

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

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** The Honourable Minister of Government Services has thirty minutes.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was commiserating with the honourable members opposite, particularly the Leader and the New Democratic Party as a whole prior to the supper hour adjournment about the apparent and the very obvious difficulty that they have to deal with, and they have to deal with it. We can just sit on this side and watch it. I was suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition has a most difficult task ahead of him. The other day we heard the political obituary of the Member for St. Johns, and you know, I'm not going to abuse the privilege, Mr. Speaker, and the House rules by suggesting, when I look at the row of empty benches opposite, but I have wondered where have been some of the heavy weights from the other side? For instance, where is the Member for Seven Oaks? Or where is the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that it is highly improper to comment on the absence or presence of any member of the Chamber. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I wish to inform the House that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has been in bed with the flu. He will be back on Monday.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we started this afternoon's session off with the Leader of the Opposition asking where my Minister of Finance was, who is in Ottawa on business, but of course, that's fair, Mr. Speaker, that's fair. And I accept, of course, without question, the word, and I wish the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks a speedy recovery because I'll tell you, his leader and his party is going to need him in this Chamber if they're going to mount any kind of an effective opposition to us.

Mr. Speaker, I can only let the facts speak for themselves. Inasmuch as there has been a hesitancy on the part of members opposite to really get into this debate and to really, which they keep on telling us is on the throes of the coming election, to warm up to the subject matter, the fray that's soon to come, and we see a disjointed, ununited, rather dismal effort in terms of representing the kind of official opposition that I think, by and large, and after all, some of us have spent eight years on the other side of the benches and I think that we, during those eight years, and they were some of the years that I, quite frankly would just as soon forget. But nonetheless we were there in numbers, ready to

debate, ready to take issue with the government of the day, at the drop of a hat. And I don't see that spirit emanating from the official opposition in these first few days of this Session and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to them that is going to be the calibre of opposition that Manitoba electors will see at the next election and the result of course is inevitable.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, and I don't really believe that they will confirm it. But the truth of the matter is that they have conceded the next election to us. They are obviously involved in some serious second thoughts about their own leadership and I suppose perhaps there's some jockeying taking place as to who eventually will be the leader that will have a serious possibility of becoming Premier of this province, but certainly from what we've seen today and what we've seen in the early days of this Session, it would appear, not so much, Mr. Speaker, I'm humble enough to admit by our own action, but by the lack of action on the part of the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested to you in the first few comments that the Throne Speech that we are debating will receive wide and growing support, alluded to the very evident support that the First Minister and this government is already surprising to us receiving on our constitutional position and it will be interesting to see the New Democrats as they attempt to rationalize their position, their common law relationship with the Prime Minister on this question of Constitution which is quickly dissipating in front of them. They believed that it was the politically expedient course to follow, but what are they going to do if the next poll comes out a month from now and it shows that 70 percent of Canadians are diametrically opposed to the constitutional package that they now find themselves supporting, and Mr. Speaker, that is going to be the case. I don't think there's any reasonable observer of the political scene in Canada today that cannot now see that constitutional package that the Prime Minister of this country has tried so desperately to foist on the country, drifting and slipping away from him.

Indeed, it may well take the form that is suggested by the Member for Inkster, that patriation, yes, but very slim hopes of the amendments which my national leader, the Member for Inkster, and any other right-thinking Canadian is completely in accord with a growing majority of Canadians that don't ask England, don't ask Great Britain, the Parliament of Great Britain, to do what we have difficulty in doing ourselves. That is the kind of final insult to the last vestige of our colonial past and it's being perpetuated by none other than our Prime Minister.

So Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech is going to receive that support. The Throne Speech is going to receive that kind of steady, growing support from all of those that are involved in the economic development field in the Province of Manitoba, both in the public and private sector. And, Mr. Speaker, again, I shouldn't be giving the NDP any lessons or any advice, but I can do that because I know the Member for St. Johns is not going to accept it and it's always nice to be able to do a little bit of crystal gazing and foresee in the future knowing what the

end result will be. They haven't realized the extent they have fallen into the trap that we have carefully laid for them. Their focusing on the issue of economic development in this province is, of course, precisely what we want them to do, because what happens, honourable gentlemen opposite, when these promises that are contained in this Throne Speech become hard fact? What happens when one month, another month, another month passes and major economic initiatives, promises, turn out to be thousands of jobs, turn out to create the kind of economic development that they are helping us focus in on and the need for as being so important to the Province of Manitoba.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the position that of course is being hoisted on us by members opposite and/or by others in community that suggests that our economy is that bad. I'm acknowledging that relative to our sister provinces, particularly Saskatchewan and Alberta, that we are, and need to attract and develop the kind of projects that are talked about in this Throne Speech. I'm also confident enough that they haven't been put in there just to fill up space, just to give the Lieutenant-Governor something to read about.

I only indicate to you gentlemen — and I see the Member for Ste. Rose has got his thinking hat on. He's starting to get a little worried about what I'm telling you because, gentlemen of the opposition, you know when the major economic flywheel in this province, northern development of hydro, commences and when some of the major economic initiatives come off the paper and actually start getting into the ground and employing people, I ask you simply, gentlemen, what's going to be your platform? What's going to be your platform? You know, having dedicated, devoted so much of your time in helping us to focus in on this one issue — sure, it puts some pressure on us. It puts some pressure on us and we will have to perform but we are confident that we are going to perform.

Mr. Speaker, that coupled with the kind of social initiatives that are being shown by this government that gentlemen opposite just didn't dream we were capable of; the kind of initiatives that my colleague, the Minister of Community Health and Social Services, the kind of initiatives that the Minister responsible for Housing is just announcing in these days that kind of selected help, that we promised by the way, as compared to the broad brush or universal programs, because the difference is we can help where it's needed. We can help where it's needed in a far more substantial way for those families, those people in our society that are raising families at a most difficult time with rising costs. That 30 per month per child will not be spread over to everybody, including myself when I don't need it. If we did that, the program possibly could not have developed more than 10 or 7.50 or 8.50 or 9.00 per child, but by doing as we promised, by selectively zeroing in and identifying the area of need, we can make these programs meaningful and real and in fact, come to the aid of those whom governments should and ought to be concerned about and thus enrich our programs.

Mr. Speaker, these things are all contained, in some of them the gears are in motion, the programs are being started, January 1st start-up for some of

them, coupled with the economic initiatives in this Throne Speech leads me to believe that there will be no question as to whether or not the acceptance of the policies, of the initiatives, the programs of this government as contained in this Throne Speech will win ever wider and wider support.

