffles. I think we've had two in the last three years. Manitobans, he said, are despairing of the future of the province. He referred to our efforts to flog McKenzie Seeds at fire-sale prices and more rhetorical overkill.

We all from time to time become a bit carried away with our own rhetoric, and I have been as much a victim of that, Mr. Speaker, as any other member in this House, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is something in the atmosphere in this Chamber that sometimes overtakes us as I'm sure the leader would agree that in at least a few spots during his remarks in the other afternoon he was overtaken, if not overwhelmed, by his own rhetoric. I find that passing strange with all of the extra help that he now has, Mr. Speaker, and with prepared text, that he should be involved in such kind of rhetorical and factual overkill, if not factual imprecision in his comments. And in at least a few spots in his remarks I think he might even agree that he permitted wishing to replace truth. And so he spoke of the role of Sask Oil contribution to the recent oil finds in Manitoba as though that were the only company involved in our oil play here in Manitoba.

I am happy to be able to reiterate the correction that was offered by my colleague, the Minister, the Member for Brandon West, as he pointed out there have been a total of 26 wells — and I believe the Minister of Resources did this as well — 26 wells drilled in Manitoba this year, more than during any other year in our history; and of this total 18 of the wells are going into production and we're delighted with that news. Mr. Speaker, of that total Sask Oil drilled two and one was productive and we are equally delighted with that news. We welcome this participation in our development by our sister province, although I think it only fair to point out to my friends that if they were still in office, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP were still in office in Manitoba, Sask Oil wouldn't be here drilling the wells because

Sask Oil, like the other companies that are actively exploring for oil in Manitoba today, wouldn't be here. Sask Oil is active here in very large measure because this government has put into place a system of petroleum taxes that make exploration in Manitoba attractive once again. That's what's happened. And while the Leader of the Opposition and his friends were in office that kind of exploration had virtually ceased because of the excessive and the uncompetitive taxation and because of their compulsory partnership schemes, and all of that other socialist baggage which they had in place which acted to inhibit the development of resources and the creation of jobs here in the province of Manitoba.

And my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, sits smiling at the Member for Brandon East. And I'm waiting, Mr. Speaker, some day for the Member for Brandon East to tell us about the Kraft plant that he succeeded in driving out of Manitoba that was supposed to be located in Brandon. Tell us about that some day.

And I would like him to tell us some day, as well, Mr. Speaker, when he's talking about job creation in this province, about the General Electric plant that he and his colleagues drove out of Manitoba, now located in the province of Ontario with six or seven hundred jobs that should have been in Manitoba. If they'd been pursuing a policy of industrial development.

And my friend the Member for Brandon East smiles, but it was no smiling matter when the Kraft Food people were told that they weren't wanted because there was a strike on, and their friends of the NDP in the Federation of Labour wouldn't have any truck or trade with Mr. Kraft, even though that meant many hundreds of jobs in Manitoba. Well, so much, Mr. Speaker, for the industrial development tactics of the members opposite. We know all about them.

And when the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, despairs and urges others to despair about the future of Manitoba, it might be well for him to know and to remember that today there is more exploration going on in Manitoba, in real dollar terms, than at any other time in our history. And he can draw his charts and he can manipulate his figures all he wishes, but those are the hard facts of life. And that's known in southwestern Manitoba, which I understand he visits occasionally.

Mr. Speaker, I said that my friend had raised one important matter of public policy in his remarks, a matter that I believe should be discussed and considered in this Chamber. And I'm speaking about the serious and the difficult questions that surround the efforts of government to encourage the development of major economic projects in Manitoba. And I think it is important for this Legislature to look at those questions and I intend to deal with them for a few moments now.

I know that in a partisan atmosphere that is sometimes difficult. There can be a tendency for governments to say that if oppositions suggest anything, why it must be wrong. And equally there is always the tendency, or at least for this opposition, to suggest that if government does something it must be wrong too, or at least non-productive. And that sometimes take us to curious extremes, Mr.

