

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Monday, 15 December, 1980**

**Time — 8:00 p.m.**

**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** My first words, Mr. Speaker, will be the traditional words of welcome to you, Sir, in your return to occupying the position that you have so capably handled in the last few years. As each session goes by, I'm sure that you gain a greater knowledge of this place, the temperament and the mood of the House and are able to make those judgments and decisions that are in keeping with the best traditions of this Chamber.

I want to also extend my words of congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address and reply, who in my view, both very capably underscored and underlined the thrust of the Speech from the Throne and what it meant to them in their particular areas and what it means to the province as a whole.

I have something less than a congratulatory message to the Leader of the Opposition. I have heard a leader defined as one who watches which way the crowd is going and then rushes up in front and hollers like hell and if that is a definition of a leader, then the Leader of the Opposition certainly fulfilled that role very admirably this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, he demeaned the office of the Leader of the Opposition in the kind of speech that was made, that we heard here this afternoon. He debased himself and I think what is even worse and what is even sadder he discredited himself by reading the words that were put into his mouth by those unknowns, and it may be better if they remain unknown, those who wrote that speech for him. Sir, it made him look like a fool, but I think we have to admit that he had the raw material over which that was fabricated. The reaction of his —(Interjection)— now, Sir, I guess now we have identified one of those who wrote the speech.

Sir, the reaction of the members opposite was the best testimony that one could ever witness as to the effectiveness of that speech. It was described by the Minister of Highways pretty accurately when he said that's the first time he's ever seen anybody go to sleep in the middle of his own speech. He forgot to put the motion, and heaven knows where he would have wound up if somebody hadn't reminded him that it was his responsibility, indeed his duty as the Leader of the Opposition to put a motion so that we can have something to judge by. With a little bit of assistance from this side of the House the motion was put and it hardly was necessary. It really hardly was necessary because it was nothing more than a regurgitation of what he said during the course of his hour-and-a-half remarks. I have no objections or criticisms to offer on a speech lasting an hour-and-a-half. I have listened to speeches that have lasted much longer than that, but one would have thought during the course of an hour-and-a-half something of substance would have been said, but sadly, Sir, it was lacking in substance.

I got the impression that as the Leader of Opposition was perambulating throughout the province in the last few months after the session ended he jotted down every suggestion or every criticism that was offered to him by everybody that he met and everything was included in that speech.

Mr. Speaker, their tactic in that kind of an appeal and that kind of a speech, and now I am going to offer my most severe criticism of the Leader of the Opposition because I am going to say that it sounded and reminded me so much of a Trudeau Liberal. That is, in my opinion, the worst condemnation that I can make of anybody in this Chamber. (Interjections)— That's right, and that is precisely what I meant, Sir, when I said he acted in the best tradition of a Trudeau Liberal. Power at all cost. Sacrifice everything and anything, it doesn't matter. Principles don't mean anything, lies don't mean anything, the truth don't mean anything. All you do is to make the basest kind of an appeal that you possibly can in order to get votes and to hell with the country. That is acting in the best tradition of a Trudeau Liberal. If my honourable friends want to identify themselves with that kind of a politician, they are welcome to have it.

Mr. Speaker, he didn't forget anyone, not a single soul. He even nodded gently in the direction of the businessmen; even had something kind to say about our businessmen and that must have hurt, because I find it difficult to understand why the socialists work so hard to give lip service to remove people from the slums, and they do go give a lot of lip service to that, because their obvious dislike for those slums is only exceeded by their dislike for those who have managed to lift themselves out of the slums; who have managed to become successful. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, we hear the comments from the Member for Fort Rouge, who with a little more experience experience in this House, might even find out what is going on in this place and the purpose of the Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what was the recital that we heard this afternoon? Job creation. They made much of job creation, and I have had some difficulties trying to understand why they could not understand, that when they were in opposition, they bragged about creating 4,000 jobs. Since we've come into power there have been 36,000 jobs created in this province but finally I'm beginning to understand what they mean by job creation. A job, in their opinion, is not created unless the government themselves create that job, unless the government hires that person, in other words, unless the government takes the money out of one taxpayer's pocket and puts it into the pocket of another taxpayer. That to them is the essence of job creation. (Interjection)— I judge from the reactions that I get from honourable gentlemen opposite that I have struck very close to the truth. That has been the philosophy of honourable friends opposite, and that, Mr. Speaker, is where they are wrong, that is where their whole idea of government is based on a false premise. I'll come to that a little later.

They talked about home ownership, and the Leader of the Opposition opined and wondered why

people could not buy homes today. Sir, when I was on that side of the House I warned them repeatedly what would happen. Time after time I rose in my place in this House and told them that the rate of government spending was going to create a disaster for this country ultimately, and we will be paying for it. They're paying for it today. The rate of government spending, the creation of a money supply far in excess of the productivity of this country, has only one result and it's been proven so often in so many ways, in so many places, that I am always at a loss as to understand why honourable gentlemen opposite have not been able to understand that very simple fact of economic life. But I'll come to that a little later as well at the same time.

They even talked about the farm machinery industry in the country. Well, of course, the farm implement industry is in difficulty if the farmers are in difficulty, and one of the very first things that we attempted to do when it became apparent that the drought was going to hit this country and was going to hurt this province was to try and restore some semblance of farm income so that the farm implement industry would not suffer as greatly as they might have otherwise, had not action been taken by this government.

The Leader of the Opposition even talked about Ollmann's Furniture and those people who had put down down payments on furniture that they were not going to get because of the bankruptcy. He didn't miss a single soul, Sir. He talked about the housing industry and how we should be revitalizing the housing industry with a seven percent vacancy rate. It was pointed out by the Minister of Highways houses built by the honourable gentlemen opposite, and that was their idea of job creation. That's what they did in Hydro as well, and that's the reason why we have a problem in this province.

He talked about rents. Mr. Speaker, I well recall when The Rent Stabilization Act was brought in in this House. When we were on that side of the House we urged the government to do something about those premises and those people who had housing accommodation available and whose rents were far below the average rent for similar accommodation in that particular area that they were creating a problem for those people. They didn't act, they did nothing. And what happened after rent controls were removed was simply that those people who had those accommodations who were not able to recover an economic rent for those premises raised their rents to the levels that they felt were economic. Now it's true that some rents did go up but, Sir, out of some 34-odd-thousand rent renewals from July 1st until the end of November 34,000, there were 903 complaints. And of that 903, half of them were settled by mediation. A number of others were settled simply by a process of arbitration and a number of others were settled because both the landlord and the tenant decided they would settle without the benefit of mediation or arbitration or anything else. There still remain a few that are posing a problem and action is going to be taken on those few.

I recall when the Minister of Agriculture suggested that he was going to remove the Milk Control Board and replace it with something that would be more