It will be supported by the agricultural community. Mr. Speaker, that is saying the redundant. The kind of obvious, enthusiastic, aggressive leadership that our Minister of Agriculture brings to the problems of agriculture, the kind of immediate responses that this government has shown in a difficult year, in drought, in flood, and Mr. Speaker, that may not be evident to some of the honourable members opposite who don't have too much occasion to travel through the agricultural community of Manitoba. But again let me tell you that it was one of the rewards of being in public life. One of the awards of public life is being able to participate in the Cabinet tours that we have been on, travelling through southwest Manitoba, through southeast Manitoba and getting that kind of instant acknowledgement, the fact that this government cares for the farmers of Manitoba, this government cares for agriculture in Manitoba, and this Minister best expounds those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to you that the Throne Speech doesn't leave gaps. When the Minister of Education brings forward his programs later on in the Session, programs complementing those programs with other social services programs, it brings a rounded, full consideration for all segments of our society of government action into being and into place. Mr. Speaker, I have no question at all about the success of that program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not perfect and I must acknowledge an area of which we, collectively, have been a dismal failure. I say collectively because we've all had responsibility, we've all known, and that is dealing with the matter of hydro. Mr. Speaker, we have allowed, even though — and I suppose it's the old adage, if we don't say it often enough, it isn't believed — we have allowed the myth to be perpetuated that we, the Conservative administration, shut down, closed down Limestone economic development in the north. Now, everybody knows that is a blatant untruth and everybody knows that it was the previous administration that shut down Limestone in the summer of 1977. I want to just reiterate that because we have to do that. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burrows had a lot of fun reading back from previous budget speeches; allow me to read from '79 and indicate, of course, what was happening in hydro. The other afternoon, it was yesterday afternoon, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster drew a caricature of hydro as being a man or person with broken knees and a lacerated face and broken arms and that was the way Hydro was being presented by the Conservatives and lo and behold now, when it suits our purpose, the man, Hydro, in that person, has made a remarkable recovery and is ready to do battle for the economic well-being of our province again.

Mr. Speaker, let me just refresh you of the facts. The fact of the matter is that Manitoba Hydro had its first general rate increase since its inception in the early Fifties of some six-and-a-half percent in 1968.

Shortly thereafter, 1969-70 when the New Democrats took over office, and you will recall there was that year-and-a-half, two years, of indecision, while they quarrelled with their conscience as to whether they were going to flood South Indian Lake or not, some of them had a bit of commitment about that, Mr. Speaker. Some had a matter of conscience because a lot of them campaigned on the fact that South Indian Lake would not be flooded. Well, two years went by and then of course finally they had to come to that decision that South Indian Lake would be flooded, and then finally through, against all the best of advice, both engineering and all the best of advice from people that have given their lifetime service in public life in Manitoba — I am referring to the former Premier of this province, D. L. Campbell, who was a board member appointed by that government, against all that kind of advice, they then proceeded on an ill-advised path of construction. The mistake was in their sequential programming of the construction phases, but had this result that effective April 1st, 1974, the rate increase to all Manitobans of Hydro users went up by 20.6 percent; followed by April, 1975, another increase of 19.2 percent; followed in the following year, April 1st, 1976 by 19.8 percent, 20 percent in other words; on March 17th, the next year, that's the fourth year in a row, a 15 percent; February 1st, 1978, for 15 percent; February 1st, 1979, another 14.5 percent; Mr. Speaker, representing a staggering 150 percent increase in Hydro rates. Can you imagine what would have happened had they been allowed to stay in office for another four years? Can you imagine?

Mr. Speaker, what happened, they even came to the conclusion that this could not go on and that's why they ordered a shut down of Limestone in the summer of 1977. They ordered that. Mr. Speaker, we have been very negligent in not getting that salient point across. I would venture to say that if I asked nine out of ten people on Portage Avenue tomorrow, they would suggest that it was this government, Sterling Lyon's government, that shut down Hydro in the north.

Mr. Speaker, that was the course that they were on; 15 to 20 percent Hydro rate increases every year since they started meddling with Hydro, and you are suggesting to me that could go on unimpeded. We are now spending nearly one half of the ratepayers' Hydro bill — whatever your Hydro bill is — 20 a month or 18 a month, half of it is going to pay interest, nothing on the capital, just the interest. Mr. Speaker, that's why your government, that's why your former Leader, Mr. Schreyer, came to some degree of senses and called a halt to the construction of Hydro projects in the north because by that time we had capacity coming out of our ears; many times during the year up to 50 percent over capacity and, Mr. Speaker, no effort to sell it, no big effort to sell it. They'd fire sale it, as we have been continuing to do whenever the Yanks want some of that power at considerably less than what it costs us to produce.

Mr. Speaker, we chose an alternate course. From the very first day that we took office we recognized how important Hydro was to us. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economic Development hadn't stopped in their search for suitable markets for that resource, not only for the over capacity that

we now have but to enable us to start up the construction once again in the north which I am sure will take place very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, and how did we do it, because this is where the honourable members of the opposition really are missing a bet. It reminds me about the fate of another leader that I had the privilege of sitting in this House with, in fact I was sitting in the present Minister of Agriculture's chair at that time and he was then the Leader of the Opposition with about 14 members behind him. The New DP's were a splinter party at that time and the chap that I am referring to of course is Mr. Molgat. His difficulty was, and I subscribe his failure in political life in Manitoba to the fact that he could not stop from carping and whining and being negative about everything that was being done by what is fairly universally acknowledged today, was perhaps one of the most progressive governments that this province had ever seen. I am referring to the administration of one Duff Roblin. But Mr. Molgat could not fathom or could not read the public perception of how he was carrying out his responsibilities and subsequently suffered defeat after defeat at the hands of the people and the demise of the Liberal Party as a Party in Manitoba as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite are not looking at what we are trying to do in a constructive, positive way. They are not recognizing that the effort that has taken place in the formation of a western grid is truly in the best Canadian, best Manitoba interests. It is something that the national New Democratic Party speaks about very often in their policy meetings about the need to develop and work with sister provinces in a national Canadian way particularly when it comes to energy matters.

Mr. Speaker, the other kind of industrial incentives that we are taking is again the very best kind of efforts that are being put forward in the sense that rather than import or export the resource, import the jobs, and that's what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, if the Alcan plant comes to Manitoba. Instead of exporting the raw product of electricity we will be importing into Manitoba, hundreds of jobs. (Interjection)— The honourable member who has spent some time in the planning priorities committee of the previous administration certainly recognizes it as a good program. But Mr. Speaker, that's not coming out in any of their statements here in this House and it's not coming out in any of the speeches that we've heard so far.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that the New Democratic Party in their opposition, in their opposition to us on these and other items, is in effect helping us to highlight and to focus public attention on their success when that success is self-evident to all. And of course, the success will be there long before the actual product is turned out. The success will be there when men are working, when plants are being built, and when the economy can begin to feel the spin-off effects of such major infusions of new capital into Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, their words, their words. Mr. Speaker, I know I have the confidence in my fellow colleagues that have been working on these items to know that they represent a great deal more than words.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I think so many of the left have this

fixation about big business, and of course about multinationals. The subject matter of Petro Canada came up in a speech by my friend, the Minister of Agriculture. I have another problem with Petro Canada. I always make it a point, whenever I see a new Petro Canada sign go up somewhere, of rushing down there to try and buy some gas. You see, I've been so brainwashed by members opposite and by the media that these multinationals have been ripping us off in terms of energy in gasoline prices all these years, that surely I can expect to buy my gas for 15 or 20 cents a litre cheaper at my station. I get a little concerned when the Minister of Agriculture tells me that if they run it like the Post Office, I may have to wait two weeks for my gas. I see I'm getting through to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. If Exxon and Gulf and Texaco have been ripping you off all these years, then surely you don't expect your own government to rip you off. So next time you see a Petro Canada station, drive up to it and introduce yourself, tell them you're a fellow Canadian, Manitoban, and show and exhibit some pride in that fine station. Walk around that station a bit, it's your station, you know, walk around it a little bit to see if they're keeping it clean, but more important, see if you can get your gas there, five, eight, nine, ten cents cheaper than you can across the way at Esso. —(Interjection)— Can you?