Speaker, as it did the Member for Lac du Bonnet last year — not last year, in the last Session, just a few months ago — who, and I presume he, as a former member of the Cabinet, was speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party, he renounced the White Paper reforms by saying that he wouldn't allow us to take money from the productive parts of society to use on what he called a welfare scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the fact that the position he seemed to be articulating was not wholly consistent with what we had assumed to be his philosophy, and that of the party that he represents, there seemed to be a noticeable shortage of logic in his statements. The only place that governments ever get money from is from the productive parts of society. That's a message that my honourable friends and their forebearers for generations have never been able to learn. And although that is something that he and his friends tried to pretend away, as they taxed and spent their way through eight years in government, he now comes up and says that he understands and believes that. Well I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition would confirm that this message has come down from whatever hill they pay obeisance to, that they understand that the only way that government gets any money, in a society such as ours, which thank God is a free-market society and a mixed economy, the only way government gets money is by people going out and working to earn it in the productive parts of society. And, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends have come to that realization as was hinted by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, then we have indeed crossed a great philosophical divide in the New Democratic Party that sits opposite to us.

And as for the White Paper reforms becoming a welfare scheme — and that's the honourable member's description not mine — on January 1, when low income and single parent families with children all over Manitoba start receiving the new CRISP income supplement of up to 30 per month, per child, those families and their children will be significantly better off. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I believe Manitobans want, all Manitobans want, for those who are underprivileged in our society.

Mr. Speaker, we in this government, were motivated by our concern for people to bring in this kind of a far-reaching program, this kind of a far-reaching program that may well have been suggested to honourable members opposite but which, in their pursuit of phoney industrial development, need I mention Saunders Aircraft, 40 million, and a few of the other things that they were attempting to follow in that rather quaint philosophy that they still claim adherence to, instead of taking that money and spending it productively, as it could have been spent, and cleaning up the rebate program as we have done in the last year, they said that the children in Manitoba from low income parents, particularly single parents, didn't that money. They needed that money as play money. They had to have more monopoly money for Saunders Aircraft, for King Choy Foods and for some of the other disasters that they got into in the course of their eight misguided years in government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we're saying that that 30 per month, per child is important. My honourable friends

can call it a welfare scheme. They can call it wrong-headed, but I tell you that the money is going, Mr. Speaker, and will go to the people in this province who need it the most.

These reforms do mean that people in the tax brackets of all members in this House will get a little less money from the cost of living tax credit. But, Mr. Speaker, how passing strange it is to hear members of the Opposition, of this socialist opposition now, trying to tell us that they have any concern for small business people, for people in middle or upper middle incomes. Where was that concern manifested during the eight years they were in government when they imposed the highest regime of provincial taxes in this province that has ever been seen in this province's history, the highest in Canada, Mr. Speaker. And now all of a sudden they have a new found concern for the people on the cost of living tax credit plan, most of this House, and people who earn 20,000, 30,000, 40,000 a year, who are going to be getting a little bit less, yes, we will be getting a little bit less, and that money is going to be targeted where? To people on low income who need it the most, and they are objecting to it across the way.

It means that thousand of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, who are in need will get significantly more, and surely that is something that we might reasonably have expected members opposite to applaud. But instead they put on sackcloth and ashes and say that they are the defenders of middle income people, and small business and the farmers in Manitoba. They, they who did more to drive small business out of this province; they who did more through their state farm systems and other collective ideas to ruin individual farm families in this province than any government in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could say that their urgings were one of the reasons that we began to re-examine the system of income support programs in Manitoba, but it wasn't because they even objected to our looking at one of the sacred cows that they said was their creation. Well, we looked at it and we've improved it and it's better and it's going to target more money to people who need it more in Manitoba. To our amazement they voted against it, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet after eight years of taxing the productive sectors of Manitoba to finance the takeover of private farm lands, he dismisses it as a welfare scheme, speaking I presume on behalf of the Official Opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we discussed major economic development projects that will be coming forward during this session and during this year, rather than this kind of wrangling for its own sake that we can use the total resources and the total good sense of this House in asking and answering the kinds of questions that must be asked about projects of this magnitude which were mentioned in the Throne Speech.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that first we should collectively work to make certain that there are clear guarantees involved in any of these new major projects, of the investment and employment that they are designed to create in Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking for such guarantees. And secondly, we should collectively work to assure that the private enterprises involved in these major projects are capable and are well financed. An



airplane factory is no good to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, if the people running it have neither the money nor the know-how to run an airplane factory, as the Member for Brandon East ought to know, and as the taxpayers of this province know, to the extent of at least 40 million plus. Thirdly, we want to work to assure that no project involves any more burden on the taxpayer than absolutely necessary, and that means keeping government participation to the minimum, consistent with our other objectives as a province and in terms of the creation of wealth and in terms of the creation of opportunities in this province. And fourthly, we want to work to assure that the total benefits to Manitoba and to Canada of each of the projects that we have mentioned in the Throne Speech that will come forth over the next number of months, are being maximized.