effective and more suited to the needs of the dairy industry. And I recall driving home one evening, hearing the Leader of the Opposition saying — and this is typical of the sort of thing that we get from my honourable friends opposite — I heard him say, we've got to keep the Milk Control Board because we've got to keep the price of milk down. That's typical. I don't know how much my honourable friend is getting out of the taxpayers in the form of a salary, something close to 50,000 I would imagine, but he says that the price of milk has got to be kept down for him —(Interjection)— the Leader of the Opposition. Yes, that's what I said. Yes, but I didn't complain about the dairy farmers getting a little bit more for the price of milk as my honourable friend did. He complained that the price of milk should be kept down, kept down to people like himself who are drawing something 50,000 a year in salary from the taxpayers while the farmers net income is perhaps 5,000 a year or less. And yet there has to be a board to keep milk prices down so that he can benefit from those lower prices, starve the dairy producers. The same thing is said about the landlords and there is only one reason why they do these things, Mr. Speaker. They do them because the landlords are small in numbers. They don't care about them, and the dairy farmers are small in numbers. They don't care about them. There are far more consumers than there are producers of milk. That's the side that they are on and it's quite natural for them to be on that side but, Sir, it is not economic justice. Why should there be only two groups of people in this province placed under controls? My honourable friends will have to answer that one for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, one of the prize comments that was made by the Leader of the Opposition was a comment that I can't help but remind him of at this point. He was quoting from the Premier when he said you don't operate government on the basis of the number of people that come before a committee. Well, I guess you don't. He took exception to that. He felt that we should. He felt that we should base our decisions on the number of people that come before the committee, and the Leader of the Opposition himself was the one that piloted the Autopac Bill through the legislation. And he has the bloody audacity to come before this House and make a suggestion of that kind. The ultimate to the suggestion that is being made by my honourable friend is nothing short of lynch mob democracy, nothing short of it. If numbers are supposed to dictate the kind of policy that you form and the kind of policies that you follow, then why not a lynch mob, because only one person objects. That is the ultimate in democracy in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends talk about job creation and the industries and industrial development. There is only one thing that my honourable friends are perturbed about insofar as the question of industrial development is concerned. They don't believe that there is such a thing as industrial development unless the government takes the money first from the taxpayer and then spends it on questionable projects and then continues to feed those projects regardless of whether they make or lose money and we have had a pretty good sample of that kind of industrial development from my honourable friends opposite and there is a reason for

that, Sir. There is a good reason why they follow that philosophy because it is in keeping with their ultimate intentions are. Sir, the wealth of this country is not created by governments. It is not created by governments taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. That is nothing more than recycling it. It is created by the extraction, the harvesting, the processing and the manufacturing of our resources, whether they are natural, renewable or nonrenewable. That is the difficulty with my honourable friends because they refuse to accept the very logic of my argument; that in the extraction of those resources, in the harvesting of those resources, and in the manufacturing and processing and the marketing of those resources, wealth is created by those people who do the harvesting, who do the processing. The difference, I've got them to agree to that, Sir, the difference lies in how that is done, and that spells out the difference between my honourable friends opposite and the members on this side of the House. They believe that all that should be done by the government. They believe that the government should own all of the means of production, all the resources, all the processing, all the manufacturing, and the marketing. That's what they believe in, Sir, because when that happens then they have complete control, because then they can dominate people's lives. Then, Sir, and at that stage, there is no freedom in this country.

That, Sir, is the ultimate. That is the ultimate and that is what my honourable friends are so upset about when the government on this side of the House announces once in a while that there are jobs being created by the private sector. They don't want a job created by the private sector and they don't count a job being created by the private sector. It is meaningless to them. The only thing that is important to them is that they gain more and more and more control.

The Leader of the Opposition made a point here this afternoon about The Farmlands Protection Act. He said we loosened up The Farmlands Protection Act and he knows darn well it never happened. There were more restrictions placed on The Farmlands Protection Act; more restrictions, not fewer. The only thing that was opened up was the availability of Canadians to buy land in this province, and for a group of people who continue to talk about Canada and a one Canada and a strong Canada, I am surprised at the attitude they take with respect to the ownership of land. On the one hand they want the federal government to control everything. On the other hand they do everything in their possible power to Balkanize this country, and they did it all the years that they were in power; even to the extent that they were criticizing a Crown corporation coming in from Saskatchewan to explore for oil. That is wrong in their opinion. I don't see anything wrong with it. It's coming from another province and I see nothing wrong with an interchange between provinces. That's the essence of federation. My honourable friends talk out of both sides of their mouth when they try to tell us that there should be restrictions on the ownership of land in this province, that you have to be a Manitoban to own land in Manitoba, that being a Canadian is not good enough. I'd like my honourable friends to tell me just what their version and what their opinion of a Canadian is, if a Canadian is one

that cannot own land in any part of this country or cannot own property in any part of this country. But that's the impression that my honourable friends have created and I think they've done it somewhat deliberately. I think they knew exactly what they were saying because that is exactly the kind of country they want.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the question of bankruptcy. The Leader of the Opposition made some mention of bankruptcies in this country and this province and he pointed with horror at the increase in bankruptcies in this last year. I would like to tell him that in . . . they probably have forgotten that, they don't realize it because they don't look back far enough to find out what happened when they were in power, and I invite them to do that and to see what happened in 1977 in the way of bankruptcies, when bankruptcies in this province went up 114 percent, 114 percent. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm telling you, they went up 114 percent. They went up from 53 to 114. Then they went down the next year, in 1978 they went down to 75. The next year they went down further still. And then they started going up again. That's a cycle that's been going on as long as this country was here. People are going bankrupt and they will continue to because of the changes that are taking place. That's bound to happen. And when you have a situation where a person borrows money at today's interest rates and then finds that his expectations are not reached, there's only one inevitable result. It's going to be foreclosed. And that happens throughout history. And for my honourable friends to try and make an issue of that today, something that has happened while they were in power, happened all the while they were in power, and it's happened all across this country, it will continue to happen, unless my honourable friends have the idea that every time somebody goes bankrupt they are going to prop them up and take them over. Maybe that's what they have in mind.

Maybe that's what the Leader of the Opposition meant when he said, and the government didn't do anything about it. What did the honourable gentlemen opposite do when bankruptcies went up 114 percent. If it was so bad, why wasn't anything done at that time?

Mr. Speaker, it's an indication of how my honourable friends are capable of talking out of both sides of their mouth. On the one hand, if it happens when they are in power, then it's all right. Then it's fine. But if it happens when somebody else is in power, the same thing, and perhaps under more difficult circumstances because no one can deny that the circumstances that exist today with respect to the running of businesses is as precarious as it's ever been with the high interest rates and the rates of inflation. It is difficult to predict, it is difficult to control. My honourable friends know that.

The Member for Rossmere mutters in his seat that he's one of those, and I regret to say, he's one of those who comes from a group of people whose ancestors escaped from the very thing that he is attempting to impose on the people of this province now. And I regret to say that the lessons that his ancestors have learned have obviously been lost on him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a few remarks about the contents of the Leader of the Opposition's

speech in reference to the Constitution. My honourable friend came out four square and so did his partners in the House of Commons in support of Mr. Trudeau and his version of Canada, which is a version that is not supported by the majority of people in this country and never will be, but because it appeared at that time, Sir, because it appeared at that time that it might be that the people of this country were going to support him until they understood what it was all about. Now my honourable friends are having an awful time to justify that position with the Leader of the Saskatchewan government who has a few ideas about how the Constitution should be amended and what the Constitution should contain in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the earlier description of the leader as being one who watches which way the mob is running and then leaps out in front of them is pretty adept because he has demonstrated that's the kind of leadership that he intends to provide. Mr. Speaker, he believes that this country, and that is a typical attitude of socialists, that the best way to run a country is to impoverish parts of it, simply because by an accident of geography they happen to have some wealth. Mr. Speaker, I would much rather take the attitude and the position of some of the businessmen in this country who, instead of bemoaning the fact that there is wealth in the province of Alberta, instead of crying because it isn't here, and instead of crying because the government isn't taking it from them forcibly and transferring it to other parts of the country, they're doing something about it, and there isn't a better example of that kind of an attitude than I found in the town of Steinbach when we were there recently. It's one of the success stories of course, that would never be reported by the press, because as the Minister of Highways said, they are more interested in the failures, they're more interested in reporting doom and gloom than they are some of the progressive things that are happening in this country.

But here's a businessman that opened up a business a few years ago and recognized that the construction industry was in a slump, first of all because of the closing down of Limestone and secondly because the housing industry had been overbuilt in this province. Now he could have sat back and howled which is typical of the socialist, and whined and moaned because the government wasn't doing anything about it. Instead of that, he flew to Alberta and he saw the construction that was going on there. He made a few enquiries and realized that he could manufacture products for those homes cheaper than they could be manufactured in Alberta and when we were there a couple of weeks ago he told me that for next year he has already 3 million worth of business in Alberta, 3 million. That's the kind of businessmen that we have in this province. That's the kind of people that are carrying on the industrial development of this province.