Mr. Speaker, we are all subject to being influenced by our own propanganda from time to time. I came across an interesting bit of writing by a George Guilder, he writes in the American Spectator. It relates to the American industrial scene. But most of us would tend to believe that, with the concentration of big business, that it's getting harder and harder for the small entrepreneur, the smaller businesses, to exist. Mr. Speaker, that simply is not the case. We are being misled in the assumption that the largest companies are increasing their dominance of the economy. Governments and tax vouchers have done their best to drive innovators and promoters out of the game, but despite that, when you take a check on the 50, and the 200 largest manufacturing firms in the States, they have failed to increase their equity position in overall manufacturing in the United States. There is no evidence that large companies are squeezing out small entrepreneurs. The number of annual small business starts, and this is the United States, has increased from 93,000 in the year 1950 to something like 450,000 today, in the year 1980. Mr. Speaker, what that tells me is the tremendous ingenuity that is there in a free and open society if allowed to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, the article essentially deals with the very exciting developments in telecommunications, in computer industries, indicating that it is these firms, these high technology firms that are now representing by far the greatest growth rate in job promotion. Your mature firms, you know, your Chryslers, your GM products, are sitting there, but your growth is in the new and high technology firms all across the United States and developing a tremendous need for manpower to mend this need for new capital and doing very well at it. The article concludes by suggesting that these new firms will inevitably triumph in the long run, but whether they can fulfill their promise to relieve our current situation or problems depends largely on politics, on

whether the dominant powers will allow the future to prevail, whether politicians can comprehend the value of free men and free wealth.

Mr. Speaker, there is this very serious difference of opinion between us and for some of you, as I did, caught the supper hour news, CBC news, and the resident economic adviser for the CBC was being interviewed, he's a good friend of ours, he used to be a colleague of ours in the House, and I'm referring of course to Professor Cy Gonick. He was being asked what was his solution to the current, admittedly very serious, situation and of course it surprises none of us who sat and worked with Mr. Gonick in this Chamber that his solution was total state controlled socialism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only difficulty with it is, if that is — and I accept that as a legitimate alternative position, but you know, Mr. Speaker, and without dealing with that very serious question that is in front of the world right now in Poland, that is a country that has for 35 years now operated under that system, and it will take our countries that will bail them out. We are feeding them. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member suggests that I should talk about El Salvador. I wanted, if I may, just one more little deal to make with the honourable members opposite because from time to time they do get upset about red-baiting that some of us engage in and I want to make a commitment to my friends opposite, that I will cease and desist from any of that if they will agree to doing one small thing for me. I'm looking at the Member for Point Douglas, perhaps he could be the person that could do that for me. If the New Democratic Party, which will be assembling a convention in February, can pass a simple resolution supporting the rights of Polish workers to form a free and independent union, if you can pass that kind of resolution in your convention, I will cease and desist from any further red-baiting. I know the party, they cannot pass that kind of resolution. They could pass a resolution, a similar resolution, about a grape picker in California. In fact they could even spend their hard-earned money to promote a boycott of California grapes. Not that I have anything against the people in California being able to have grape pickers unions, but that used to occupy their minds. Mr. Speaker, closer to home they didn't like the purchasing practices of one notable and well-known Canadian food processing company, Kraft Cheese, and they passed resolutions time and again in their conventions. Do me that little favour at your coming convention, have the Member for Point Douglas pass that resolution, and I will respect him for it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment as Speaker and I look forward to your assistance in the upcoming Session. I was worried earlier in the day that possibly the job creation in this province was occurring right here in this Chamber as a result of the statements of the, especially the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Government Services, they were throwing so many red herrings into this Chamber that I thought we were producing a fish factory here.

The issue in Manitoba at this time, as it has been since the 1977 election, is the economy. The issue is the handling or the mishandling of the economy by the people opposite. The issue is the matter of the acute, protracted restraint which we were promised in 1977 and which that Tory government has so faithfully given us. Housing starts are down, our real net income is down, our percentage of national income is down, our population is down. We're the only province in the country with a population that is declining. Our retail sales, as a percentage of national sales, are down; our job creation rate as a percentage of national job creation rate is down; our real domestic product is down, that's for the first time since before we had an NDP government. There are things that are rotten in this province, bankruptcies, foreclosures, unemployment, and thank goodness, very soon the Tory term in office.

People in this province have learned again that Tory times are hard times. Tough times. So they're attempting to save their hides, and they've done so in a number of ways and on a number of fronts. The Minister of Government Services just finished a speech filled with flim flam. H1 was talking about the New Democratic Party, about the Opposition, about the fact that one of our members is ill today, he made great hay on that, but when we . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Can I repeat to the honourable members to make any mention of the presence or absence of a member is highly improper in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't my reference, it was a reference to speech of the Minister of Government Services. But while we are talking about problems, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the problems of the members opposite. Let's look at what is going to happen in this next election in the constituency of Osborne. Are we going to see the Attorney-General running there or is he going to run south to Fort Garry? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, or will he go all the way south to St. Norbert. And the MLA for St. Matthews, where's he going?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We can only have one person at a time involved in the debate in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious we've hit a sore spot. The MLA for St. Matthews, is he going to stand and fight in Ellice or is he heading west into St. James, and if so, where is the member for St. James? Where is he headed? — (Interjection)— Yes, talking about Rossmere, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Conservative Party, will he come to Rossmere, or will he run north to River East? Let's watch this. Let's see what they are going to do.

And who, Mr. Speaker, will be the Gimli goose for the Tories? Is it going to be the Minister of Education or is it going to be the Minister of Government Services? That will be very interesting, very interesting, Mr. Speaker. And in Radisson, Mr. Speaker, are we going to have the MLA for Radisson running in Radisson again, or is he going to head south to Niakwa and fight with the current member

for Riel for that one because he's afraid to hold that one in the NDP sweep in the coming election. What is going to happen there?

Some of them are absolutely cornered; the Member for Emerson, the Member for Springfield . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to all members that they allow the courtesy to the member who is speaking without interruption.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Emerson, the Member for Springfield, the Member for Dauphin, Swan River, Thompson, where are they going to run to? They have no place to run. They will be retired. We have finished hearing their contributions and at least one of their members, we've heard from the Minister of Government Services, he's talking about the Member for St. Johns and what he referred to as a political obituary. How about the Member for Brandon West, who is not going to be with us any longer, and after the next election there will be an NDP member for that riding sitting on that side of the House.

**A MEMBER:** Remember we're going to read these back to you, Vic.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes. But the government has tried on a number of fronts to divert our attention from the issue of their total mismanagement of this economy. For instance, they are attempting to put a human face on Toryism. They have been trying that for months without success. After three years of deterioration in the education services, in social services, in health services, in any services to people, after three years, suddenly they're starting to say that they're spending money.

We had these advertisements, I'm sure that there is no member in the House who would want to take credit for those advertisements for seniors with the little old lady pushing the cart in the supermarket saying, what a nice day. They got 7.80 a month. It didn't even keep up with inflation. They're worse off on the cost-of-living basis now than before you did it. That money that you're spending on those ads would have been much better spent on the program and increasing the amount.

They changed the MSP eligibility rules so that people above 55 years of age were eligible, providing that they were on the poverty line. (Interjection)— Yes, and I know of only one person who has applied for that program. She happens to be a woman who is in receipt of a Canada Pension because of a medical disability. She has a 15-year-old son, and yes, she receives some social assistance in addition. She applied back in September, Mr. Speaker, and she was given the full amount, the full total of 15.64 a month, and she received that, Mr. Speaker, for September, for October, and for November, and you know what happened in December? That government took that full 46 off of her social allowance cheque for December — that government — nobody but that government. Nobody but that government would set up a firecracker of a program like that, that would allow a person the belief that they were going to be receiving 15 a month more and then pull it back at Christmas time. Not even Scrooge stole money from the poor at Christmas time.