We can't achieve that by buying from Russia, equipment that can be made in Canada. We can't achieve that by having Russian engineers doing work that Manitoba consulting engineers could do. We can't achieve it that way, Mr. Speaker, but we can do it by adopting clear policies of buying from Canadians when Canadians are competitive, and that's the policy that we intend to adopt. Mr. Speaker, it is the policy that we will require the major private enterprises involved in these projects to adopt as well, and that's buy Canada, buy Manitoba, or in reverse order, and we think that that's good for Manitoba, good for job opportunities and my honourable friends opposite are going to have an opportunity during the course of this resumed session to stand up and devote as to whether or not they favour buy Canada, buy Manitoba, or whether they still want a buy Russia policy which seemed to flavour some of their major contractual obligations when they were considering turbines for the ill-starred development at the head of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, we are determined that whether we are talking about the development of the western grid, of additional hydro generating capacity, of the St. Lazare potash mine, of the proposed Alcan refinery, or of the major new investment that is necessary at ManFor, if that facility is to continue to offer increased jobs and opportunities in the north, we are determined that we will maximize the benefits to Manitoba to the west and to Canada as a whole. And on the basis, Mr. Speaker, of projects of this scale we can begin once more to play a full and effective role within the economic life of this country and we want the help and the advice of members opposite and of everyone else in Manitoba in doing just that.

It's a curious thing, Mr. Speaker, at one point in his speech, the Leader of the Opposition dismisses the western power grid because we have as I believe we should, brought clear information about the negotiations surrounding this project before this House and before the people of Manitoba at each of the major stages. We announced when we began negotiations with the other western provinces. We announced when we obtained agreement for the major feasibility study which has just been completed. We tabled in this House the consultants' reports that backed up the first feasibility studies which are being furthered by the studies now under way. We announced that when that study was over that we anticipated a favourable decision soon and

we will announce that decision when it is reached after the Ministers meet early in the new year.

And at no point did our friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, offer us advice as to what Manitoba should be attempting to achieve in the negotiations. At no point did they suggest ways in which this project could be used to the greater benefit of Manitobans and now the Leader of the Opposition has the unmitigated gall to dismiss the grid because we have kept him informed. He says that's old hat. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not old hat when it will start and can be responsible for starting the construction again at Limestone, which my honourable friends shut down in August, September of 1977, and I don't criticize them, Mr. Speaker, they should have shut it down three years before that as the Tritschler Report has amply demonstrated.

So, Mr. Speaker, our friends can't have it both ways. They can't on the one hand say that there's been too much secrecy in these major negotiations when I have just outlined to the House how we have kept the House, the opposition and the people of Manitoba informed at every stage as reasonably as we could. He can't on the one hand complain about secrecy and on the other hand say but that's old hat, we've heard all about it. He's got as in so many things in life and in principle, to choose his course and to stick to it and when he does that he'll find he'll be a more effective Leader of the Opposition and he perhaps won't be referred to as a sheep in sheep's clothing or look like one.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to announce as much about every project under consideration as early as we can and with as much detail as we can without compromising legitimate negotiations that are under way. This House and the people of Manitoba have a right to that information, and we will continue to be receptive to reasonable suggestions and advice from our friends opposite as to how this can better be done.

But there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that we will not do; we will not abandon our efforts to achieve these projects for Manitoba because my honourable friends in their sack cloth and ashes say that it can't happen, it won't happen, because we have a vision for the future of Manitoba even if they don't. Mr. Speaker, that vision arises from a genuine concern for the people of Manitoba and for the future of this province, not in blind obeisance to a 19th century doctrine that would have no project be of any use or any value unless it's owned by the government. That's the only doctrine that seems to inflame the imaginations of my honourable friends opposite.

Mr. Speaker, our friends talk of despair about our economy. Well we're not despairing although heaven knows that we have had floods and we have had fires and we have had droughts and we have had interest rates emanating largely from Ottawa policies, and we have had problems enough but, Mr. Speaker, like the majority of Manitobans who are not socialist, we're not bellyaching about them. We're not bellyaching about them; we're not whining about them; we're not standing up in sack cloth and ashes and saying isn't that terrible, we'll never recover from it.