My honourable friends don't want them. My honourable friends would hate to see people like that. Because here is a successful businessman who took advantage of an opportunity that is waiting for all the businessmen in this province if they choose to take advantage of it. Instead of doing what this gentleman has done, and what I think many other businessmen have done, taking advantage of their

opportunities, the opportunities that are available to them, they're being convinced by honourable gentlemen opposite that it's the government's responsibility to bail them out every time they have a bit of a problem. Mr. Speaker, it's only a matter of time that if we bail people out every time they have a bit of a problem, it isn't going to be very long before they're going to expect us to pay their debts if they go to Las Vegas and lose money on the roulette wheels.

And now I hear my honourable friend muttering about Massey-Ferguson. Well, Massey-Ferguson doesn't happen to be in this province. I notice it's on their brochure, it's on the piece of literature that they send around, as one of the industries that went bankrupt in this province which is only another indication of the type of hypocrisy, the type of falsehood that honourable gentlemen opposite are capable of spreading around this country and around this province. The truth doesn't mean a thing to them. They're only interested in making everything sound as bad as it possibly can. The only people in this province who really believe that this province is in bad shape are honourable gentlemen opposite and they've created that impression in their own minds. They've talked about it so much, they've repeated it so much themselves that they honestly believe it. That's the only honest thing about anything that they said today by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of speeches in the 23 years that I've been both here and in the House of Commons. I have never listened to one that was as badly presented, that was so full of inaccuracies, hypocrisy, and weaknesses. And the effect that it had on honourable gentlemen opposite was pretty mute testimony to its ineffectiveness as a speech. They fell asleep in the middle of it. Not one ripple of applause all during the course of his remarks, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it didn't deserve any. It was the worst speech that I've ever listened to, in any Chamber in any place. Sir, if that is the measure of the Leader of the Opposition and if that is the measure of the kind of thing we can expect from honourable gentlemen opposite, then we're in for a very interesting session.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. LLOYD G. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your resumption of office and to make mention that in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, you do conduct the affairs of this House in a very dignified manner.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech on their presentation. I speak of my colleagues, the Member for Minnedosa and the Member for Springfield, and I would like also to make mention of the two Pages that are looking after our needs in the House today, I believe these two young gentlemen come from my fair City of Portage la Prairie and I am very pleased and honoured that they are able to be here on this occasion of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier of our province for the stand that he has taken on the issues of the Constitution. As a member of the

Manitoba Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders on the constitutional reform, I was very impressed by the number of citizens who started their presentations by stating that they were first, as a concerned Canadian citizen, and secondly as a Manitoban. After listening to some 45 briefs the message was clear that the people wanted the Constitution patriated, but amended after it was safely brought to Canada.

The issues, I believe, are large and not that well understood by many people and therefore will require a lot of effort on the part of many people to see that the consequences of the unilateral patriation and entrenched human rights are clearly understood.

Mr. Speaker, let me leave the subject of the Constitution for now, although I wish to return to it later. While we wrangled with the constitutional issue, the economies of North America are struggling. High interest rates, inflationary prices, are a threat to the economic stability. In our province, we have been slapped with devastating floods in 1979 and record breaking drought in 1980. The harvest of this year has been hit by poor weather which has caused much damage to the yield and the grade of the crops grown in our province. The dangerous forest fire problems that faced this province were a drain on the administration, fighting them. But Mr. Speaker, even though all of this, which this government and this province have met head on, I am pleased and proud to be speaking in this House on the Throne Speech which conveys optimism and confidence in the people of this province and the economic future of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this government and the people of Manitoba can look at many developments of the past three years, reassured that the policies of this government are effective.

Manitoba's mining industry was being seriously threatened by uncertainty under the former government, policies which resulted in declining exploration and development. This government recognized the need for a healthier atmosphere for industry in this province. The reduction of resource at taxation has had a direct influence on the recovery of mining exploration. Development of the proposed potash mine at St. Lazare will result in more than 500 million being spent in Manitoba over five years and the creation of over 400 permanent jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of development that will inject stability into our economy, creating new employment. In the past three years, economic growth within the private sector has provided 30,000 new jobs for Manitobans. This compares with 10,000 jobs in the last three years of the former administration. Still more important, only 2,000 jobs of the 30,000 created were in public administration, while in the period from 1975 to 1977, 7,000 jobs of the 10,000 created were drawing tax supported wages.

Mr. Speaker, hydro development will be a major component of strengthening economy in Manitoba's future. Proper management of this corporation, which has been returned to financial stability will be vital to its success. Construction agreements for the western power grid will ensure that the development on the Nelson River will resume once new markets for the electricity are confirmed. Broadened markets

for hydro-electric power will boost Manitoba's economy through exchange of resources with other regions and local benefits such as job creation.

Mr. Speaker, as part of a continued support for a diversified agricultural industry, it is pleasing to note that a 40 million rapeseed crushing plant will be constructed at Harrowby in the northwestern part of Manitoba. This project . . .

**A MEMBER:** Is that near Binscarth?

**MR. HYDE:** Yes, it's in the area of Binscarth. This project will not only provide jobs in the short term but will have a positive effect on agricultural marketing in oil seeds. Government measures promote export markets, and domestic markets can only help the industry.

The economic squeeze has had a direct effect on young farmers and I am pleased that the government recognizes the need to reassess credit policies as time changes, referring of course to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The 40 million emergency drought program to be, in my opinion, the salvation needed to maintain the production of the large dairy herds within our province and for the most part has maintained the basic beef herds that are so vital to our agricultural economy. Continued support for research and crop processing developments as well as amendments to The Farmlands Protection Act will receive my support in this session. This government will continue to recognize the importance of agriculture to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that our government is ready to continue the program of replacing older nursing homes and new construction in the hospital field where it is felt is needed.

I was most pleased to hear of the plans to construct a recreational facility at the Manitoba School For Retardates in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba's economy is recovering from the ill-fated ventures under the former government; mismanagement where millions of dollars were wasted on government-run businesses and costly make-work programs. We have turned the tide, Mr. Speaker, through efforts such as providing a competitive tax structure in Manitoba which has improved the economic atmosphere. We could also restore faith in Manitoba. With a government under good management, we can lead Manitoba through steady and positive progress as a contributing part of Canada. We must continue to take a strong stand against the new Constitution that would badly weaken provincial powers and effectively destroy the federalism upon which our country is being built.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, it is peculiar that members opposite are doing their very best to pick various leaders. Obviously they are very concerned about the leader we have and the leadership will show, and I can assure them, that we don't have any problems such as they seem to have in the question of the leadership of our party.

Mr. Speaker, let me join others in welcoming you back. You and I have not always agreed on your

rulings and I expect we won't in the future, but I hope we can continue on the basis we have in the past to exchange opinions and learn to get along, which is something that I find more and more difficult as between politicians in the various provinces of Canada, in the federal government and in this House itself.

I want to spend a moment dealing with the question of the Constitution. I want to recall that there was a promise made that there would be a committee of this House established to deal with the proposals of the federal government relating to the Constitution. I want to recall to you the efforts from this side to have that group meet and meet quickly in order to discuss what is a vital matter for Canadians and the stalling by the present government in establishing the committee and in having it discuss issues.

I want to recall to you, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Attorney-General, I believe, who made it clear, I believe, that the committee, at least his side, the Conservative side, was not prepared to listen to the question of entrenchment or be influenced by it. I believe that statement was made although I would have to go back to the records of his challenge. But, Mr. Speaker, it shows an attitude which I think is not healthy from the standpoint of the interests of Manitobans and of Canadians.