They have tried the SAFER program, Mr. Speaker, and I tell you that program is perceived in my riding by seniors as nothing but an excuse for landlords to raise rents which that government hasn't dealt with because of their friends. In my particular district, I'm sure the Member for Crescentwood is well aware of which friend we are talking about. They see it as a program with a means test which increases government bureaucracy, and so they are not impressed. There will be further attempts at putting a human face on this government, Mr. Speaker. I predict that there will be a substantial and belated increase in the funding of education in this province. I predict that there will be a belated increase for funding of special needs children in this province, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is too late to save that government or to save the Minister of Education.

We all know and the public of this province knows that an NDP government will be capable of and has more will to provide those types of services to people, and so they haven't been able to put a human face on their government and that particular ruse to divert us from the economy will not work and so they tried plan number two, the Mega projects.

We heard about the Flin Flon mine, the discovery made under the NDP; the aluminum project, and on April 18th, 1980, the Premier informed this House of the IMC deal. At least he informed us of the tip of the iceberg. This isn't the first time that the Premier has been involved with St. Lazare. Twenty years ago he was at a meeting of the Executive Council of this province which passed an Order-In-Council and one of the whereases is: Whereas Tumbell Mines Limited is the holder of a certain potash lease containing 53,842 acres, and this is the identical property, and another whereas: Whereas the company has drilled two wells which indicate the presence of potash of probable economic grade. Twenty years ago our Premier was involved in that and he has pulled that old rabbit out of the hat. And so we have heard that song before.

The Minister of Finance on that very same day answered a question posed to him by the Member for Churchill, and I just happen to have Hansard of that day, or a copy of that page with me. On page 2671, Mr. Cowan's last sentence of his question was, "My question to the Minister is, can he indicate if this flirtation with socialism, this partnership was brought about as a result of a request by the company or did the government force themselves upon the company in this regard?" And Mr. Craik's answer, the last sentence of his answer, "With regards to his question, I would have to advise him that this came about by way of mutual agreement. It takes two to tango and the two tangoed and this is it."

Some of those very same people were present when a previous Tory government tangoed with Dr. Kasser and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is nobody in this province who doesn't know who led and who followed during that tango. The Tory tango, Mr. Speaker, is one step forward and three steps back and that's what they have done with this deal. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they stepped forward one step with an announcement of a mineral development, but how many steps back did it take them? They started off by eliminating their right to a 50 percent partnership in mining in this province. They

remember it well. They should be ashamed of it. That was a step back. Then they gave half of our potash land away to IMC. Under Duff Roblin you didn't do that, but you are doing it now. And then they entered into a secret agreement that they have still not tabled in this House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is nothing but a gimmick to save their hides. This 25 percent equity is something that is a shame to the province, a sham — you can say that it's a sham if the Member for Churchill wishes.

And IMC, I quote from its annual report, its 1979 report on page 23 under the heading Reserves. "IMC Canada controls the rights to mine 147,300 acres of potash bearing land in Saskatchewan. This land of which 13,000 acres have been mined is in the southeastern portion of the province and consists of 76,000 acres owned in fee, 57,400 acres under lease from the Province of Saskatchewan and 13,900 acres leased from other parties. All the leases are renewable by IMC Canada for successive terms of 21 years with the first term of each expiring on October 31st, 1981. During the renewal terms of the leases, rents and royalties will be established by regulation of the Saskatchewan government. The reserves in this acreage are estimated to be about 8 feet thick containing 1.3 billion tons of recoverable ore at an average grade of 26 percent K20, enough to support current operations for more than a century." The report goes on to indicate that total annual production in 1979 was 3.1 million tons, but they had production capabilities in Saskatchewan of 4.2 million tons. They are 1.1 million tons below total capacity, and that very same company has over 36,000 acres of potash land at Carlsbad in the United States and until last year they had a mine which they sold to Dennison for a 24 million pretax profit in New Brunswick. The point is not that there is anything wrong with IMC or that they are not a capable company. They are one of the leaders in the field. There is no question about that, but the point is that IMC is in absolutely no hurry; is under no force of time to enter into an agreement with the province of Manitoba. It has other areas where it can expand up to its current capacity level. IMC has all the cards. It is dealing with a government that is in disrepute. It is dealing with a government that is on its last legs and I for one do not like the notion that government, on its last legs, should be able to enter into a secret agreement to try to pull its chestnuts out of the fire before an election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the public has no confidence in that government at this time in its position and hour of weakness, dealing with IMC on a secret basis. I also have no doubt that with the increasing prices for potash on the world market, that what we have there is a very marketable commodity which will be marketed within the next several years be it under that government or a good government. But the difference will be, Mr. Speaker, that we will get a proper economic return for the people of Manitoba and we will not get involved with a bunch of secret agreements which will sell our rights down the tube. When I say that, Mr. Speaker, the same thing has happened just very recently in New Brunswick. Did you know that the Potash Corporation of America has entered into a deal with a weak Tory government in New Brunswick — a weak government which has only a one member

majority and needs desperately to hang onto power — a deal which gives them potash rights in that province for a royalty of 6.25 percent. I quote from the Kings County Record of Wednesday, April 9th, 1980, and in that edition, a senior member of the New Brunswick government is quoted as being very unhappy with the arrangements made down there. And again, it was done by a government under pressure, in secret. We don't want any repeats of course of CFI or that New Brunswick project.

Incidentally I should mention that in Saskatchewan, the government is receiving more than double the royalty that they have negotiated in New Brunswick although the potash in New Brunswick is within something like 50 miles of a coast in an ideal position to compete on the world market. But they were so desperate that they sold their inheritance down the river to that company, and I have no faith that my friends opposite are not in the process of doing the same thing right now. I would like to see all documents tabled, and I believe that is important for the public.

The Mega projects then, Mr. Speaker, are not working. There are three reasons. The public does remember Tory previous give-aways. They do remember and they want to see the fine print before they stand up and cheer. The public remembers the promises of good times and no budgetary deficits — jobs for everyone. Our kids are going to stay in Manitoba. We are going to have a happy time here, a great province, a province to be proud of. Remember that in 1977, remember what you people were saying? Well, the public remembers and that is another reason why they will not buy a pig in a poke from you people. And of course the public has watched not only your economic mismanagement, not only your broken promises, but they remember your abysmal record at legislating. They have no confidence in you at all.

I refer you to the incident of several days ago when you knew, you knew months ahead of time that we were going to be coming up with a problem in this House and when it arrived, what did you do? You pulled into your back pocket for some silly resolution which wasn't going to solve the problem and you had to get us, the Opposition, to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for you. When we heard that resolution, Mr. Speaker, we went to our caucus and we were shocked that a government would be so ill-prepared that a House Leader would have nothing available to handle a situation which we had all seen coming, totally unplanned. And so, Manitobans have no confidence in the Mega projects that this government is announcing.

You have now gone to your third ruse to get our minds off the economy, Ottawa-bashing, and that takes many forms. You have the pathetic attempts of the Minister of Government Services to try to get into a fight with his federal counterparts over anything that's worth or not worth fighting about. Then you have the suggestions of the patriotic Tory backbenchers, that we should patriate the Constitution, but don't touch it — no amending formula, no nothing, just bring it back. Well, Mr. Speaker, the current amending formula on the Constitution is one which allows a joint address by the Parliament of Canada and the Senate of Canada to the Westminster Parliament to change the

Constitution. That is the way it has been going for a number of years, for 100 and some years. But if we remove Westminster from that equation, there is no amending formula. Is that what they want? Are they saying unanimity? Are they saying never?