My God, Mr. Speaker, we would not have a province here if we'd had people with that kind of mind set when this province was first settled. If my

great-grandfather when he first came here in 1876 had said oh, we have a bad crop this year so I better move back to Ontario, where would I be back somewhere in Ontario. No, he and thousands of others who came to this country and settled it in the worst kind of privation that my honourable friends could ever hope to imagine — and there are descendants of the same people on that side of the House if they would only go to their taproots to find out the kind of privation, the kind of sacrifice that their forebearers made to make this province what it is today — it wasn't made by the whining that we hear from across the way.

We're not despairing, we are confident and we are determined that Manitoba will not waste the opportunities that we have today. We are determined that Manitoba will not lose these opportunities through the backbiting and through the back talking that is going on from the Opposition and some of their friends in the press. The opportunities are real and they are real, Mr. Speaker, in potash, in our existing forestry industry, in other minerals and in mining, in manufacturing based on our hydro resources and in our hydro resources themselves. Those are real opportunities and we intend to maximize those opportunities for the benefit of every citizen of Manitoba now and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes get a little angry with members opposite when they talk and talk about all the things that are wrong with Manitoba and I'm not blind to the problems, I'm no Pollyanna. But why do they insist on being blind to the blessings that we enjoy here and the very real opportunities that lie before us in this province? Why are they blind to that? I'm proud of Manitoba. I'm proud, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, that my children are fifth-generation Manitobans and I'll be even prouder when their children are sixth-generation Manitobans. My heavens, Mr. Speaker, there won't be any sixth-generation Manitobans if we all follow the attitudes of my honourable friends opposite and say, oh, we can't do it; we're too small; we can't manage that; it's government's fault to do this, that or the other thing. When the people came to develop this province did they look to government to do anything for them? Not a damn thing, Mr. Speaker, not a damn thing.

We say today, Mr. Speaker, that government has a role to play in developing the economic climate and we know what that role is and we know the limits of what government should be doing. My honourable friends opposite thought government could do everything. That is a piece of nonsense that history has proven to be such. We know what the limits of government are and we will work to those limits to ensure that we maximize these opportunities for Manitoba. I'll be proud, Mr. Speaker, even if my honourable friends opposite aren't when we have a major operating potash mine in our province. I'll be proud, Mr. Speaker, when our hydro resource is once again being harnessed on a prudent and on an economic basis, not a some sort of make-work scheme the way our friends opposite treated it, even if they did make more work in Russia than in Canada on certain of the turbines, but in response to development that should take place in response to economic and clearly identified market opportunities.

I'll be proud, Mr. Speaker, even if my honourable friends opposite aren't as I watch the industries based on that resource grow up as such small and medium-sized operations as the Simplot expansion and the Tupperware plant have already grown in Manitoba providing jobs for Manitobans as the Minister of Highways and Transportation mentioned the other day. I'll be proud, Mr. Speaker, even if my honourable friends in the NDP aren't as I watch the industries based on all of these resources that we have been talking about build up and grow in Manitoba. I'll be proud as I see the orders created by those projects being placed with Manitoba businesses and with Canadian businesses to enhance the economy of our province and of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected in Manitoba about three years ago because thousands of Manitobans, including thousands who had never supported our party, were determined that we should not settle for a second-class province here. They were determined that we would not strangle on our own growth with uncompetitive taxes and uncontrolled government spending and we have lowered the taxes, Mr. Speaker, and we have brought spending back under control. The people were determined that government should not intrude blindly in the ownership of businesses and of farms and we have ended those intrusions. They were determined, the people, Mr. Speaker, that imprudent government measures should not spell the end of our basic resource industries and we have taken measures that have so stimulated those industries that mining and oil exploration are both at an all-time high in our province. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba were tired of the kind of constant warfare between the socialist government and virtually every other group in our society from insurance agents to school teachers to doctors to public servants, you name it, they were prepared to fight with them and we have worked to end those confrontations.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Manitobans were tired three years ago when they gave us a large majority of the fading confidence in our province and what we could become that marked so much of the time of the last government when they were in office that that hope was being lost. Manitobans were not ready in the socialist terms to give up trying to become something more than they had been; they weren't ready to trade that chain of aspiration that saw each generation of Manitobans passing on more to their children than they had started out with; they weren't ready to trade that in for the kind of institutionalized envy and levelling and egalitarianism that the NDP preached, two-and-a-half times one and all of that. That merely evokes, it merely evokes, Mr. Speaker, what they believed in then; it merely evokes today what they believe in now but haven't the candour or the forthrightness to tell the people of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not satisfied that we have yet restored the confidence that Manitobans ought to feel in the future of this province and we still have a job ahead of us. Heaven knows there is a constant enough counsel of despair coming from our friends opposite. Job creation has approximately tripled; private sector investment is up; mining and other exploration is up to the highest levels in our history.

But our friends across the way continue to tell Manitobans to despair, to give up their pride and their confidence in this province and in themselves and that is the doctrine of despair that they preach to the people of Manitoba, that they should give up confidence in themselves. Why? So that they can maybe sneak back into office as my colleague, the Minister of Health, said, the most discredited and incompetent group of socialist zealots ever to hold office in a province in Canada, that they could somehow through a back door sneak back into office by demeaning the ability of the people of Manitoba to improve themselves. Poor old Manitoba, that's the slogan of the NDP, poor old Manitoba. Well, I don't accept that, Mr. Speaker, and I know that a majority of the people of Manitoba don't believe it or accept it. I think our job as government is to try to help Manitobans all over this province to get over that kind of thinking and, after eight years of having it impressed on them, day after day, week after week, one can understand why it's a little bit hard to get out of that kind of mindset.

We have, Mr. Speaker, one of the best places on earth to live, here in Manitoba. We all know that in this House and yet there are people sitting in the opposition benches in this House, Mr. Speaker, who tell people to give up on it. They try to denigrate it, to downgrade it for their own kind of selfish, partisan advantage so that they can sneak back into office, sneak back into power. Like we referred earlier tonight, Mr. Speaker, to Clement Attlee, to the Labour Party in Britain, so that they can have the fun, I suppose, of seeing the red flag and saying we are the masters now so that they can inflict their funny ideology on the people of Manitoba again. Mr. Speaker, that isn't going to happen. We have one of the best places on earth and they tell people to give up on it and they revel in stories about children in soup lines and other contrived situations that we find. When we say that Manitoba can compete in today's world, that our resources and the resourcefulness of our people can build up our wealth today, just as it was built up when our parents and our grandparents first started this province, they, Mr. Speaker, the socialists say it's impossible. I say it isn't impossible at all. Not only is it not impossible, it's the future for our children. They have to know and to understand that it can be done; it is being done at the present moment and it will be done, notwithstanding the nay sayers opposite.

Mr. Speaker, when we take sensible steps to take advantage of the opportunities here, they say it just won't work. Why do they find the idea of Manitoba's success so difficult to accept? Our province and our people have built a history of more than a 100 years of success and we're a long way from finished in this province, even though the NDP are prepared to bury it for their own partisan purposes.

Well frankly, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding their dog-eyed view of life, or as others have described it, and I don't claim to be the originator of the statement but it is so true, that I repeat it from time to time, they insist on looking at the world through the wrong end of life's sewer pipe and that's where they sit. They don't believe in the future of the province or its people, they want to tear down everything that is meaningful in building up the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, we ask them to cast

aside these funny ideas and funny thoughts. We'd like the help of our friends across the way because we need the help of all Manitobans to build up the province. We'd like them to stop apologizing for Manitoba and start offering sensible suggestions about ways in which we can make jointly Manitoba a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of mine that the Leader opposite quoted so often, if not entirely accurately, had one important component that was lacking entirely from his remarks of a few days ago. It had page after page of clear suggestions about the things that our party believes should be done to help overcome the problems that then plagued Manitoba. And those things have been done by this government and there was not as he would have you believe, a long list of election promises. We have done the very few things that we said to the people of Manitoba we would do in terms of direct government policy, with the result that we are today in a position to start taking advantage of the kinds of major opportunities that we talked about in the Throne Speech and to which I have alluded again tonight.

Mr. Speaker, they say it is impossible. Even if we do them, they say it will be somehow bad for Manitoba because it won't all be government owned. And after eight years of government owned farms and government owned aeroplane factories and government's right to own 50 percent of any new mine, which didn't really amount to much because under the NDP there weren't any new mines, they want more of that, more of that kind of sterile policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this government or the people of this province can afford to waste time on that kind of argument. But we ask our honourable friends to shuck off that kind of ideological fixation and to start working with the government and the people of Manitoba in achieving these opportunities for the future. We have much to do. And those of us who are still proud of and confident in Manitoba, have a great deal at hand. We have to get on with the job of building up this economy, through the projects that we have already talked about and others that will contribute to the public interest of this province.

We have real problems to cope with. Problems like the record high interest rates the federal government has imposed in Canada. And you know the rationale for those interest rates, don't you, Mr. Speaker? According to Ottawa we need the high interest rates to protect the Canadian dollar because U.S. interest rates are up. But the real fact is that our dollar is down because international confidence in Canada is down as a result of a whole package of federal policies including the current federal energy policy, which if you can believe it, the Member for Brandon East would have us adopt as a policy that is good for Manitobans. Well, Mr. Speaker, unrealistic energy policies and confiscatory policies with respect to foreign energy investment in Canada, is not going to create one more barrel of oil in this country or help self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, no one, no one in this House can offer any easy answer to the problem of high interest rates. We all know that the only answer that can be worked out, if any answer is to be worked out at all, must be done on a national basis with all of the

provinces participating and that is what the Minister of Finance was discussing with his colleagues in Ottawa last week.

We have put our concerns before Ottawa. We're going to continue to examine extremely closely the effects of those rates, but unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we're not going to try to pretend to Manitobans that we can wish away, in this House, a national problem. That certainly beggars the mind when it comes to a solution provincially. For those in greatest need we have at least the comfort of knowing that our White Paper reforms, which my honourable friends opposite voted against, will provide some relief immediately but there is no easy answer to the problem. And I do well to remind my honourable friends opposite that it was they and their colleagues in Ottawa, who helped to turn out of office the Clark government which did have in its budget, real policies to help by way of taxation, benefits, taxation payments for energy, for taxation on homes, for mortgage interest rates and so on, that would have helped to benefit people in low income groups in Canada, had they not worked to get rid of that government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we can do and what we are doing is therefore, to prepare the conditions for Manitoba to resume the kind of healthy economic growth that this artificial, federally-imposed strangulation is removing from our economy. The downtown core initiatives will help in that. The Canadian procurement policies that we are building into our major projects are going to help as well. And improved programs of support for the family farm are going to help. The White Paper reforms are going to help and Enterprise Manitoba Initiatives will help too. I think it should be clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that those initiatives, like many of the other things this government is able to undertake, are partially financed by the federal government and that's part of the partnership of federalism, one of the few elements of partnership that still exist under this particular federal government.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's proof of the fact that whatever strains may be placed upon our Canadian family by particular policies of this particular Ottawa government, with its lack of understanding and respect for western Canada, our union in Canada is still strong and still benefits all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks tonight by saying to you that Canada can survive, even the Trudeau government, a government that is really an aberration in our history in that it has consciously chosen to open confrontation on virtually every front, with virtually every region of this country. And Manitoba survived even eight years of government by our friends opposite, so how can the Trudeau government begin to frighten us, here in this province?

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to contrast the position we were in three years ago with the position we find ourselves in today. I'm not going to detail all of the matters that that comparison will bring to your attention, except to say, that the national and international economies which my honourable friend the Member for Brandon East conveniently forgets, were much stronger then. We were creating about a third as many jobs in Manitoba as we are today, even with that strong international economy. Our

landscape was cluttered with government-owned farms and money-losing, government-owned businesses. Our resource industries were at a standstill, Mr. Speaker. Hydro was bloated with debt and surplus capacity and rate increases for virtually every year of the last three to four years of their administration and we froze those rates shortly after we came into office.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to pretend that everything is rosy today. I've talked about high interest rates, and we all know that there is a continent-wide recession on, but largely because of the measures this government has taken and I'd be the first to admit that some of them were tough measures, we have opportunities today that three years ago seemed lost forever. The new mines are coming. The new manufacturing and forest investments are coming as well and the renewed expansion of hydro, this time on a sound financial footing and this time without relying on Russian suppliers, will come. Those things will all be translated into tangible opportunities for Manitoba businesses and for individual Manitobans, by the efforts primarily of the people of Manitoba, with the government of Manitoba working to provide that kind of a conducive atmosphere for that kind of development to take place. And I suppose that that in the end, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest difference between this government and those across the way. We believe in Manitoba, that's the big difference.