I want to recall to you that an action was commenced by this province before the committee got very far into its work and it has thrown the matter into court in a way which I think is not helpful at all. I don't quite understand how they appealed to the courts to consider the fact that the federal government wants to turn over to the courts certain issues for debate and review. That talk about contradictions, that is one which which was self apparent. What bothers me most, Mr. Speaker, is the intransigence of the people involved. I think that Mr. Trudeau and his government are behaving very badly; are behaving in a way contrary to the interests of Canadians; are behaving in a precipitous manner which I think is damaging and which makes it very difficult to carry on an intelligent discussion about the issues.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province, I believe, has shown a similar lack of concern on behalf of the people he represents; has taken the same intransigent attitude, a refusal to debate or discuss but rather a posture which he has taken which is not in the interests of Manitobans and not in the interest of Canadians. Posturing about I am a Canadian first, a Manitoban second, is nothing but posturing for many of the people who speak about the matters relating to the Constitution of Canada. And I accuse them both, the leader of the government of Canada, and the leader of the government of Manitoba, of a failure to recognize the importance of the democratic method of arriving at decisions; of discussing matters, of attempting to reconcile differences; of attempting to make something out of what now exists, or what often exists and that is a complete adversary position.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province has supported Lougheed, has supported Lougheed to the extent where I believe he is prepared to give away the rights of Canadians, and Manitobans are Canadians, in the interests of some dogmatic

approach he has to the needs of Alberta. One of the speakers from the Conservative side today said something to the effect that the interests of Manitoba's economy are the interests of Alberta, and I may have misquoted the word, but he tied Manitoba's future to that of Alberta. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the interests of Canada are closely tied to the resources and economy of Alberta, and I for one do not recognize that one supports Alberta as against the interests of Canadians.

I picked out of the newspaper today a report which is headed, "Lougheed Warns Ottawa of Separatist Potential." But the words he used, Mr. Speaker, are rather important. The first paragraph reads, and I quote, "Separatist feelings in Alberta could go "out of control" within several months if the resource dispute with Ottawa isn't settled to the province's satisfaction, says Alberta Premier, Peter Lougheed." If ever I saw a threat, that is one. If the province is not satisfied, then separatist feelings in Alberta could go out of control within several months. And he says, now this was not a direct quote from his speech but now I come to a direct quote, "but if we continue in this province to feel that we are being treated unfairly and unjustly, those frustrations are going to grow and I am not sure whether or not it's going to be possible for us to control it."

Mr. Speaker, I believe sincerely that Mr. Lougheed has not the slightest desire to control these feelings of separatism but is working on them and capitalizing on them to carry out his objective. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province and his cohorts are fallen into that position with Mr. Lougheed and are talking about separatism and giving lip service to the interests of Canada itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to listen, I think it is important to discuss, and I think it is important to negotiate. I think there is a foolhardy attitude on both sides. Mr. Speaker, anybody who says that the New Democratic Party is supporting Trudeau, doesn't know what he is talking about because it is clear that we are dissatisfied with the way Trudeau is handling it.

Mr. Speaker, when it came to the question of the Constitution, back on June 10th of this year the leader of the Conservative Party, the Premier, came in with a statement dealing on the developments in Ottawa dealing with the continuing committee of Ministers, and at that time I had occasion to say, and I quote from page 4581, "that we would like to see an open mind in approach to all the issues referred to in the report itself on a charter," it says charge but it means a charter, "of rights, reduction, regional disparities, resource ownership and offshore interests." And I mentioned then as is apparent to anybody who knows recent history of Manitoba, that we already have entrenchment of language rights in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I made the point that yesterday in Committee of Supply on Finance, that would have been on June the 9th estimates, it became very clear that the ability of the federal government to be able to support equalization grants which are necessary for a reduction in regional disparities and a proper sharing of the natural resources of Canada by all Canadians, makes it necessary that the Premiers

who are so insistent on protecting their own provincial parochial rights to the natural resources, should be eased by the fact that excess profits or windfall profits should naturally fall into the hands of the federal government so as to make possible a greater equalization of opportunity for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, we find the talk about speaking out of two sides of the mouth as the Minister of Consumer Affairs liked to say, we find the Conservative government of Manitoba complaining bitterly that the Liberal government of Canada is attempting to withdraw support, or funding, for joint programming and by the same token we find the same government of Manitoba supporting the Lougheed position which would deny to the Canadian government those resource revenues which are essential for them to be able to maintain a proper interest and a proper participation and joint programming in the province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that unless we care about the interests of equalization, we care about those provinces that do not have wealth, unless we care about how they will be able to sustain themselves, we will fall into the trap of supporting one province against another, one interest against another; and talk about Balkanization, that is the exact thing that our government is working towards.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the speculation about an election in Manitoba, and in recent months, was such that I felt we were not facing an election. I felt that the Premier of this province was relying strongly on his belief that the federal budget would create a tax on the export of Hydro power and he said, this is the issue on which I will go to the people; and I believe that when he found that that was not promised, he lost the issue which he felt he needed. I think that he tried to say that on the question of the constitution, his fight with Trudeau would be such that would justify an election to go to the people, and, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are not so concerned about the constitution and about the quarrel relating to entrenchment of rights as they are to the question of the economic affairs of the province, and that, Mr. Speaker, is where I felt the Premier of this province was so weak: that he dare not go to the people. I did not expect an election.

Mr. Speaker, I still don't expect an election but I am not puzzled but amused by the way today, the first day in which we are discussing the Throne Speech, we find the Conservatives rallying to speak on that first day. Last year, I think it was the Minister for Public Works who adjourned debate after — I think it was last year — he adjourned debate after the Leader of the Opposition — no, I'm told not, apparently not.

Mr. Speaker, what interests me — oh, he spoke last time, that was it. What interests me is that the speeches were all ready set to go. That makes me think maybe they are getting ready for an election, maybe they are rehearsing. Because, Mr. Speaker, talk about rehearsing, they talk about the speech writers; it is the same speech that is spread right across all the ranks of the Conservatives and they are each making the same speech again and again with a few matters that they are able to talk about, mostly hope and mostly expectation and very little foundation, as the entire Throne Speech is, very little concrete about what we are doing or what is already

on the table. Instead of that, it is an expectation of what we may yet be able to negotiate; we might yet be able to bring in; we may yet be able to do for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we are finding statements such as the Minister for Consumer Affairs made today, that the idea of the New Democratic Party is that building houses and building Hydro is job creation. That's not his idea apparently. Building houses is not job creation. Building Hydro is not job creation. They go further, and the last speaker mentioned something about the civil servants. The Conservative Party seems to believe that a civil servant does not make any contribution to the growth and to the productivity of this province. I think they believe that, Mr. Speaker, and I think that they are throwing back against the civil servants who are delivering programs, and have been for the last three years, programs of government to assist and benefit the people of Manitoba are not useful people, they keep wanting to cut down on the civil servants, they keep wanting to lower the respect which the civil servants, in my opinion, definitely deserve.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. I wonder if the Member for Elmwood was reading a newspaper, I believe the rules . . .

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'm not reading a newspaper, I'm cutting one up.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer Affairs spoke about the idea that wealth of this country is not created by governments, no, he says, it is created by the extraction, the harvesting, the processing of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, when did he wake up to that fact? The fact that that is how the wealth of a country is created is well known to all, but who benefits from that is not so well known by many. And as far as the Conservatives are concerned, they think that anybody who comes in and pays someone to extract and pays someone to harvest and pays somebody to process is therefore building the wealth; and I say no, Mr. Speaker, it is the people who are doing the work, it is the people who are the extractors, the harvesters and the processors who should be deriving the benefit from the growth of the wealth of this country. And it is the Conservatives in their misguided view on how a country grows and develops its wealth that are prepared to junk the concept that the people who do the extraction and the people who do make it grow are the people who should have the benefit of it, and I think that the natural resources which belong to Manitoba should be used to benefit the people of Manitoba.