We have heard examples in the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders which I might say is capably chaired by the Member for Crescentwood. We have had suggestions down there for amendments but we have never had anyone say that it should be absolute unanimity and we know full well that if that's what you are asking, you will never get changes. We have heard about things like the ERA in the United States where three-quarters of the States, or what ever the formula is, can't get together to pass a constitutional amendment. Now what they are talking about is to have all of us, all eleven provinces, nothing — no dissent whatsoever before you can change, and that is not a very bright position —(Interjection)— 10 provinces and one federal government, that's 11, I'm sorry.

I approached one of the members of the Legislature who made this suggestion of straight patriation with no amendments and he said to me, but what I want is a little amendment in there to give Ottawa the powers which Westminster used to have. I just wonder how many Tories would get up and support that, the notion that the Constitution is there, but only the federal government can amend it. They were complaining about referendums. There wouldn't need to be any referendums because under the current proposal the only way you can have a referendum is if the federal government wants a change in the Constitution. If the federal government are the only people who can amend the Constitution, why would they need a referendum?

That is not to say that we on this side support the particular proposal before the Parliament, right now. We have our differences with respect to the referendum position, the perpetual veto of several central Canada provinces and other matters. That committee that I referred to —(Interjection)— I'll come to the Bill of Rights. We had an interesting meeting with a committee from the Alberta Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I was offended by the position of the Manitoba Tories in backing regionalism, division, and greed, and when I asked, Mr. Speaker, whether they could name another country on this planet where the region in which oil is produced is the region which receives the funds and sets the prices, they could not. They mentioned that there were several anomalies, as there are in the United States where in certain minor instances, the States have certain powers over pricing and funds. But other than that, there's nothing else on the planet, and they just simply say, well, that's our Constitution. We want ours different from everybody else so that a Manitoban can have lived here all his life, but has no interest as a Canadian in the oil that's in Alberta, or an Ontarian can have lived in Canada all his life and have absolutely no interest in the hydro in Manitoba. I reject that position. I believe that being a country means something more than that.

Where was the government and its members during that entire meeting? They were ducking any real issues, they were not showing any leadership, they were not showing any foresight, they were not

showing any planning, other than the plan to attempt to divert public attention from the real issue in Manitoba, the economy, toward Trudeau bashing. That was it.

When that committee first met, we were told that they would be flexible, they would be flexible on everything other than the entrenchment of rights. Yes. And of course we had heard the Premier's previous statements with respect to the slippery slide to Republicanism; well that has been a long, long slide because in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, we have had entrenched rights since 1870 under The Manitoba Act, and the question is, what kind of rights? We have had, for instance, the right as a people in this province for this Legislature not to have the right to change the time of elections to more than five years unless there is a time of emergency. This Legislature cannot make it six years. This Legislature cannot, although it attempted to do so in 1890, take away people's language rights. We have an Act which says that there are certain rights to language in the courts and in the Legislature which this Legislature has no right to take away from Manitobans. Of course, if it wasn't entrenched, if that right wasn't entrenched, Mr. Forest would have had no grounds upon which to go to the courts.

The courts did nothing but tell us what the law is, what we knew the law was, to enforce the law. That's all they did, they didn't make the law. The Parliament of Canada and Britain made that law.

Mr. Speaker, all governments, all ten provincial governments and the one federal government approved of the Victoria Charter in 1971, that Victoria Charter had included in it an entrenched Bill of Rights, a stronger Bill of Rights, I might add, than the one that the current government is presenting. That was in 1971. All ten provincial governments and the federal government of this country approved, in 1976 of the United Nations Covenant on International Human Rights, as well as the protocol, which gives our citizens the right to go to an international tribunal if one of our governments violates their rights. Of course, we have seen the example of Linda Lovelace who has no rights in Canada. Linda Lovelace is an Indian woman who married a white man, who lost her status as an Indian because of that fact. Had she been a man, and had an Indian man married a white woman he would not lose his status, and so there was discrimination on the basis of sex and that happens to be against the International Charter on Human Rights.

Now, she couldn't go to a Canadian court. There's no Canadian court that could deal with her rights. She had to go to the United Nations. She had to go to Geneva. Our courts, the people opposite say, are not capable of dealing with her rights. We agree that yes, she has that right but we provide absolutely no remedy for her in this country although that right is based on our international treaty obligations. I might state that the federal proposal for a charter of rights does not even meet with the basic minimum requirement of the United Nations Charter to which we are a party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, laws evolve over the years and some rights I suggest have been created by the courts. I will give just several examples of that. About 50 years ago in a law case entitled Donahue

versus Stevens, it was held by the court that a manufacturer could be held liable to a consumer of a soft drink who had purchased it not directly from the manufacturer but from a store, where there was some foreign material in a bottle. That was a case that changed, I would suggest, at least the common law had evolved and that was a principle which had never been recognized before. And ten or twelve years ago in the case of Hedley Burn versus Heller, the courts held, for the first time, that a statement negligently made by an individual knowing that someone else will rely on that statement, will result in damages being paid by the person making that statement to the person hearing it, if those damages were reasonably foreseeable.

Outside these Chambers, we have rights against each other. If one of the members get rambunctious and punches somebody out in the hall, or if somebody has a car accident and someone else is at fault, there are remedies in the courts. You can go to the courts and say, I was injured, I want a remedy, I want damages, and you're entitled to them under our law. If someone tells you, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to keep you out of a church, I don't want you going to a Mennonite Church and I will keep you out; I am your neighbour and I will not allow you to drive. You have a remedy, you can go to the courts and you can get an injunction authorizing or ordering that person off of your back and you can get damages.

Mr. Speaker, without a Bill of Rights, without an entrenched Bill of Rights, it has happened that Legislatures have done precisely that. In Quebec, the padlock laws were passed against Jehovah's Witnesses telling them they cannot go to their churches, to the church of their choice. They had no remedies against the Legislature, they couldn't go somewhere and say, you can't do this to me, there are basic human rights that you cannot take away and you cannot tamper with. They couldn't do that.

We have in this province a situation where males, who are in charge of or custodians of children, are not treated in the same way as females who are in charge of children. Males are being discriminated against on the basis of sex in Manitoba, but there is nothing you can do about it. There may be a breach of your rights but there is absolutely nothing that you can do about it other than to lobby. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that an individual should have the right to a court decision when he is being discriminated against, and he should have the right to damages. There must be that right and in terms of the right to lobby, that committee of ours sat through numerous hearings, we never heard one single individual say that lobbying changed the government as a result of the mistreatment of the Japanese during the Second World War; changed the government as a result of the fact that Canadian Indians didn't have the right to vote until 1960; changed the government in Quebec as a result of the padlock laws; and the Lovelace case, the Indian case, a prime example of minority rights not being an issue in election campaigns, not being involved at all as an issue in election campaigns, was where the Minister in charge of Indian Affairs, Mr. Epp, said, yes, next year I will change that law. But that didn't become an issue in the election campaign and despite the fact that he was going to protect minority rights, his government was swept out of office, and it's just an indication

that minority rights are not matters which are ordinarily dealt with, or, I would submit, ever dealt with by the electorate in the heat of an electoral battle and as the Member for Transcona points out rightly, John Diefenbaker also believed in an entrenched Charter of Rights. I didn't know he was a Republican.

I would submit that this total attempt by the Tories has been a pavlovian attempt to equate western disgust with the Trudeau Government with support for the provincial Conservative Government. They have attempted to divert our attention from the miserable mismanagement of this province and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it will not work.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would ask you to pass my congratulations on to the Speaker on assuming the responsibility again in this Session of our Legislature. I know that he will act in the usual impartial fashion to which we have become accustomed.