My friends across the way, Mr. Speaker, don't believe in Manitoba. They want us all to despair. To give up, to settle for second best, to settle for a standstill and to call that progress. Well, Mr. Speaker, some of the arguments that we have heard in this Chamber are philosophical arguments and they're not easily resolved. Although it should be said that since our friend the Member for Inkster left the fold of the NDP, we see a great deal less of philosophy and a great deal more of sophistry, than we did in the past. But this argument is different, Sir, this is one that is going to be resolved by events, not by philosophical discussion. It will be resolved when the projects that we have spoken of are achieved in Manitoba, as they will be achieved in Manitoba and when Manitobans begin to reap their benefits. I can't and I won't put a timetable on it because we will negotiate in the interests of all Manitobans, to make sure that these matters and others that we have not as yet discussed, will take place and will be in the public interest. As I said the questions involved are too important to be rushed to meet some kind of electoral timetable which seems to be the only concern of honourable members opposite.

But the potential is there and because of the measures we have taken, the climate and the opportunities are there and because of the nature of Manitobans, the achievement will be there, not because of this government but because of the nature of our people. They demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, through eight years of the most incompetent government that this province has ever had, that they could withstand that and, Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of Manitoba will achieve these things, notwithstanding the doom-saying that goes on from across the way.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue to do our part. We're going to play a sensible and a flexible

role in the development of our economy. We will continue prudent and sound management of the public affairs of this province. We will continue to improve and augment the services available to Manitobans through their government and perhaps most important, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to be proud of and confident about this province and its people and of the lives that we have already built for ourselves in this province, which would be envy of virtually every other group of people on earth and we will continue to be proud, Mr. Speaker, of the things that we still have left to build.

I invite our honourable friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, to join us in this vision and in this crusade for the future, to play the positive, if critical role an Opposition ought to play, rather than, if I may quote the Leader of the Opposition quoting me, "settling for a constant gnawing on the bones of old contentions".

Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Official Opposition are not worthy of the support of this House. Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition will not receive the support of this House.

I commend the Throne Speech, unamended to this House, for the future of all Manitobans and for generations yet unborn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. According to our Rules, Rule No. 35, sub (3), at 30 minutes before the ordinary time of adjournment, should there be any amendment to the Throne Speech, it is the requirement of the Chair to put the question.

As we are very very close to that 30 minute time, I would now put the question to the House, on the amendment to the Throne Speech, moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following:

But this House regrets that this government,

- 1)has persisted in policies which have mismanaged Manitoba's economy and led to a decline of economic growth from 80 percent of the national average under the previous government to 10 percent of the national average, and to the worst job creation rate in 1979 and the first eleven months of 1980; policies which have increased the cost of living for all Manitobans, particularly the elderly, working people and small business,
- 2)has broken its promises to the people of Manitoba, in particular young people, northerners, farmers and those in the Winnipeg core, and
- 3)has refused to listen to the people of Manitoba, and has conducted economic and resource planning in total secrecy, causing a loss of confidence in this government; and
- 4)has failed completely to meet its own standards of fiscal management and government efficiency.

**QUESTION put on the amendment and defeated.**

**MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan):** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.  
Order please.

The question before the House is the proposed amendment of the Leader of the Opposition.

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

### YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schroeder, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding.

### NAYS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas, 16, Nays, 31.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion lost. We're now dealing with the Main Motion, the Motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUKE:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to use the few remaining minutes I have left to me to comment on some of the speeches I've heard in the Throne Speech debate today. I'll save the time I have tomorrow for a presentation of alternatives. I'd like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech. I'm in a very happy mood, it's the festive season, I'm even going to go on and congratulate the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, Committee Chairman.

Obviously we are entering the holiday season and I want to in fact indicate that the people on this side of the House are entering that holiday season, not wanting to hurl invective back and forth as we've just heard for the last hour and a half. We, in fact, wanted to go into the holiday season with a feeling of accomplishment, with a feeling of fulfillment but you know we've just finished, or are in the process of finishing, a rather hollow, truncated sojourn in this Legislature.

I keep wondering why were we called to sit here for the last eight days by the government. All we've done is listen to a set of press releases that the government has put forward. Most of these are press releases that we've heard before. The press releases that we haven't heard of before whenever we asked a specific question about it we are given an evasive answer. The government was not prepared when they called us together. They weren't prepared to deal with anything at this particular time. Where is the legislation, we have one more day to go? Where is the legislation that I expected to see on the Order Paper? I expected the government to be tabling material. I expect tomorrow that we should get the Estimates. Surely tomorrow we should get the Estimates.

We on this side of the House want to in fact deal with the problems and issues facing Manitoba. We don't want to go through a nice grand rhetorical grandstanding display and then walk away at Christmastime, walk away for a month or two washing our hands of the matter and not doing

anything. In fact we wanted to work, we wanted to work at this session. We want to ask a number of questions and we aren't receiving any answers at all from this government. We in fact haven't turned our backs on this province. The Conservative Party, the Conservative government has turned its back on this province; they turned their backs on interest group after interest group that's been hurt by this government when those interest groups have come before the Legislature, when they've come before the government; they've turned their back on the elderly, and they laugh about that; they turned their back on community groups; they turned their back on religious groups that wanted to help Manitobans to help the elderly in the area of personal care; they turned their back on group after group after group while feathering the nests of a few of their friends who provide health care for profit — that is the group that they were supporting but they've turned their back on the community. The people out there, Mr. Speaker, they know who's turned their back on Manitoba. You could look at it in the second last federal election and in the last federal election. They knew who turned their back on Manitoba, and when they had the opportunity they turfed those people out. When I look at this rerun of press releases and when I listen to the speech of the Premier, which is really a rerun of the speech I've heard for the last three years, frankly it reminds me of a rerun of the Gong Show. The Gong Show was a show of amateurs by amateurs, and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba will gong the Gong Show across the way.

We came to this Legislature to hear more than a pep talk; we wanted some answers; we wanted something more than a pep talk, we just didn't want the government sort of going back to the days of Walter Weir chalking slogans on the wall, Growing to Beat '70, relying on that type of jingoism, that type of boosterism without specifics. I'm expecting that they're going to do what the Winnipeg Development Corporation has been doing, chalking all those slogans on the wall saying all the great things, telling people about all the firms they've attracted and whenever you check out the specifics you find that that's not true. And when we try and find specifics about ManFor, we have a minister not willing to provide any answers to us, not willing to provide any answers.

Then I say to myself well, why were we called here? Why were we called here, told about ManFor in the Throne Speech? Obviously we should ask questions then, that's our function as members of the Official Opposition and we find the minister skirting the issue. We find the minister skirting the issue with respect to Alcan as well. We're not against projects for this province, we're for positive projects; we're against the type of give away, we're against the type of desperation that existed between 1966 and 1969 that led to some terrible give aways. When we see a situation right now where this government says that they are in the process of renegotiating ManFor but will not give us an answer we then, along with the rest of the people of Manitoba, get very suspicious. What is going on? Is that another rerun? Is that a rerun of '66, '67, '68 with the same actors involved in this show as were in last time? — (Interjection)— That's right. Not at all. What we find

is a government that isn't prepared to table any information at all. You know what I think's happening, Mr. Speaker. I think that they have goofed with ManFor. I think they are in the process of signing one of the biggest give aways this province has ever seen. They've gone beyond the stage of putting ads in the paper saying, we're desperate we want to give it away. They sent out secret prospecti to people. We can't get the prospecti, the people of Manitoba can't get the prospecti but those people can. And so I wonder why were we called to receive these announcements and not to get specific information.

What we've had over the last few days, and it's funny to hear some of the heckling, is a set of the most defensive speeches I've heard in the last three years. You know, the cockiness that existed three years ago isn't there right now. In fact the Member for Lakeside who I enjoy, I enjoy his performances, very defensive this time. Shocked, I think you should read some of your old speeches, you had a lot more pep then. Maybe you had some idea about where you were going, maybe you thought your ideas would work. Three years later you're lost right now, you're lost and you're terribly defensive and that is the tone of the speeches that we are hearing from members across the way. That is the road, that's the tone, no pride in what they are doing, they're not prepared to defend their record; they're not prepared to talk about the performance of the Manitoba economy; they're not prepared to talk about what the future of this province will be; they're prepared to throw out a couple of press releases but they're not prepared to talk about the levels of employment; they're wanting to duck those particular issues. Even if you look clearly at the Throne Speech, it says that these mega projects won't really solve the problems entirely but we hope somehow that just the talk of these "mega projects" will change the psychology.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The hour is 10 o'clock. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just indicate, as a result of my conversations with the Opposition House Leader today, there appears to be unanimous agreement that the vote under Rule 35(4) should take place tomorrow at 5 o'clock rather than 9:30 and that the House would subsequently adjourn sometime before 5:30 until next year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 10 o'clock, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)