That is not the attitude of the Conservative government, a government that is talking now about deals, they are not yet telling us what deals they are about to make and will not tell us until they sign the agreement, and I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that we'll get more information out of that Conservative government than we did out of the similar government of 1966 to '69 when we were trying to learn what they were doing with the resources of Manitoba and with the money of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I've already made the statement publicly and in my constituency that I do not propose

to stand for re-election. But I have, to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am looking forward to the continuing work we have to do until the end of this electoral period; because Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward that when I leave this Legislature, that that will be the same day that the Conservative government leaves this Legislature, so we may both walk out at the same time. I will work to that effort. And I am being helped considerably Mr. Speaker, by the dismal showing of this government in the last three years.

In 1977 we heard campaigns about mismanagement, about the promise that they would cut the fat, they would balance the budget and they would not reduce programs, and in doing so they misrepresented the NDP programs and policies — and are continuing to do so, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think they're being believed like they were then — but they are continuing to do so, they are still relying on some Chinese food to carry them through the next number of years and it won't happen, Mr. Speaker, but let them keep talking —(Interjection)— Oh, Russian generators, Mr. Speaker. We who are dependent on the sale of our grain to a large extent to the behind the Iron Curtain countries who invited people of the industry of the entire world to make bids, to quote for work to be done in Manitoba and who accepted the lowest tender are now being told that this is an ideological development. The stupidity of it is that some members opposite really believe it and the falsehood of it is that many don't believe it and say so anyway. And that's what's happening, Mr. Speaker. They will repeat and constantly repeat what they know in their own hearts is not true because of their political advantage, and I think that's a disgrace which several members, and I think the Minister for Corrections, who is making the biggest and loudest noise at the moment, has the intelligence to know that when you get the lowest bid, you deal with the lowest bid if your engineers say so, and Mr. Speaker, he is an engineer and he should know that engineers normally expect to be respected. I expect he will be making a speech when he is standing on his feet rather than sitting on his rear but so far he is doing nothing but sitting on his rear.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Conservative Party which

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** . . . with its appeal to prejudice and bigotry, Mr. Speaker, has gone to the people to ask for their support, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they have been found out. I believe they have, I may be wrong. But here is a party which fought Autopac and now embraces it. Why? The Minister for Public Works, the Minister for Agriculture, have been out saying, look at Autopac, look how great it is. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they're the ones who fought it. They're the ones who attacked it.

When it comes to Medicare, Mr. Speaker, there are not many people in this House now who were here in 1968-69 to watch the Conservatives clearly reject the principle of Medicare, to watch the Minister of Health introduce Medicare, indicating clearly that he was opposed to it but couldn't, didn't dare, not to accept it; to see the then Premier threaten to sue the federal government for imposing

Medicare and here they embrace it to such an extent, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to have a pamphlet here, issued in the name of the Minister of Education, MLA for Gimli — I must say, Mr. Speaker, it was given to me by a gentleman who lives in Stonewall who says he wonders how come this pamphlet was delivered in Stonewall which he said was not part of the Gimli constituency. Nevertheless, he said it was delivered to him, and that may well be because of internal problems in the Conservative Party. But let me read what they say, Mr. Speaker, in this pamphlet. Justice Hall described our Medicare program, compared to world standards as, "one of the very best health services". Manitobans have many reasons to take pride in the health services provided by their government. Mr. Speaker, what about that double faced discussion. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, there you are, the Minister for Public Works, in his lack of knowledge — but that's not so. The Minister of Public Works is one of the cleverest people on his side. He knows very well that when the truth is embarrassing, you scream louder and you blind yourself to other things that are said.

Mr. Speaker, he did not hear me say that the Minister of Health, who sat in the seat he's sitting in, in 1969, the Premier of the province then, Walter Weir, fought Medicare all the way, and took it in only because they were forced to and knew that the people would not accept a rejection of it, and that's what happened. And now they say, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is one of the provinces in Canada that provides both premium free Medicare and premium free hospitalization.

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, the reaction when we introduced it? Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister for Economic Affairs when he was on this side complained bitterly when I talked about the greatest shift that had taken place in Manitoba when we transferred from the people who were premium paying people, on a flat rated premium, the moneys to the people in the higher income brackets by income tax, I said that was the greatest shift, and he said he would hear it forever, he assumed when I would be a man leaning on a cane and saying it, and I say it now. And I say it's funny that the Conservatives are now using that as part of their propanganda.

But Mr. Speaker, we have other examples. We have examples of the present Minister of Finance, who said back in 1976 that they would wash out the property tax credit plan; why he said, as soon as we can straighten out the foundation program, and maybe take more than a year, but we will wash it out — and I quote now, Page 3260 of May 3, 1976, and I quote, "Let me tell you right now it would be our prime objective to get rid of this sort of an inefficient program. Now if you say will we wash it out, I say how many years do you give us, because right now you're up to 77 million. How fast can you absorb 77 million into a grant structure?" I'm still quoting, Mr. Speaker. "If the foundation program can be repaired in one year to the point where we can again establish an equitable school finance program, I assume we would do it in one year." I end quote, Mr. Speaker. This is the Minister who this last year, for the year ending March 31, 1981, estimated an expenditure of the property tax program and the cost of living tax



program of 156 million, and he said when it was 77 million, do you expect us to do it all at once? We'll straighten out the foundation program.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you that the Minister of Education said that by December 31st of this year, we would have the program of the Conservative government on school financing before us, it would be distributed before the end of this year. I don't believe that will happen; but when it does, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that good or bad, it will not impinge on the cost of living and the property tax credit program. I promise you, Mr. Speaker, that it will not disappear. It will not be washed out as he said it would and it is another inconsistency on the part of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but comment that I happen to have a newspaper clipping before me that said, before the election of '77, how Mr. Lyon, the Leader of the Opposition, was talking about the per capita public debt of the province. On August 20, 1977, he said it's 3,417 and when we said to him, what about all the assets that back it up, he thundered, gross public debt is a debt. And if only for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I say to him and to his cohorts, the gross public debt, as at September 30, 1980, according to the interim statements published, is 4,377.00. Mr. Speaker, I know very well that there are assets behind it to back it up and justify it but the Conservatives are the ones who went to the people of Manitoba and denied that, the Conservatives said, how can you bear that burden of 3,417 per capita gross debt and now, from 3,400, it's 4,377, a substantial increase.

And if it were Hydro, the Conservative government brought in a phony bit of legislation in order to freeze hydro rates when there was clearly no justification, evidence today, nor then, that there was a need to freeze it, because the investment in hydro generation of power is such as is producing substantial profits to the Manitoba Hydro, to the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there are cries, there are cries, but they are cries. And they are not crocodile tears, they're actual tears on the part of the Conservatives because of their failure, their mismanagement, the mess that they have shown in the last three years and they feel bad about it.

Mr. Speaker, four months after the 1977 election, the Premier of the province said, we have to buckle down to control government waste and spending to create the jobs and income opportunities our young people have a right to expect, and to make sure that those who need our help receive it as quickly and generously as possible. Mr. Speaker, they can talk all they like about job generation, they can talk all they like about the way the economy is going, tell it to the Marines, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Manitoba know what's going on.

The Minister for Consumer Affairs can talk all he likes about bankruptcies then and bankruptcies now. The people of Manitoba today know they are suffering in the economy of Manitoba as it is today created by the . . . Mr. Speaker, I have a cartoon here —(Interjection)— I think we'll get you a hearing aid.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. I recognize the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I quote from a cartoon showing a couple of gentlemen sitting at a conference, and one says, we've got to give the appearance of changing direction without giving the appearance of changing principles in a way that won't be dismissed as cosmetic.