Might I also congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech for the excellent job which they did in moving and seconding, backing the content of the Throne Speech.

I think it also would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, if I was to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on surviving his first year as Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, in his reply to the Speech from the Throne on Monday, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Constitution is not the most pressing problem confronting Manitobans today. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution might not be the most pressing problem facing the country today, but in my view it's certainly the most important problem, the most important question facing the country today. It wasn't the most important problem a year ago, but Mr. Trudeau has made it the most important issue facing the country today, because he has proposed changes that will change the basic nature of government in Canada in a way that Canadians are only now coming to appreciate. I think that the former Leader of the National Conservative Party, Mr. Stanfield, who was a man not given to overstatement, said that those proposals, those constitutional proposals put forward by the Liberal government in Ottawa amount to a coup d'etat just as much as if those changes were to be brought about by force of arms. I must stress that Mr. Stanfield is not a man given to overstatement yet he sees these changes as being of that magnitude of importance to the people of this country, Mr. Speaker. That coup has been very carefully planned and orchestrated.

If you can imagine the situation that the First Ministers of the Provinces found themselves in, in Ottawa in September, having before them a federal strategy document which set out the plans of the federal government as to how they were going to deal with the provinces. Now, the existence, Mr. Speaker, of a strategy document in itself is not unusual. One might expect a government to have a document, a strategy laid out, but what is particularly shocking to me about this document was the fact

that it was a strategy for failure. It was not a strategy to succeed, but rather a strategy for failure and to make it appear as though the provinces, the intransigence of the provinces was the reason for the failure. And those words are used in that document, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is a very shocking thing when our national government is operating on a strategy of that nature and have even reduced it to a written strategy document as well.

It was evident in that strategy to the extent to which they were prepared to go to convince the people of the rightness of their position. They referred in that document to the advertising campaign which we all saw last year, the 6 million Canada goose, and they raised the moral question, Mr. Speaker, about using taxpayers' funds to advocate a political philosophy and they said that this was a question which that government, the Cabinet Ministers, would have to deal with, that it was something that the public would react to, but that government has obviously been prepared to follow that course, and they have been largely successful in making the provinces appear to be responsible for the breakdown of those discussions. They were successful at one point. And they also were able to pursue the strategy of making our First Minister and others appear to be opposed to human rights because they were opposed to the entrenchment of a Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place on the record some of the things that we favoured with respect to the constitutional debate because I think it's important for the public to understand that we would like to see the Constitution returned to Canada, or come to Canada. I believe 10 Premiers agreed on an amending formula at the September meeting of First Ministers. I don't think they could have been that far away from agreeing, not only the 10 Premiers but the Prime Minister as well, on an amending formula. The Constitution could have been brought to Canada under those circumstances and changes made within the framework of that formula. Some federal Ministers have expressed the feeling that it is a national disgrace to have to go the British Parliament and ask for changes in our Constitution. I don't feel that it is a national disgrace to do that but I can understand why some people in our country might feel that or might feel much more comfortable with the Constitution in Canada. Fine, but why would those same people who feel it a national disgrace to have to go to the mother Parliament to get a change made in our Constitution, why would they go and ask the mother Parliament to entrench a Bill of Rights which they know they would not be able to put into the Constitution, were the Constitution to be in Canada prior to that? That is a contradiction, Mr. Speaker, which I am not able to understand.

We are in favour of seeing a Constitution in Canada. We also, and it has to be said, we are in favour of human rights despite the efforts of the federal government to make it appear otherwise. If there are some weaknesses and certainly the system is not perfect, in the way that our Parliaments and Legislatures have protected human rights, then let us work towards improving within our existing system, the protection of those rights rather than embarking on a course of action which would change the basic structure of government in Canada. The proponents

of change have not, to my satisfaction, demonstrated the necessity for those changes and, Mr. Speaker, I think the onus is upon them to demonstrate why we should accept the changes that they are putting forward.

At the First Ministers' Conference in September, our First Minister and our Minister of Finance, put forward a paper dealing partly with the question of trade between provinces and the freedom of individuals to move back and forth among provinces to seek employment. Our Minister of Finance pointed out that there has not been one single conference convened to discuss that question, not one conference. No effort has been made at the national level to resolve that issue. Is it really necessary to move directly from where we are today to entrenching that right in the Constitution? I think not, Mr. Speaker. I think not. I think that it would be possible for governments to work towards strengthening the fabric of our country within the parliamentary system that we know now.

Some of the things that we do not favour, Mr. Speaker, the essentially unilateral patriation process which the federal government is now pursuing, and I believe now that the vast majority of Canadians also do not support the method which the federal government is following. We do not support the entrenchment of a bill of rights in the Constitution because of the change that it makes in our system of government, because it takes the responsibility for making laws out of the hands of the Legislatures and places it into the hands of the courts. If that is a change that Canadians want, and I don't think they do, if it's a change that they want, we must be certain of that. It must receive the kind of discussion that is necessary to be assured that people understand it. The kind of closure on debate that was invoked in the national Parliament earlier this year is very difficult to understand on an issue as fundamental as the Constitution of the country. It is very difficult to understand. Surely it is not necessary to meet artificial deadlines established by essentially one person, the Prime Minister of this country.

We do not support Mr. Trudeau's amending formula and I understand from the remarks that the Member for Rossmere made that there is some question in the members opposite about the amending formula which awards a permanent veto to some provinces and establishes a framework for the holding of a referendum that could allow the federal government to bypass the provincial legislatures and to remove the ownership of resources from provinces. We do not favour such a system that can strip us of the rights that we have with respect to resources. I think, Mr. Speaker, that Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan put it rather well at the First Ministers' Conference when he pointed out that in 1936 Saskatchewan had approximately a million people and today in 1980, Saskatchewan has approximately a million people. Over that period of time he said, people from Saskatchewan have had to leave that province in order to seek opportunities elsewhere in the country. He said at last we have the opportunity based upon our resources so that those people in Saskatchewan no longer have to leave Saskatchewan and go somewhere else to seek opportunities. He said why should that opportunity now be removed from Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker,

that's a question that all Manitobans and all Canadians, I think, must ponder very carefully before coming to a conclusion on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by the statement of the Leader of the Opposition in his reply on Monday when he referred to the court case which is under way. He said a court case which is premature is an excuse for the Premier to stop negotiating on the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, anyone who was watching the course of debate in Ottawa in September would know that on the Saturday morning when the Premiers appeared with the Prime Minister, and you will recall the looks of sadness on the faces of everybody around that table, it was our First Minister who said, I think we have made substantial progress, Mr. Prime Minister, and that with some further discussion we can make more progress. Our First Minister did not move away from further negotiation and I think it is an insult for the Leader of the Opposition to indicate that he did.

Our Prime Minister, our First Minister in Manitoba has provided leadership to Manitobans and to the country beyond what people now recognize today. When the question of the entrenchment of a Bill of Rights first arose, our First Minister stood alone in opposition to that. Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that when the First Ministers met in Ottawa in September, he had some seven other governments with him who had seen the wisdom of the case which he put forward. I hope that one day that the contribution that our Premier has made in this debate will be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Inkster made a reasoned and impassioned attack on Mr. Trudeau's proposals and he described them as the worst threat to social and economic change facing this country and this province today, the worst threat to social and economic change. He acknowledged the wisdom of our Premier's position and this government's position. Mr. Speaker, who is perpetrating that threat? Mr. Trudeau is perpetrating that threat and who is supporting them in that threat? The NDP are supporting that threat, the greatest threat to social and economic change in the reasoned judgment of one of the ablest parliamentarians that this House has ever seen. Mr. Speaker, I think that the members opposite should ponder that judgment made by the Member for Inkster, very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on and deal with some economic questions if I might. (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, someone says Brandon economics and indeed they are right, Mr. Speaker. I feel compelled to make a few comments on the latest economic analysis on the Member from Brandon East. I'm sorry, I apologize, Mr. Speaker, it's the Member for Brandon East, he's actually from Transcona.

I would like to quote from his document, if I might, Mr. Speaker. I usually spend a major portion of my time in the Budget Speech and in the Throne Speech to dealing with the details of the Member for Brandon East's latest economic analysis. I am not going to do that tonight, Mr. Speaker, because I don't wish to devote that much time to it, but I would like to quote something here. He says, "What basic changes occurred in 1978 to 1980 to cause our provincial economic activity to be lower relative to

the rest of Canada? What elements were at work during the Conservative years that were not present during the NDP years in government? The only basic change was a change in government policy itself."

Mr. Speaker, that is the basic premise on which this entire analysis was conducted. The Member from Brandon East — for Brandon East, is an economist, I've heard. He is a professional economist. If he took this material to a seminar of his peers and made that kind of premise that the only change, the difference between the 1970 to '77 period and the '78 to '88 period was government policy, he would be laughed off the campus. He would be laughed off the campus, Mr. Speaker, for that kind of intellectual bankruptcy. The members opposite are fond of talking of bankruptcies, they don't have to look further than that.

Let me list a few of the factors that are changed now from the conditions that prevailed during the earlier part of the 1970s. This is the first year since 1954 that the Canadian economy has produced less than it did in the previous year. That happened in 1980, not the period 1970 to 1977. We are experiencing unprecedented and extraordinary interest rates, prime rate today at 17.5 percent, the U.S. rate at 21 percent, the prime rate last April was at 17 percent, those kinds of things. That fact has a major impact, especially on the Manitoba economy because of the kind of economy which we have here, because of the reliance of small business on borrowed money. It has a greater impact on Manitoba than it has on Alberta, for instance. They don't have that same kind of reliance, they're not working on the same margins, they have a greater opportunity for return.

We have experienced in the last couple of years the virtual collapse of entire industries, the auto industry, the housing industry, the steel industry, the recreational vehicle industry, in North America, Mr. Speaker. Those were not phenomena that were experienced during the period of 1970 to 1977, and the Member for Brandon East says, nothing changed but government policy. We are now experiencing synchronized world-wide recession, which they did not experience in the period of 1970 to 1977. Many countries today are on the verge of bankruptcy, Peru and Zaire, and Jamaica and Turkey. They have had to go —(Interjection)— Poland, yes, they have had to go to the international banking system and ask that their debts be reordered. That is happening today, not the period of 1970 to 1977.

We have unprecedented hikes in the price of energy, we have unprecedented inflation and, Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting things that I found in this report, the Economic Council of Canada, a Climate of Uncertainty, was some information showing that during the period of 1974 to 1976, the Canadian economy grew faster than the U.S. economy, than the Japanese economy, than the French economy, West Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom; 1974 to 1976. In the period of 1977 to 1979, the Canadian economy exceeded only that of the U.K. The performance of the Canadian economy then was exceeded by the U.S. and Japan and Italy and West Germany and France, and the Member for Brandon East, a professional economist, says nothing's changed but government policy. Can the public place any reliability on an analysis put forward by that member?

And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, some other very interesting statistics associated with that period of time. Let's look at the number of jobs that were created in that period of 1974 to '76 when the Canadian economy was one of the leaders, the leader in the world. What happened in Manitoba? In 1974 there were 17,000 jobs created. Pretty good year. Pretty good year. In 1975 they lost 2,000 jobs; 2,000 jobs while the Canadian economy led the world. In 1975 there was another 9,000 jobs, for a total of 24,000. At least 7,000 of those were in the public sector and supported by tax dollars, but 24,000 jobs. Now, 1977, there were 3,000. I'll sort of move from that because the previous government had some responsibility for that and we had some responsibility.

Let's look at 1978 and '79. In 1978 there were 11,000 jobs created in Manitoba. In 1979 there were 13,000 jobs. 24,000 jobs created in this province in two years during a period of time when the Canadian economy was lagging behind all major OECD countries except the United Kingdom. For three years, in '74, '75, and '76 when the Canadian economy led the world, those members who were then in government saw 24,000 jobs in those three years. And the Member for Brandon East says nothing has changed except government policy. Well that change in government policy, Mr. Speaker, has had a very very beneficial effect on the economy of this province.

Within the circumstances that prevail today, the international situation of interest rates and energy prices and worldwide recession, Manitoba has many strengths. We have a very diversified economy, the agricultural economy, our mining, our manufacturing ranging from light to heavy manufacturing, aerospace, of high technology type of manufacturing, we've got a lot of financial services here, we've got forestry resources, one of the three provinces in Canada that has some opportunity for the development, the use of our soft woods, we've got hydro potential, of course. The hydro freeze that's proving to be one of the major attractions to industry to come to this province, we are well located as far as geography goes to serve the west and the midwest to the United States. We're recognized as having a very stable workforce. The housing situation is good in this province to be able to absorb additional industrial expansion here. We've got the cultural and recreational and educational facilities here to support a larger population. We have a tremendous infrastructure for a province with a million people. And it's a very very attractive place for an industry to locate, especially with a government that welcomes the private sector to come and invest in this province.

And although we're very vulnerable to interest rates in the situation that prevails today, we are going to build on those strengths that this province has. We're going to utilize those strengths for the future. There have been some difficulties, we acknowledge that, there has been some population loss, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Statistics Canada information shows that from January to October of this year, there has been an increase in the population of this province by 2,000 people. An increase of 2,000 people, and the Member for Brandon East is still talking about the declining

population of this province. Well, where's the credibility?

During the period of time we have still maintained the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada, we've provided opportunity for our youth, the period of '74 to '76 there were some 4,000 people age 15 to 24 entered the workforce in Manitoba and there was not one single extra job for those people. From '77 to '79 there were 6,000 people age 15 to 24 that entered the workforce and there were 6,000 new jobs for those people. And the Leader of the Opposition says that we have broken our promises to the youth of this province. Mr. Speaker, he need only deal with the facts, and don't get them from the Member for Brandon East.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some major successes that we are on the verge of achieving. I'm not going to deal with those in detail, I'm going to be content to see the opposition say that those developments are just pie in the sky and they're never going to come to pass because I want to watch. I want to watch the look on their faces as each one of these agreements starts to fall into place; forestry, potash, western power grid, Alcan. Those are the major ones, Mr. Speaker, that we're working for and there have been a lot of other successes as well.

But in the few minutes that I've got left, I want to review a few of the NDP policies as they have been enunciated because I think it's important that the public should understand. They should understand what those policies are. Because in contrast to our policies of building on the strengths of this province, the NDP want to resort to the same old disastrous economic policies, priming the pump. I saw the Member for Brandon East on television the other night, he wants to prime the pump. Good Lord, the federal government is running a 15 billion deficit, and he wants to prime the pump.

They want to return to constructing hydro plants that they don't need. He says that's going to put us at the mercy — if we don't build until we've got a market — that's going to put us at the mercy of the purchaser. But somehow, he's going to build them when they're not needed and he's not going to be at the mercy of the purchaser. Understand that if you can. I can see them extending that principle to developing potash mines for which there is no sale for the potash. Makes just as much sense, in fact it makes more because they could store it rather than let it run around the dam.

They're going to bring back rent controls until there is a satisfactory level of housing. If that isn't a contradiction in terms, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. They're going to force the private sector out of the health care field, we don't know how far that's going to go, doctors, dentists, just to what extent they're prepared to go there, they're going to have compulsory government participation in the mining industry again, to return us back to the same disastrous kind of exploration levels that were going on in this province during their previous experimentation, they're going to pay more than lip service to small business, which I suppose would mean that they're going to reintroduce succession duties and that they're going to increase the capital tax, and that they're going to increase the corporation taxes as well. We're going to have more state ownership of farmland; that's got to be a major plank of NDP policy for the 1980s.

And Mr. Speaker, they are going to place the economic decision making of this province in the hands of the union leaders. Because the Member for Inkster, Murdoch MacKay, a former President of the NDP, tell us that the Party is in the hands of organized labour. These are respected capable members of the NDP, former members, that say the Leader of the Opposition is in the pocket of the leaders of the labour unions. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the people of the province want to place their economic decision-making in the hands of the union leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP in 1977 were defeated, I think because they were out of touch with reality. They were out of touch with reality. Their economic policies were disastrous. There's an indication in their statements again today that they want to return.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They want to return to the policies of yesterday, of yesteryear, to re-implement some of the same kinds of disastrous policies that they had pursued during the period of 1970 to 1977. When their leading economic light, their leading economic brain in that group makes the kind of premise about the economic conditions prevailing in the world and in Canada and in this province, the kind of statements and analysis that he has done, I think that the people of this province have to ponder very very carefully. I think there is only one conclusion that they can come to. They don't want to return to the kind of situation that prevailed in those years, Mr. Speaker. During that election the people voted for policies based on economic reality. Mr. Speaker, we have had economic reality in this province for the past three years and some of it hasn't been all that palatable and I'll be the first to admit that because reality often is not that palatable.

Members opposite want to stand up and say let's knock the interest rates back by two or three percent. That's the way they want to tell the people that they don't have to take anything that's unpalatable. I don't think that's reality. The Leader of the Opposition, what I find most disconcerting about the Leader of the Opposition's position is that he says that the enthusiasm of individual people is a weak reed to place any confidence on, Mr. Speaker. The individual enthusiasm is a weak reed. On this side of the House we believe that individual enthusiasm and initiative is the kind of thing that economies are based upon.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made to the Throne Speech should be rejected in the same way that the electorate is going to reject the NDP in the next election.

Merry Christmas.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, may I again congratulate you on the position that you hold and I would like also if I may to congratulate you on the good humour with which

you meet even your harshest experiences in that office. I want to congratulate also the Mover and Seconded of the Speech on their recognition by their leader for this important task of introducing the Throne Speech this year.

Mr. Speaker, last session I took advantage of the opportunity you so kindly afforded me to be one of the first responders to that session's Throne Speech. I was new in the Legislative Assembly and I was eager to make my contribution as an individual, as the Member for Fort Rouge, and as the Liberal Party representative in this Chamber. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the other members of the Assembly for the courtesy and understanding shown a newcomer by most of you. I also appreciated the tolerance shown by my honourable colleagues in allowing me to subject them to my Liberal views on the governing of our province. I am sure they found them a refreshing change from their own and from each other's views.

I return to the House this session, Mr. Speaker, not yet what one would call a veteran of this august Assembly, as the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs so kindly reminds me from time to time, but as one who has at least experienced one other Throne Speech and is in a position to compare one with another and to recognize the shortcomings of both; the failed promises of the first and the false hopes of the second.

Sitting back and listening to the debate that has gone on so far, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of an amazing repetitious similarity in the style and rhetoric of the other two political positions being espoused here in matters relating to this province. I feel called upon to present to you for your own relief and perhaps for the intellectual stimulation of the other members of the Assembly, a third view as to the direction this province could and should be taking; a direction we could see us hitting as early as next year under the stewardship of the Liberal Party in Manitoba's recently elected leader Doug Lauchlan, and I want to just take a moment to thank those members of the House who have so warmly welcomed Mr. Lauchlan, both at Government House the other night and in the halls here in the last few days. I appreciate the courtesy as usual.

While I didn't notice many of the members of this Chamber at the recent Liberal policy convention, Mr. Speaker, I know that they all followed the reports with great interest. It was a very good convention. It was well attended by Liberal delegates from every constituency in the province. They all had the opportunity to contribute their voices to the ever-growing dissatisfaction with both the Conservatives and the NDP. They also had the opportunity to be more positive in outlook, to review the needs of the people of the province, to update the Liberal point of view on a number of issues and to select from two excellent candidates an outstanding individual as their spokesperson and leader for the remaining months of this 31st Legislature and into the next.

My colleagues here have noticed, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is a time of high spirits for Liberals in Manitoba. First, because the current administration is in its dying months of its existence. Secondly, both the Tories and the NDP have been so accommodating in driving back former disaffected Liberals back to the fold, and thirdly, because there's

an opportunity for the third alternative in Manitoba politics to emerge once again.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in the next Legislature our party leader will be the first Liberal, the first of several Liberal members to comment on the Speech from the Throne. It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— I presume that this isn't being taken off my time. It is fitting that the Liberal leader and his caucus will be . . . That was really witty, Mr. Speaker. I have to congratulate that man on his excellent wit, it's unusual.

That the Liberal leader and his caucus will be presenting their collective policy agenda for Manitoba in the coming years but today I have the opportunity to pave their way and I intend to do so by presenting my own view and those of my party on a policy agenda for our province, a policy agenda that could be adopted today, Mr. Speaker.

We live in an increasingly complex and small world where not only actions in other parts of the world or in other parts of country affect each and every one of us, but where it is no longer possible to separate economic factors from social ones or from political ones or from personal ones. Consequently, we must as a people and most definitely as a government try to understand how economic political and social factors affect one another and we must try to deal with them comprehensively. It is difficult to predict what will be the final outcome of any one policy, consequently, Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party believe it is dangerous for any government to make policy decisions which are based on dogma, which are based on a rigid and theoretical view of the world. We believe the world is more complex than that. We believe that decisions must be based on a clear and accurate picture of the world in which we live. We believe that this world changes and thus we believe that policies must be reviewed and reconsidered as the objective reality around us changes.

Inserting a policy agenda for Manitoba then, Mr. Speaker, we must first assess the situation in which we now find ourselves. Through the past decade of the 1970's Manitobans have been offered two political theories of society and forms of government. In the early 1970s we were offered a theory of society where government could ensure all those things which are good. In the late 1970's we were offered a second theory where free market forces would solve all the evils of society. Though the 1970's were not a decade of complete deprivation, Mr. Speaker, that decade was a relatively poor one for Manitoba. Though Canada has prospered relatively well compared to the world, Manitoba through this decade of two different governments has lost ground compared to the Canadian average. For example, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed a steady erosion of Manitoba's relative position. In 1970, Manitoba accounted for 4.24 of Canada's real domestic product. In 1978, we only represented 4.03 percent. In 1970, Manitoba accounted for 4.67 percent of Canada's employment. Now Manitobans only account for 4.41 percent of that total.

Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada reports that between June 1979 and June 1980, 41,000 Manitobans have left the province. Population growth throughout the west is above the Canadian average except in Manitoba. Our net population is down by 3,200 while the other western provinces are growing.

Thursday, 18 December, 1980

---

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)