We are getting this cosmetics all the time but they're trying so hard to make it appear different. They are the government which impose tax cuts in the high income levels, and impose user fees in the lower income level. They've reduced programs, they have damaged the economy and put Manitoba — oh, we heard all about the poor unfortunate things that have been happening all over North America, and much of them are true. But they put Manitoba in a worse position in relation to Canada than Manitoba has been in relation to Canada throughout the previous ten years of the administration. And maybe since Confederation. That's a point to stress. We know interest rates have gone up and are not the fault of the government of Manitoba, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the economy has suffered and suffered worse than it has on the average, in the place where Manitoba was in Canada, than it is now. They have made it worse. For that, they are responsible, Mr. Speaker, and will be held responsible.

I have another little cartoon here. It shows several gentlemen talking to a man sitting behind a desk and they are saying, I'm terribly sorry, sir, but in the process of cutting out programs for the poor, we inadvertently cut out a program for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you some relevance to this. They cut out programs and they have reduced taxation, at the same time hurt the economy. What they didn't realize, that by cutting the taxes that they promised to cut in the higher income brackets, they promised it, they honoured that commitment in 1977; concurrently, Mr. Speaker, they damaged the economy to the extent that the people whose taxes they cut in '77 would not now be able to pay those taxes because they are suffering too. The small businessmen, the people who would have been paying those taxes, cannot pay them today because the economy was damaged by this government, and that is where I'm saying that they intended to hurt one group but they have hurt the other group. And now, Mr. Speaker, what are they doing? They are working for the economy. The Member for Crescentwood who spoke today talked about Alcan and he said what can we expect from the other side, environmentalists will try and make trouble for that program. Does he mean that the environmentalists shouldn't care about what will happen in the advancement of the economy and in the way the Conservatives will want to do it, that he's already saying, don't let the environmentalists stop what we are about to do with Alcan. That's what he said today and that to me was a shock.

Mr. Speaker, now we have the government monitoring interest. What do they mean, Mr. Speaker? Are they going to tell us? Because I have to tell them in case they don't know it, prime rate now is 17 percent. Is that a matter for concern? Are you going to monitor it when it goes to 18 and will you monitor it when it goes to 19? Because if what you are going to do is monitor it, then, Mr. Speaker, we will tell you, as the prime rate goes up and down,

we will tell you what it is, if that's what the effect of monitoring is.

Mr. Speaker, I think they put it in that Throne Speech because they felt they had to acknowledge the fact that it was a problem. What they would do about it is another story all together, and clearly what they are going to do is to monitor. What amuses, Mr. Speaker, is that even Fred Cleverley points out that the Government of Manitoba and its Leader should stop talking in the form of rhetoric, stop talking about the past and start talking about the future.

The Minister for Economic Affairs is appealing for help. He is saying to me, what would you do. Let me tell the Minister for Economic Affairs, that we have every wish to give him advice if he would only open his ears and listen; but he is so dogmatic in his approach, there is nothing we can tell him that he won't reject with the standard words that are used, you know, all those red boogy words, all those continuous repetitive, almost nauseating approaches that Conservatives use when they talk about the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Economic Affairs to admit that he is listening, is an admission that we should record because it is not often that he will listen. And now that he will listen I want to tell him that I read the Throne Speech and I listened to it. I want to tell the Minister for Economic Affairs that when he has a right to ask me questions, I will answer him, but when he has no right to speak from his seat, I will do as I please with my speech, not as he pleases.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Economic Affairs has been here long enough to know that we have things to say and tell him, but that he will not decide when we tell him. If he will listen, he will hear. But I want to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that in reading the Throne Speech we heard about the pestilences; we heard about the flood; we heard about the drought; we heard about the fires in the province of Manitoba. The one pestilence that is not referred to specifically in the speech, but that we know about, is the Progressive Conservative government on the province of Manitoba. That's the fourth pestilence that should have been named and wasn't.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am looking forward to continuing these debates. I do hope that we will have that opportunity because I really don't want to fight an election in January, but if so, by all means let's do so, but I think that the more opportunity we have to debate, the more we will see the desperation on the part of Progressive Conservatives who are finding it easier to attack personalities, to try to downgrade our leader, to do anything they can to divert us from telling them what it is they are doing wrong and from telling the people of Manitoba.

We have the Minister for Corrections, who has interrupted, I'll bet it was a dozen times in this speech, who is enjoying so much the opportunity to . . . and he is the one who attacked our Leader, and he is the one who has downgraded personalities, not the worst by any means. He is one of the more fair-minded of that group, but his colleagues have been doing that and I say they are doing it out of a sense of desperation, Mr. Speaker. I really shouldn't be

saying this, Mr. Speaker. Why should I be pointing out to them their weaknesses; so that they might correct them? Maybe I should tell the Member for River Heights, maybe it is my naive approach to democracy and to the role of the opposition that we continue to assist you even when you don't listen or even when you don't care.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to my original statement dealing with my decision not to run again in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to be in public life for about 30 years. I have enjoyed most of it, I can't say I have enjoyed all of it; but I have been given the opportunity to serve at the schoolboard level, at the rural council level, at the city council level, metro council and in this Legislature; and, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I believe that the work on the opposition is equally important as the work on the government side; certainly more important than the work on the government backbench where you are frustrated to a large extent. But I am happy that I was given the opportunity to serve not only in the backbench of government but also in the Cabinet of government, and that is an opportunity that is not granted to many in Manitoba. To be able to bring into effect certain principles, certain policies that you espouse for a number of years, is a satisfying and gratifying opportunity and one which I do not attribute and grant to New Democrats alone, but to every person who offers his services in the public interest and gets the opportunity to give of himself to the extent he can. I am grateful that I had that opportunity.

I am also grateful, Mr. Speaker, that throughout all that time, I was chosen to represent the New Democratic Party or its predecessor, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. I am proud that throughout all the time I served under party leaders whom I could respect and did respect. I served in this Legislature under Russ Paulley and Ed Schreyer and Howard Pawley, and I am very happy that I have had the opportunity to work with them and to know, Mr. Speaker, that in all cases their leadership was one of consultation and co-operation, and to know at all times that every member of the caucus had an opportunity to express a point of view and to discuss it. I don't know how that works in other caucuses. All I know is that that's the way it worked in our caucus and that's why I for one, have been very proud to be able to work with those leaders and with the present leader, who merits and has the support of every member of our caucus. Let that be clear. That no matter how much dissention, no matter how much the desperate Conservatives are trying to create some kind of a chink, they are doing nothing but solidifying it, and for that I have to thank them.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that now that I am intending to leave, along with the Conservative government, this Legislature, that I will continue to have an opportunity to work with the New Democratic Party and I hope with the government it will form in the next election. I feel that it is something that I will be able to continue to do as a worker, as a person in the background and not necessarily one that has to speak here. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is some feeling of satisfaction to know that there are some people in this Chamber whom I will not have to debate with in the future; not

that debating bothers me, it's looking at them and listening to them, that sometimes I find hurtful. I have to say that, Mr. Speaker, because I have made many friends on the political arena on all sides of the House — many friends, Mr. Speaker, and I have also made a few enemies — and I believe that the enemies I have made, I have made in spite of the fact that we are all supposed to be here working in the common interest and I am sorry that it happened but to the extent it happened, I don't regret the fact that whilst it was happening I was fighting for what I believed to be important on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

I have also made friends amongst civil servants and that has been important to me and generally I feel that I have fulfilled a great part of my life in the arena of politics and in spite of pains and heartaches that have occurred in the past, I would certainly encourage others to enter into the field of politics and participate in it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again it is my privilege to have the opportunity of congratulating you as again acting as the Speaker of the House. In the years that you have served, we have found you to be very fair on both sides of the House.

I listened with interest to the speakers from both sides this afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition of course had the major role to play today and it seemed that as he went further and further along with his speech, that he seemed to lack the confidence or he lacked the conviction that normally a Leader of the Opposition does display. He spoke for an hour and a half and we listened on the most part very attentively and to me it appeared to be a very negative approach to just about everything he spoke about. As a man that was in opposition or a government that was in opposition, proposing to form a government in the province of Manitoba, I would have expected that he would have stuck his chin out a little bit and said well look, this is what we are going to do if we become government. But you had to go away with the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't feel that he ever was going to become government. We on this side are firmly convinced that he definitely never will be.

I want to also congratulate the Member for Minnedosa and the Member from Springfield, mover and seconder of the speech. They did a fine job. And for the previous speaker, the Member for St. Johns, to say all the speeches are the same, there must be one speech writer. I can assure him that we all struggle through getting a speech ready. We don't have speech writers, but we only have one Throne Speech, and we know what's in it. We are very proud of what's in it, we can't all approach it in a different manner or different fashion, but we do make an attempt to put our views across as to how we feel the speech affects our constituencies, how it's going to affect the people of Manitoba, and this basically is what we are interested in.

The Member for Pembina this afternoon gave a very good speech, I would say possibly one of the best speeches he has given in the House. In his

modesty he forgot to mention his highway program so as we go along through the course of the session we will be jarring his memory and reminding him of some of the things that we would like to see happen in our particular constituencies and also across the province.

There is one topic known as the health and highway. He is quite familiar with it. And I'm sure that it possibly will not be a four laner within the foreseeable future, but there will be some efforts made to improve the situation there.

The Premier has taken a stand in the Constitution. I am not going to delve into that at great length because it will be mentioned by more competent people along this line than what possibly I am, but you do have to say that he has shown leadership. There is more than one province involved in contesting what the federal government are approaching to do and the fact that our Premier has been chosen as a leader to contest this in the courts, I think shows the respect in which he is held by the people of Canada and by the people of Manitoba.

As an individual I would have to say, and I think that most of my constituents would agree, that the Constitution should come back to Canada, but it should come back in its normal state without an amendment in the British Parliament, and I don't think anyone has any argument about that. But, I do feel that we have a federal government which is grasping for straws. Over a ten year period they have run up a deficit of 120 billion. We are on the skids financially right across the board in the federal system. I think possibly it is a bit of a red herring to say, well, hopefully something will go right, maybe the American economy will pick up, things will start going better, we can get back on track, but they're definitely not making any efforts in economic recovery.

You can take a look at the Throne Speech, what the business activities projected for this province are. In all the years that I have been in this House, I have yet to see a Throne Speech that delivered such a concise approach to what the economic development of the province can and probably will be. Certainly there isn't as much — the front page of the paper, I guess our good friends in the Free Press, they are getting it today because they are the only paper I guess left in the province, but the general consensus was that it was a, you know, if and maybe sort of a speech.

Let's just take a look at them. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, Granges, Trout Lake, International Minerals and Chemical, which is potash, projection of 500 million over five years, 400 jobs. You can go to ManFor Forest Products expansion, another major projection in the north; an oil processing at Harrowby, 38 million involved there; gasohol at Minnedosa, and this is something that was brought up again today by one of the speakers, that the plant had laid idle for many years under our great and glorious friends across the way, was reactivated under the existing government. Why was it? Probably wasn't because there were any more opportunities, the fact was that there was a tax concession given by our government and it is the only gasohol plant in Canada and it definitely is going to be a benefit to the town of Neepawa and to the peoples in the surrounding areas. I understand that there will be

approximately a million bushels of barley involved in the development and the processing of making ethanol.

Aluminum Company of Canada; now even our friends across the way can't criticize this. They say normally if we're going to do anything well the state should be involved, we're giving away our resources, etc., etc., etc., so what happens when all of a sudden there's a product that is partially processed comes in, the facilities are set up to further process it, jobs are created, the capital expenditures are made, employment provided, and our friends really can't criticize that. What really can they say about that? Well, we're not putting a bunch of taxpayers' money in it, it is going to possibly involve, if this happens to come to pass, which I expect it will, will involve the expenditures that will require, at least, probably one hydro generating station, for this one plant alone.

And you can go back through the businesses I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, Simplot Chemical, and this is another development, 38 million. Even if only one-third of these projects come to pass, Mr. Speaker, they will do more to develop a sound economy in the province of Manitoba than our friends in the Socialist government did in eight years.

And, Mr. Speaker, we're not leading with our chins, we're not taking taxpayers' dollars to throw into crazy ventures that our friends have done for so many years, these are particular businesses, Mr. Speaker, that have developed over the years, they've developed for one reason only, or more than one reason, they had confidence in the government of Manitoba, they knew that we had hydro power that would make their industries go, they hoped that there would be an adequate supply of skilled labour, which there is not going to be, and which will be coming back into the province very shortly I expect. So these are a few of the things, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at. And I don't blame them for hanging their heads, because when they start to come to pass, which they will within the next one year to 18 months, they'll have their heads below the desk. That is why the Leader of the Opposition today didn't have his heart in his speech. He started to wilt. Mr. Speaker, he started to wilt the other day on the third page, as someone said, of the Speech from the Throne and he's never got it up yet. And it will be a long time before it does come up.

**A MEMBER:** You've got them listening now, James.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, I am being unfairly coached by my colleagues along a line that I certainly have no intention of entering into. Once bitten, twice shy as the statement goes, and I think I will follow that. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the Christmas season and you can feel in the House the feeling of goodwill that is generating on both sides.

But getting back to hydro development, Mr. Speaker. We have, as I have quoted before, we do have the industries that are coming on stream, our government has held back when they could have rushed in and started developments, but as again, we are 40 percent overbuilt, we had to wait until such time as we do have places to put the hydro, markets, we hope that we'll be able to go ahead with at least one of the projects in the very near future.

The power grid, of course, is another thing that is under discussion and the Member for Winnipeg

Centre today said, yes, the power grid, but it's got to go through Saskatchewan. I wonder just what prompted him to make that statement. It wouldn't possibly be that he knows something that we don't know. Like we know there wouldn't be collusion between the leaders of the opposition or the socialist party here and in Saskatchewan to say, well, let's hold this off for 15 months because we really don't want to see too much happening in Manitoba. Mind you, I wouldn't say that they would do it but the thought would have to cross your mind, knowing our friends.

Something that hasn't really been mentioned today, and I'm going to mention again, it's one of the things that is going to be foremost in the thoughts of many of these people that are going to set up industries here, is the freezing of our hydro rates in Manitoba, and I guess possibly two years of that particular time gone by, could be wrong on that so I won't say, but in any event it was five years. We have to look at what is happening to our oil prices; 1980, they're what? — 16.50; 1990 they're estimating they'll be 62.50 a barrell, I'm talking about barrels. This is quite a major increase so people are going to have to look at the development of other sources of energy and consequently hydro will certainly be one.

Another thing there's been a great deal of talk about is the out-migration, and I'd like to read a statement, this is from the Minister of Labour. It's a survey of 1978, and the surveys indicate that 90 percent of Manitoba's college graduates and 84 percent of university graduates remained to work in this province. Manitoba ranked among the top three and four of the eight provinces surveyed, for employed graduates who stayed to work in their native province. The 1980 Manitoba survey revealed that 88 percent of all provincial community college graduates were employed one year after graduation.

Mr. Speaker, to me this wouldn't appear that everyone is rushing out of the province. — (Interjection)— Someone says the percentage that isn't here is in Alberta. That may well be; but if you talk to any of the young people who have been going to Alberta, I have, the cost of living there is so exorbitant that many of them will be coming back to Manitoba, and many have come back to Manitoba. So we'll see what the statistics are a year from now, or 15 months from now, and there'll be some more red faces on the other side of the House.

Job creation, we're not going to go through that again. It's been quoted several times today, 4,000 to 10,000 jobs, etc., etc., etc. The Leader of the Opposition today went to great pains to point out that the people that were going out of business in the province — he mentioned Neepawa Food Processors twice. I'd like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, very shortly after I came into politics the Neepawa Salt Well closed down. Many of the employees went to Esterhazy. Very shortly after that Edson Trailer closed up, they went to Rivers. Neither one of those plants went bankrupt but the place that they were operating, it wasn't feasible. They had a better opportunity to go somewhere else, which they did. I didn't hear one person over there stand up and say, what are we going to do? Are we going to go and buy Neepawa Salt Well? Are we going to buy Edson Trailers and make them stay?

Like fun you did. You didn't give a damn, not one little bit, did you? —(Interjection)

Certainly, there was no one more disappointed in the fact that there were 40 jobs lost in the town of Neepawa. But we're certainly not going to go rushing in to buy an enterprise that is losing money. If a company as big as the company involved cannot see their way clear to stay in the business, then unfortunately it will have to go along the same lines as some of the rest. Some of the people will be employable in Neepawa, some will not be, they will have to seek jobs elsewhere.

The main segment of the operation, which is the boiler barns, ran into difficulties, to a degree, I'll buy that, because of boiler quotas, but that was only a very minor degree that was overcome. They've run into problems through health of animals, etc., etc., etc., in their processing plant. I'd like to point out that there was 420,000 put into upgrading that particular eviscerating plant, not too many years ago. No company is going to put that kind of money into an operation and then pull out if they don't feel that they are sustaining very heavy losses.

There is an arrangement under way, as I understand it, to take over the operation on a free enterprise basis, which it was held by before, but these people also will be taking a long hard look at all segments of it, whether or not they can make both ends of it work I don't know and the deal hasn't been made, as I understand, it is fairly close to fruition. Anyway, that's enough about that particular industry.

But I would like to point out that our good friends — when a job goes bankrupt or a business goes bankrupt it's a little bit different, when a business is transferred its assets are transferred, etc., and its place of operation — the old story still is that someone has to make a buck and everyone can't have government grants and government subsidies and government involvement to keep them floating when the thing isn't going.

I'd like to talk about agriculture for a few minutes. We're not crying that hard, but the last couple of years certainly haven't been bad years for agriculture. I've been involved in the business for quite a few years and I'd have to say that this year was the closest thing to a crop failure that we've ever had and be that as it may, that's part of the game. It's a very high risk and a high gamble and if things don't work out properly that's the way the ball bounces.

I would also like to point out that our government didn't sit on its hands. It's the first time in my lifetime, Mr. Speaker, that I've ever seen a crop that was completely finished in many instances by the 1st of July. This particular year it was and as the indications were there was no hay crop or anything else. Our dairy industry, which would have to be the Number One that was going to get hit first, we did organize very quickly. We started bringing pellets in from Thunder Bay. We had fires down in Ontario, where there was a very good hay crop. We moved to start moving that hay without any assistance again from our federal friends who sat on their hands as long as they could, then came in with a lukewarm program; then they came in a little later on with a Herd Maintenance Program and they laid the rules out, then they changed the rules, then they've

amended the rules again and by the time they get through, the latest thing I hear today is that they are going to change the rules again but they're going to set up a Court of Appeal, so anyone that doesn't get anything can go and appeal. Well, this will be good under the usual Liberal method of operation whereby there'll be another 10 people who will get jobs and they'll go around and sit and listen and it will be a great and glorious game, as I say in the usual Liberal manner or tradition.

I would say that probably our most successful program was the Green Feed program. Here we had approximately 10,000 applicants and the pay out basically will be in the area, I would expect, of maybe 10 million. I wouldn't want to be quoted on that too firmly, Mr. Speaker, but that will be roughly in that neighbourhood. We did introduce a . . . Program, whereby the budget shows 41 million dollars. I'd expect that some of that will not be used. But in any event, the action was taken, the programs were laid down and the thing was brought into play.

A great to-do is always made about our friends across the way about their social programs, what they've done for people; they did one thing for people in the eight years they were in government, Mr. Speaker, they developed a few tiers of people that they encouraged never to go to work; they might have been the healthiest people in the province but don't go to work, we'll put a social worker there, we'll look after you and you don't ever have to go to work again. We need your vote and we'll look after you and oh, we've got a grant for this and a grant for that. When we became government in 1977 I never had so many people phoning saying, can we get a grant for that? You know, it was wonderful, it just had to be wonderful because all non-productive, but here we still have carried along with many of the programs that are still looking after the welfare of the people that are deserving. Unfortunately, we haven't done away with some of the programs that are going to people that are not deserving.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Get with it, move it.

**MR. FERGUSON:** We probably will. We are also again involved with our good federal friends. They are waffling again in their cost-sharing, and really whether or not they're going to participate in many programs that they instigated and more or less insisted on to start with, is something that has to happen.

**A. MEMBER:** Enterprise Manitoba.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Yes, Enterprise Manitoba was probably one of the best programs that has hit the province as far as the promotion of small businesses went. Certainly, it was cost-shared between the feds and the province, it worked out well and it did allow the small businesses an awful lot of good. So we'll give credit where credit is due, which some of the people across the way won't do.

Health care, education, all the programs that have gone along — there's been a great deal of increase in spending. I'll read that off later on, Mr. Speaker, the actual budget. The White Paper reforms, I'm not going to go into depth with that, there are many here that have followed these a lot closer than I, Property Tax Programs, CRISP Programs, SAFER Programs,

and these are all supposedly by an uncaring and callous government.

I'd like to just read some of the expenditures that have gone along with this. We'll start with Agriculture. In 1978-79, 23 million, 1979-80, 27 million and the printed vote in 1980-81 is 34 million; and go to Community Services and Corrections 172 million in '78, 182 in '79, 201 in 1980; go to Education, 342, 368, 399 — these are hundreds of millions of dollars; Health, 471 million, 517 million, 583 million; go to Highways and Transportation, 135 million, 140 million, 153 million; Drug Relief Program, 41 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to me that doesn't sound like a harsh and callous government throwing programs out willy-nilly that are benefiting the people of Manitoba. To me it sound like . . .

**A MEMBER:** A government that cares.

**MR. FERGUSON:** A government that cares — thank you, Mr. Minister, you're so helpful. I'm happy to see, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a continuing carrying out of the development of the personal care homes. There will be replacement of older nursing homes, etc. Education for the first time in many, many years, there is a suggestion that there will be a change in the Foundation Grant. This, of course, is the first since 1967.

I also would like to congratulate the Minister of Fitness and Sport in that over the past year there has been an expenditure of 2.5 million — this has gone into 343 community complexes, curling rinks, skating rinks, etc., and it has been very welcome. Something that has been missed in many cases in our rural recreational complexes is that the tightening up of fire regulations has necessitated the expenditure of considerable amounts of money and in many cases there are not funds available; they're having enough trouble keeping the places operating — these grants are very welcome, and this basically in many cases in my constituency is where this money is being used.

This program again will be carried on in 1981 and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the rural people and many in my constituency certainly are looking forward to the continuation of this program. It is something that is well worthwhile. As I say, we are having problems keeping our rural complexes going and this is certainly one of the things that will contribute to making it work.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is all that I have to say at the moment. I look forward to the rest of the session. I am, of course, always sorry to hear that the Member for St. Johns will not be around for another Legislature, and undoubtedly there are many that will be joining him from both sides of the House, by their own volition or otherwise, but in any case, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do the same as one of our other members did this afternoon, wish our honourable friends across the way a Happy and Healthy Christmas Season. Thank you.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. There is another member wishing to speak Mr. . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's 9:55, can I call it 10:00 o'clock or do you want me to tell an anecdote as I . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** If there's another member wishing to speak, is the member prepared to yield the floor?

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

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that this House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow.