



ISSN 0542—5492

Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

30 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXIX No. 9 - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 23 DECEMBER, 1980

Office of the Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Ind
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSEN, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	Ind

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 23 December, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Highways.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. Can the House Leader advise whether or not any decision has been arrived at as to the date of resumption of this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that date that I will propose at the end of this afternoon will be the same date I advised the Leader of the Opposition of a few days ago. The motion will be to adjourn until Tuesday, February 3rd, at 2:00 p.m. I believe that's satisfactory to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the House Leader, on October the 31st, the date that the Legislative Session to commence on December 11th was announced, it was indicated by the First Minister that the short Session before Christmas was being held in order to have Throne Speech Debate completed and certain legislation introduced. Can the House Leader advise as to why no other legislation besides the amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act and other amendments, which we understand are to be introduced later this afternoon pertaining to the matter involving the Member for Wolseley, have been introduced?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition will be aware that during the Throne Speech Debate, the Throne Speech Debate takes precedence and of course no other matters can be discussed, and the intention was, in calling the Session, to deal with the Throne Speech Debate and then of course adjourn before Christmas until some time in the New Year, so the fact that the Throne

Speech itself takes precedence precludes debate on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated in the past that we will be introducing, for example, The Builders Lien Act, that was tabled at the last Session of the Legislature. I had hoped to circulate that to members during the Throne Speech Debate, but as a result of tabling that legislation for the last Session and widely circulating it to interested groups there have been some suggestions for some minor amendments which have not been completely resolved. As soon as those are resolved, Mr. Speaker, and they will be resolved before we come back next February, that legislation will be before the members immediately upon their return to the Chamber, but they can of course expect that they will be seeing a bill substantially in conformity with the one that was tabled during the last Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, we will also be bringing to the Legislature virtually all of the legislation that we foresee in our program at this time very early in February so that members will have plenty of time during the balance of the Session in February on, to review it and study it and make their comments to the Legislature as the session proceeds.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the expressed intention, we understood from this side, was to introduce legislation during this sitting so that it could be studied prior to the resumption of the Legislature in February so as to avoid the anarchy that existed last July.

Further then to the House Leader, why was it not possible that there be legislation introduced during this Session, outside of the two bills that I made reference to, so that we could have as members of this House enjoyed the opportunity to peruse and to study any intended legislation to be introduced later this Session?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in fact there is lots of time. What we are attempting to avoid is the situation that the former government got itself into and we unfortunately got ourselves into at the last session and that was introducing legislation late in the session.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated we intend to introduce virtually the whole of the legislative program in February when we return and there will be plenty of time, Mr. Speaker, for the members opposite to review it and study it, and members of the public also, and interested groups to review it and study it and make their comments to the Law Amendments Committee or other committees of the Legislature when they meet to deal with that legislation, Mr. Speaker.

The member is again ignoring the fact that during the Throne Speech Debate the Throne Speech takes precedent, Mr. Speaker, but we do intend to introduce virtually the whole of the legislative program in February when we return.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education

whether he has carried out his undertaking given a week ago on December 16th wherein he agreed to check the records to confirm that he had stated at a previous Session of the Legislature that the study on foundation program financing would be available before the end of this year, and if so what has he found?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I have checked that particular Hansard as to the wording that time where I find that I stated on Page 4451 of the Hansard of Thursday, the 5th of June, that we were making progress in our study, we were quite hopeful that we would be able to complete it in this calendar year, and I can report to the honourable member and this House that we have completed our study.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister now informs us that they have completed the study, can he give us any information? By the way, may I in doing so, refer him also to Page 4349 where he stated that it has taken 2-1/2 years to come to fruition because, "I think it is long overdue and will be welcomed by all Manitobans." May I ask the Honourable Minister whether it is his intention, in view of the fact that the study has been completed, to let the people in Manitoba, in particular the legislative representatives of the people of Manitoba, to have that information now so that at least we would have a reason for being here in December and be able to study that proposal during the month and more before the next time we meet.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, any announcements relative to that study, any announcements relative to educational financing, will be made at the appropriate time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Education, in view of the fact that the study has been completed at the peoples expense of course, is he not prepared to give us the study so that we too, can review it and be able to deal in an intelligent way with the proposals when and if they come from the government?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would repeat to the honourable member that at such time as the study's recommendations and so on have been fully studied by government and we are prepared to make any announcements, I'll be very pleased to present those announcements to this House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I address the Minister of Education and request him to inform us firstly, how long it takes the government to study a proposal that has been developed within the government or a study that has been developed within the government; and secondly, whether or not since the study has been completed, there will be any doctoring, amending, or changing of the study before it is presented to this Legislature. If not, why isn't it available now? —(Interjection)— It's been done before by you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the member may badger away as much as he wishes but I cannot give him any further information at this time other than what I have stated here, and he will just have to await the announcements the same as everyone else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question also to the Minister of Education, and ask the Minister; now that the government has decided to unfreeze the Assiniboine College Expansion, which had been planned by the previous NDP government, is the government now prepared to unfreeze the addition to the Brandon University's School of Music building, which had been also previously planned by the previous government?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I cannot agree with the honourable member's statement that we have frozen Assiniboine College addition, quite the contrary. That project is going forward and I would suggest that action speaks louder than words. We just didn't promise it. We have carried it through.

As far as the other project that the honourable member refers to, when we get to my Estimates I would be very pleased to make any announcements relevant to any projects we may be embarking on at that time.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister telling us really, that at this time the Government of Manitoba is not prepared to go ahead with the expansion of the School of Music building which had been planned by the previous government? Is this what the Minister is advising us at that time, he cannot announce any expansion of that facility at the University of Brandon?

MR. COSENS: I repeat to the honourable member that at such time as my Estimates are before the House, I will then be discussing any particular expansions or building programs that we plan to have under way.

MR. EVANS: By way of supplementary, can the Minister of Education explain to the House why it is that the government has delayed and procrastinated for three years this much needed and required expansion to the School of Music building? What is the policy that the government has been following to hold back on this particular needed expansion, particularly in view of the fact that our debt situation is as bad today, in fact worse today than it was three years ago?

MR. COSENS: I suppose the member may phrase the question, Mr. Speaker, so that it sounds as if we have been holding back for three years. I suggest to him that they held back for eight years on the project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the tourist industry in Manitoba and I would like to pose this question to the Minister of Economic Development and ask him if he could enlighten us on his reports as to how the tourist industry has fared in the Constituency of Churchill, particularly in the port of Churchill itself this past summer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report to the honourable member, who is the only one in the House who shows a great interest in Churchill, that the tourism in Churchill in 1980 was up considerably. In fact hotel space was at a premium at one point in Churchill, and we're very pleased with that. It's something we're very proud of and there's a lot of historic things to see there and a lot of wilderness to see and a lot of people were interested in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact you demonstrate that you show interest only if you ask questions, what about the tourist situation in St. Boniface, would the Minister tell me, please?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the tourist industry will be up approximately nine percent and we think that by the end of the year it will be up more. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that we're very proud of the area of St. Boniface and the number of tourists it does attract to our province.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's the Interlake constituency and I direct this question to the Minister of Highways, and ask what action his department and his offices are undertaking to rid the Interlake highways of the sheer sheet of ice that we've experienced for over a week now and we're finding that many people are unable to do any travelling within the Interlake area for fear of being involved in accidents. I'm referring specifically to Highways 6, 8 and 9. Highway 7, just a day or so ago, received a coating of salt so that's under way, but the other highways I believe have really not been touched.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the department has undertaken normal salting, blading process, to assure that the highways in the Interlake are in good travelling condition.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Highways could assure us that the policy of this government is not to keep people at home during the Christmas season if they so desire to visit friends and relatives within other parts of the

Province of Manitoba, that he can assure me that the highways will be salted so that the people are able to leave their homes during the festive season.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for the Interlake that we would even welcome tourists who may want to even leave the province for the holiday season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Minister of Agriculture and it relates to his recent announcement dealing with crop insurance, can the Minister assure me and assure farmers that the announcements made about increased coverages have been done actuarially and whether or not this may preclude any further investigations that have been undertaken by the one man commission that he has set up to investigate procedures within the crop insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the changes that were made recently to crop insurance were not as a result of the review that is being held. The changes that are being made particularly to those in sunflowers, the increased coverage that's being now made available, is from the longer term experience of the growing of that crop in the province, but the review as I have indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, will deal with other anomalies or difficulties that were made apparent this particular year with the operations of crop insurance and the review will be taking place during this coming winter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health and is the question of which I gave him notice last week. It refers to a medical instrument called, I think, the chondrotome, which is an instrument for paring the cartilage, and I wondered if the Minister has been able to ascertain whether there is any proposal to bring this instrument into the province and make it available to the practitioners.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for giving me notice of the question, but I do not have that information for her as yet. I'm not familiar with that type of instrument myself. I have asked for comment on it from official advisers to my department. When I'm fully familiar with the instrument and its function certainly consideration will be given to inclusion of its services under our service program spectrum, but at this point in time I can't give the honourable member any further information. I'll advise her as soon as I have more details.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister will take into consideration the fact that this considerably reduces the recovery time for the patient, reduces the number of days that the patient has to take off work, and that the instrument may, in fact, pay for itself within a very short time. I wonder if I may also ask the Minister if he would advise me by letter, since we are not going to be meeting again in Session until February?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my answers to those questions would be yes, and yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and ask him whether all homes in Manitoba that have urea formaldehyde installations should be inspected due to the possibility of health hazards, especially in view of the fact that some 21 percent of those inspected appeared to show some level of cause of concern?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's necessary to inspect all homes that have been insulated with urea formaldehyde foam. We are carrying on a program of inspection on those homes that have requested inspection and that program is continuing. My honourable friend may or may not know that the problem arises when the mixture is improperly applied and in those cases there could be a problem.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he has a sufficient number of inspectors to handle a rash of calls?

MR. JORGENSEN: Up to this point we have had a sufficient number of inspectors. It is hard to tell just what a sufficient number are until we know what the number of calls are.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether he has received any complaints concerning this matter prior to last Wednesday's announcement by the federal government or was that the first that he heard of the problem?

MR. JORGENSEN: As I have indicated to my honourable friend we have been inspecting homes where complaints have arisen, and on each of the occasions where a complaint has been received by our department a inspector has visited that particular home and carried out inspections and the results have been made available to the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour regarding the grain elevator fire at Medora. I wonder if it has been determined yet if in fact it was arson or not that was the cause of the grain elevator burning at Medora?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it's still under investigation.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, due to the possibility and the ever escalating cause of fires if it maybe is not time for the Minister and the grain companies to look at some other matter of surveillance of grain elevators to see if this matter cannot be brought under better control than it is at the present time. The losses are exorbitant and maybe the elevators will have to be taken care of 24 hours a day to try and bring the matter under control.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it is of great concern to ourselves in the department and I think all citizens of the province and any thoughts that anybody wishes to pass on to us would be quite welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the House Leader. I would like to ask if the government has been able to organize its activities sufficiently over the last two years to enable it to convene the legislative committee to look into the whole question of citizen access to information, which was unanimously called for the by the members of this Legislature some two years ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the resolution with respect to that matter asked the government to give consideration to that matter. Since then, Mr. Speaker, we have had a freedom of information bill tabled at the federal level by a Progressive Conservative Government, followed by another bill by the Liberal Government, which are under review by a number of provinces, in fact, and we are reviewing that. Mr. Speaker, until that review is completed no decision will be made.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Health which has particular relevance to the whole question of government secrecy with respect to information. I would like to ask the Minister if in fact he will make public the secret study on chiropractors done by the Manitoba Health Services Commission which did not include any members of chiropractic profession on that study, which is a secret study and which has not been released to anyone. Can the Minister indicate why that was done and whether in fact that piece of information will be released to the public and especially the chiropractors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that government secrecy is not the laughing matter that the First Minister thinks it is, I would like to ask the House Leader again whether in fact this

government will take action as unanimously called for by the Legislature to deal with the whole question of citizen access to government information which is kept secret from them in the province, which is a provincial matter, a legislative matter that should be dealt with by the Legislature and should not be referred to the Parliament. We have legislative supremacy, Sir, and I would like to ask the Minister if he in fact is going to call the Legislature to deal with this whole question of secrecy of information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Economic Development. I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what action he or his department has taken concerning a proposal regarding the relocation of an aluminum smelter in the vicinity of Churchill, which has been brought to his attention by members of the New Democratic Party Caucus in Ottawa as well as myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I answered the honourable member's letters. I can say to them, Sir, the same as I basically said in the letters. Alcan is looking at Manitoba. They are doing studies to make a decision as to where they want to locate or the place that they think would be the best to locate in Manitoba. They have indicated that an aluminum smelter within 50 or 60 miles of Winnipeg, they feel, would be the most desirable place.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it is they who feel that it would be the most desirable place, but I would ask the Minister if his government has undertaken any studies so as to review the potentiality of the Churchill area being used for such a smelter and pass that information on to interested parties who may be thinking of locating a smelter in the province at this time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as it was said, we are not in the smelting business. We in the province have never been responsible operating one and so we wouldn't have the knowledge of the economics of operating one, nor do we have the knowledge of the economics of the future of the smelter and the best place it should be located. We certainly don't want to say to somebody it has to be somewhere and find out that they would say to us it's not economical to go there. They have done extensive work themselves and they have said that it would be preferable to be within 60 miles of Winnipeg.

MR. COWAN: A final supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. I would ask him then as it is obvious that the government has not made any representations to the smelting company on behalf of northern Manitoba, I would ask the Minister if he can

indicate what action his department has taken in regard to a problem that is more germane to the government's activities and that's regarding the supply of propane to the community of Churchill. Can the Minister indicate if a contract has been signed with Steel Gas Limited for the supply of propane to the community of Churchill, and can he indicate what the price differential was between that contract and a proposal which was put forward by a local entrepreneur in the community?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, first of all his accusation that we have not made presentation to the Alcan Corporation regarding Manitoba as a whole is wrong as far as northern Manitoba is concerned. In fact northern Manitoba has been looked at for years from the point of view of the port being there etc., but there are some economic problems to being there.

Mr. Speaker, I will only answer his second question this way. The honourable member sat in an office opposite mine when my staff went over the whole situation of the contracts for propane in Churchill. It was explained to him thoroughly at that time. I'm not quite sure whether the contract has been signed or not and that's why I'm not going to say today, or whether I will release the prices because I won't do that until the contracts are signed. But the honourable member, when he left that room said, well if it doesn't go to the Locker contractor I'll have to make a public issue out of it and obviously that's what he wants to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, well, I certainly do want to make a public issue out of it and I have and I will continue to do so because I think the government has been wrong in the way they have proceeded with that contract. At that time when I left the meeting it was indicated that contract would be signed shortly. Is the Minister now indicating that his government was unable to complete the negotiations as per they had outlined to me at that meeting and that contract is still unsigned? Are they that inefficient in his own department?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I don't know. Maybe I'm the inefficient one but I will find out if it has been signed.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. I would ask the Minister if he could advise if he has received any information in regard to serious problems or conflict between medical doctors at Neepawa that seems to be developing at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been. I understand that it's under discussion between the board of the hospital and medical personnel with some assistanceship and counsel, I believe, from the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue those questions I put earlier to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and ask him if he can indicate whether any other provincial government suspended the allowance of loans or the installation of urea formaldehyde prior to last Wednesday?

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend will have to get that information from other governments, not from me. I'm not aware of what their actions are.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether in view of the fact that there were some 42 inspections done in the past year in Manitoba, nine of which were found to be hazardous, some 21 percent, didn't the Minister feel, prior to last Wednesday that it might be necessary to suspend loans for that purpose?

MR. JORGENSEN: In those cases where difficulties were experienced, the contractors were contacted and I believe in four out of those nine cases at the present time the foam has been replaced, and I think that the other five are in the process of being replaced.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Minister whether these installations are completely banned in Manitoba at this point in time or whether it is just that the provincial government is suspending loans for that purpose?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the use of the urea formaldehyde foam has been banned by the federal government. We are suspending loans in this province.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of his announcement that the retail prices of milk will be deregulated at the first of the year, could the Minister indicate the reasons for his allowing the deregulation to begin prior to having the cost of production formula in place in setting the price to farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as the member should be well aware, the pricing mechanism or the pricing system for milk is controlled by the Manitoba Milk Price Commission which is under the direction of Dr. Clay Gilson who is the Chairman, and consumer representative board and that was a decision of theirs and not one of mine as the Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, during debate, during the last Session on the bill that the Minister proposed dealing with The Milk Prices Review Act in changing the formula, the Minister indicated that he certainly would not want to see any undue competition in the market-place for fear that some industries might go bankrupt. That was one of the

reasons that he gave, that he would not take out of the Act the powers to set maximum and minimum prices. Now he has gone ahead and deregulated the price of milk prior to giving some protection to the producers of putting their cost of production formula in place. Can the Minister, is he not concerned, that the producers will be dealt the unfavourable comment of being used as a scapegoat for any changes in retail price of milk in the province while they are not now protected by a cost of production formula which is non-existent?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the premise of what he has suggested was part of the debate last year when the Milk Control Commission was being put in place or established. I do believe it was a positive move by the government in the best interests of the consumers and of the dairy industry to get on with the job of allowing the producers to be paid fairly and equitably through a formula system which I understand is in the process of being set up by the Commission, it is actually taking place at this particular time, the establishment of a formula.

I am sure the member is aware, the 1st of November that the producers did receive a five cent per litre increase in the price of milk which I'm sure that they had asked for many months before and they now see that as being a real move to support the dairy industry and at the same time, the Commission have moved to allow the retail price of milk, or will, on the 1st of January, to reflect more the market-place pricing at the same time it is being done on a trial basis monitored by the consumers of this province. So I think it's a reasonable move, one which we feel is in the best interests of the consumers and the dairy industry. And along with that, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's out of line with what is happening in other parts of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell us what kind of a monitoring system is being set up by the Prices Review Commission throughout the province to monitor retail prices of milk when they are deregulated and how is this going to affect the producers who yet, to this day, do not have a cost of production formula in place?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a very positive move was made by this government to enable the producers to achieve what it takes to produce milk and at the same time acting responsibly for the consumers. And now he asks the question, how is the monitoring process set up. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and the Commission could better answer this but it is my understanding that they have contacted the Consumers Association of this country to work with them to monitor the prices of milk in all parts of Manitoba, and they've said that it's on a trial basis for one year but at any time they have the authority to move in and either roll back or peg milk prices in this province, something that the consumers, if they feel they are unjustly treated, have the ability to make their appeal known and be heard, something that they haven't had the chance to do except at public hearings under the last government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is a positive move in the best interests, as I said earlier, of the consumers and of the dairy producers of this province, something that has been long needed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Education and it concerns the report that he has admitted having received and will not table for the House. Can the Minister confirm that this report was produced by the Educational Finance Review Committee that he announced during his estimates this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is confusing a committee that has been in existence for some time called the Advisory Committee on Educational Finance, that reports to the Minister of Education each year on financial matters that affect education. That committee is made up of representatives from the educational community. He is quite correct that they do report each year.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. No, I am not confused and I think perhaps the Minister is. The Minister announced during his estimates of this year that there was a committee set up to look into educational finance called, "The Educational Finance Review Committee". I would like to ask him whether that is the committee that has produced this report that he refuses to table in this House.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, just further to what I was saying, yes there are two committees. There is the committee I have just referred to previous to the Member for St. Vital speaking again, and a committee within my department that worked on a general study of educational finance in this province, and certainly as I indicated to the Member for St. Johns, earlier, that committee studying educational finance in the province has completed its study.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to inform the House who were the members of that finance review committee.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no problem giving the members that particular roster of people from my department who work in the finance wing in particular. Mr. Bob Dalton, Mr. Dave Bell, Mrs. Iris Maurstad, Mr. Bert Bestech, were the chief members of the committee.

MR. WALDING: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether his Advisory Committee on Education Finance had any input into the preparation of the educational report he has referred to?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I can inform the honourable member that some of the people who I

just named previously also sit on the other committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Time for question period having expired, the Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister without Portfolio;

WHEREAS a Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders of the Legislature was, by resolution of the House agreed to on Tuesday, July 29th, 1980, authorized to enquire into matters relating to proposals for the amendment of the Constitution;

AND WHEREAS the said Committee, in its report submitted to the Legislature on December 15th, 1980, recommended that the Committee, not having completed its work, be authorized to continue its inquiry into matters relating to proposals for the amendment of the Constitution;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations Orders of the Legislature be authorized

- (a) To continue to inquire into matters relating to proposals for the amendment of the Constitution;
- (b) To hold such public hearings as the committee may deem advisable;
- (c) To report at this Session of the Legislature.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition agrees, by leave, to let this resolution pass.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, the Honourable Member for Transcona has 30 minutes.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I was commenting on the Throne Speech and on this session in general, I was commenting that I was disappointed that we really weren't doing very much and the performance of the government this morning really just confirms that. This session is one big make-work project leading to nowhere, raising more questions than answering and not providing a forum within which those answers can be given. What we're doing here is we're going to deal with legislation. The only intent of that legislation is to deal with issues caused by the session being called. We are going to deal with legislation which will bar the Member for Wolseley. We bring the session in and then pass legislation to keep a member out caused because we called the session at this particular time.

The other piece of legislation will be one which deals with the mechanics of paying the MLAs for this

particular session but that is pure make work. The only substantive pieces of legislation dealt with are ones created by the session being called right now. If the session would have been called in February that legislation wouldn't have been created, so I'd call that pure make work leading to nowhere. It's a symptom, Mr. Speaker, that the government has started this session exactly where they left off last summer, as bunglers, as compete bunglers. We aren't getting the reports promised, we were promised that. We aren't getting the legislation promised, we were promised that. Why announce the session with great fanfare in October, come here and have nothing happen. It was our intention to come here to work, we aren't being given that opportunity, we can't even ask specific questions, we can't even get answers out of the ministers. They raised points in the Throne Speech and then refuse to answer them saying, two months from now, three months from now. Well, why call the Throne Speech, raise questions in the Throne Speech and then not deal with them? Mr. Speaker, we haven't been against a fall session, we recommended a fall session in the past. We could have had a session in October; we could have sat here for six weeks; we could have dealt with the Throne Speech; we could have had legislation introduced; we could have discussed the principle of the legislation; we then could have recessed; we could have passed that legislation out to interested parties; we could have debated it; we could have come back in February and dealt expeditiously.

After three years this government still can't get it's act together with respect to running the Legislature. They were the ones who had the supposed experience in governing, and each year it's gets chaotic, each year it gets worse. I don't want to dwell on the episode we had here the other day, apart from saying that I was astonished that the Premier of the province, who hasn't changed his ways at all in three years, would in a sense hurl his invective and play what I call bully-boy politics, not only with peepers but with people on this side of the House but would attempt to play bully-boy politics with the Speaker as well. And I thought that was a disgrace to the Legislature. That type of bully-boy politics doesn't work in here, and it's not working out there with the general public. They don't like bully-boy politics, they're embarrassed by it, not only Manitobans are embarrassed by it, but people right across Canada are embarrassed by it as well. You can look at journal after journal of national repute, the Globe and Mail, Macleans, Saturday Night, look at the articles about our leader, our Premier. What do they say about him? They say that this man is really the worst Premier in the country. And that will change soon, Manitoba will not long suffer the worst Premier in the country. Soon the people will in fact change that, soon they will change that, because they don't like that style of politics, it's confrontation politics, it's the politics of diversion, it's the politics that tries to set up another target so you don't have to deal with the particular issues facing us today.

And Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues facing us today that the Conservative government would like to sweep under the carpet. And you know, when we talk about the issues of today they call that the politics of despair. Well, what we're trying to do, Mr.

Speaker, is trying to deal with the problems of today and come up with solutions for them rather than sweeping them under the carpet.

The Conservative government was elected on a platform of stimulating smaller and medium-sized indigenous businesses in this province. That was the group that they said would flourish and develop if the proper climate was created. And obviously after three years that hasn't worked. We have indication after indication that that hasn't worked. In fact if there was one word that could be used to characterize the Conservative term in office to date it would have to be the word, exodus. We have never had the exodus from this province that we have had over the last three years. Is that what we were expecting in 1977?

We, in fact, said that in 1977, we said if you bring forward this type of an achronistic political philosophy which is a throwback to Herbert Hoover and to R.B. Bennett, we said that the results of that would be disastrous. And we prophesized it at that time, we said change your ways; change your ways, it won't work. But the government was quite insistent at that time and we said the impact will be a severe cutback in services, that happened; the impact would be an out-migration of people and that happened in record numbers, 35,000 to date. We said the impact of that approach would be bankruptcies and a tremendous loss of confidence in the province and all those things have come to pass. You know, I hate to say we told you so but we indeed told you so and when we point those things out today and say you are continuing with the same approach and that will take us deeper and deeper into this mess that you have led us into, you then turn around and say, shoot the messenger. It's as if we had told you if you follow that policy you will go over the cliff and while you go over the cliff, you then turn around and say, ah, you have pushed me over the cliff. We didn't push you into this particular situation that we find ourselves in, you did it deliberately; you followed the politics and the economics of people like Milton Friedman and Margaret Thatcher. I don't hear the First Minister getting up now and praising Margaret Thatcher but if you look at the situation in Britain where they've applied sort of Lyconomics or Thatcher economics there, you find tragic similarities. A high rate of inflation there, an extremely high rate of inflation. What is our rate of inflation in Canada, in Manitoba? 11.6 percent. Highest for the last six years since the time when OPEC quickly and abruptly changed the oil prices.

Obviously what they are doing doesn't impact on inflation, it worsens it. What's our unemployment rate? Our unemployment rate is increasing. Sure we're still third but let me tell you, if you keep those policies up, B.C. is very quickly getting close to us in terms of unemployment rate, we could quite easily find ourselves in fourth place, again, tragically. We said if you look at the bankruptcies in Britain, record numbers of bankruptcies; record numbers of bankruptcies in Manitoba. Same approaches, same approaches in both countries. Discredited approaches, certainly discredited approaches through imperial fact. We didn't bring that about. Oh, no, you can prophesize doom and gloom through stupidity which is exactly what we did. We prophesized that this type of thing would happen; it

has happened. The job now is to turn things around and this government is not the instrument to turn things around because they are committed to doing that which they have done to date.

When you talk about people turning backs on other people, you turned your backs on Manitoba. You were the ones who started off saying that the businessmen would flourish but you turned your backs on them. You cut out the circulation of money within the economy and we have had a record number of bankruptcies. They know you've turned your backs on them, they know that. They are looking for alternatives, they are looking for alternatives. Some of them are looking at the Liberal Party, others are looking to the New Democratic Party but they certainly aren't looking to the Conservative Party in terms of any type of development of business in this particular province. They know that your policies don't work; they can see what happens in Britain as well. They know that those things don't work. What you have done, you have taken some world trends and rather than trying to buck those trends, your policies have accentuated them. You have exaggerated those trends so that what we have now in Manitoba is a worse situation relative to the other provinces than would have existed otherwise. And the interesting thing is that you refuse to look at that carefully, you refuse to acknowledge that your policies have cutbacks at the wrong time and hurt our economy.

Your policies of cutbacks cut back on the economic activity in this province and has led to the increased pessimism. I have never felt a greater sense of pessimism in this province than occurred when the Tribune closed down and that was just a reflection of the attitude that exists in this province. Now I'm surprised that the First Minister hasn't got up and blamed my leader for that closure. My leader got up and was against that closure, spoke against it. The Premier was in favour of it, said that's the way the system operates. Now that adds to the despair in this province, that laissez-faire attitude, that hands-off attitude towards a consolidation of power and fewer and fewer corporate hands. That adds to the despair; that adds to the helplessness, the feeling of helplessness in this province. They feel that there is no way that they can buck those types of trends, that they can buck corporate decision taken often out of this province, outside the borders of this province which hurt us detrimentally because this government isn't prepared to tackle those big corporate decision-makers. The people who suffer are indeed the small and medium businessmen. (Interjection)— They are helpless right now and that's why they are turning against this particular group, that's why they are turning against it. That's why they are looking for other alternatives, Mr. Speaker, and it's our job to deal with the recovery. It's our job to establish some type of order to the economy.

In order to do that, Mr. Speaker, you can't walk away from the problems. You can't try and imagine that they don't exist. You in fact have to deal with them; you have to face them head on. You have to recognize that problems do indeed exist in our provincial economy, problems do exist in the national economy and in the international economy. You have to recognize them and you then try to have to deal

with some type of mitigating programs and policies to deal with that but you people are in fact unwilling to admit and to recognize that problems exist.

Secondly, I think you have to look at the pattern of the problems to see what the pattern is because you can then start looking at the causes, if you're serious about dealing with them. But since you're not prepared to even recognize that problems exist you won't even look for patterns. So there is a difference in approach, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in approach. The Conservatives aren't prepared to recognize problems, aren't prepared to analyze them and, Mr. Speaker, what they've done over the course of the last three years is they've completely emasculated the instruments that might exist, to try and deal with those problems.

They have torn up this government. They have torn up the administration. They have put their own people in certain spots then over the last year the interesting thing is, that their people are leaving this government. Their people are leaving them like rats leaving a sinking ship. They're jumping ship. I asked, where is the Deputy of Industry and Commerce, the Deputy of Economic Development? Remember that executive from Gambles? Jumped ship about three-quarters of a year ago, Don Rogers, went off somewhere, no replacement for him. First he jumps ship after a short sojourn here, secondly they couldn't get a replacement for him. They brought in Fil Fileccia from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to fill in some type of stop gap role, in the Department of Economic Development. But what happened to Fil Fileccia? He jumped ship too. He went off to Saskatoon and we can't get answers from the Department of Economic Development as a result. We can't get answers to some straightforward questions that we've posed.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we shudder to think what's happening in these negotiations that are being conducted with these big multinational firms with respect to possible developments here. We have a Minister getting up and saying, we have no knowledge of the economics of Aluminum Smelting. We don't want to know. We don't know what the homework is. We aren't prepared to deal with them. We will have to wait for them to tell us what to do, where to locate, what hydro rates should be paid, what the benefits should be. That isn't in fact any type of negotiating position to take. You are negotiating from a position of complete and total weakness, Mr. Speaker. That's the Department of Economic Development.

They talk about renegotiating the Western Northlands Agreement. The key civil servant there, Merve McKay, he's left, he's gone to the Northwest Territories. There's no one now acting as the coordinator and the facilitator for the renegotiation of the Western Northlands Agreement. That one's in limbo as well, despite all the rhetoric in this press release Throne Speech.

You go on to Manpower Development, Ernie Enns has left, again the key person there.

We look at Urban Affairs, they talk about the core initiative in this press release, because that's all it is a press release, and if you talk to the other people involved there, they'll say nothing is happening with respect to a provincial position with respect to core initiatives. They don't have any people coming

forward to the meetings. There's always a different person there. They took the Department of Urban Affairs and they put the Deputy into a corner, Dave Sanders, they completely emasculated his position and any back-up staff he had. He's become a laughing stock within the bureaucracy. Now when we have to be responding to an initiative that I think we should be responding to in terms of urban development, we finally got the federal government saying they're willing to put some money in here, we don't have the capacity to govern. So they won't recognize the problems. If other people point out the problems to them they want to sweep these under the carpet and they don't have the capacity to deal with them.

They have taken —(Interjection)— Yes, I want to be positive in fact. I recommended at an earlier session, I recommended putting together your staff. Why would you wait for two years, for example, why would you wait for two years before appointing a Deputy of Health? They still haven't appointed a Deputy of Health. This is the government of management that has reports piling up on the Health Minister's desk, that he keeps secret because he probably hasn't read them either? This is the government of efficiency, that took a situation in 1977 that had some stability to it in the hospital and personal care scene; that just butchered that whole program; that cut back on the hospital program where now we have a situation where yesterday administrators in hospitals are pointing out, yes, people are kept for days and days on end in the corridors. This is competence? This is efficiency?

What this government should do, Mr. Speaker, is build bigger corridors. This government should be sitting down and determining what our objectives are with respect to these large developments. You aren't developing the policy with respect to resource development, you're sitting there waiting for big multinationals to come to you with propositions and you don't have the homework done to deal with them in an intelligent manner. Then when I hear the First Minister get up and say we believe in a buy Manitoba policy, they might use the rhetoric buy Manitoba but really they're practice is sell Manitoba, sell it for dirt cheap. That's right, like Tantalum; like Trout Lake; like the Lord Selkirk; like CFI right now, and we want to raise some questions about that.

We look at ManFor. We want to know what the terms of the ManFor Development are. Who'll do the financing? Is the government of Manitoba going to underwrite it? Is the government of Manitoba going to guarantee the financing while someone else gets the equity, while someone else gets the profit at no risk, is that how these people are going to operate? Because that's the critical question right now. Then who gets the benefit? So we ask the Minister, you raised in the Throne Speech, tell us what your approach is. He can't do it. He won't do it.

We ask about Alcan. What is the approach with respect to Alcan? Is it the position that you are going to, in fact, bring Alcan here, have a smelter in order to link up with other industries, or are you just trying to sell out some power? If you're trying to sell out some power, then what is the hydro rate? Will you people sign a 20 or 25 year contract, such as was signed before, a 60 year contract as was signed before with Inco, to provide Inco with as much power

as the city of Winnipeg uses, but at a quarter of the rate? Is that the type of deal you are negotiating? So when we ask those questions about Alcan, and we have the Minister get up and isn't able to give us an answer then, Mr. Speaker, we get terribly worried about what the direction and what the competence of this government is with respect to what we think the key issue is, and the key issue for Manitoba's future surely is the effective management of the resources which we own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can't effectively manage that which you don't wish to own and that's why the Conservatives can't manage resources. They do not believe in public ownership of resources, yet the public owns the resources. We own the resources. I mean that's our birthright in a sense. By the Constitution, we own the resources. We the people of Manitoba own the resources and the government is the instrument, the trustee of the people, but the Conservatives are terrified. To them that's a type of hot potato. So if they can throw the ownership rights of those resources over to Alcan and have them make the decisions, or throw the ownership rights to the potash over to a multinational corporation, then they'll feel better. They'll have washed their hands of the matter. They feel better. They can't be held accountable, Mr. Speaker, but that's not what the people wish.

The people want to maximize the benefits of a resource, both in the short-term and in the long-term and the way in which you do that on an ongoing basis is to retain and maintain an ownership position with respect to that resource and that's the position that we take, Mr. Speaker. It's completely contrary to the position that they take. As a result they will take something which is the public's and they will alienate it from the public domain.

We take the other position, Mr. Speaker, we're not afraid of public . . . We already start with 100 percent, we're prepared to deal with it from that position of negotiating strength in dealing with any companies.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Tories cook short-term deals what they're doing is they're giving up those long-term positions and they're leading us down the garden path. The reason why I say that's critical, the most critical issue is that once you give away resources for 50 or 60 years you've alienated them from the public domain for a long, long time.

You know, we deal with the second issue, talk about managing the economy. Again, Conservatives don't believe in managing the economy, that's anathema to them. Their position is to withdraw from the economy and let the invisible hand work. Well, the invisible hand has worked for three years leading to exodus, Mr. Speaker. They in fact can't permit a discussion of what should go on. To them it's inconceivable that the government could act as a catalyst in the economy, could organize activity, could try and do things like circulate money within the economy, circulate money to all regions in the economy without denuding the north, without really wiping out the north — and these people don't travel up there so they don't care — they don't go through rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, they don't go through parts of Swan River looking at all the for sale signs in front of all the small businesses in the small towns there, but that's the job of government to act as a

catalyst, to act as a regulator in the economy. They aren't prepared to deal with opportunities that are in front of us, Mr. Speaker. We could be doing so much with respect to transportation, not one word in there about transportation. We could be talking seriously about a steel plant for Manitoba. We could be talking seriously about building rail lines, building the line for the rail line improvement in western Canada, that's a serious proposition that we should be pursuing.

We should be making box cars and hopper cars here in Winnipeg, we have the capacity to do it, but we aren't dealing with that. We aren't dealing with that type of proposition at all. We could, Mr. Speaker, if we had some creativity on the government benches, be talking about electrifying some of the railway lines, but they're not prepared to do that. We have a situation where we have railway lines, abundant power, and a government that isn't prepared to deal with that particular area. We have the situation with respect to public transportation, Mr. Speaker. Here we have an abundance of power; we have a company owned by the people which makes buses; they have to sell their trolley buses to BC; they have to sell them to San Francisco, why? Any word in the Throne Speech, any practical word in this package of press releases about what could be done, how the government could be creative with respect to public transportation. Is there any way in which we could start electrifying the public transit system of Winnipeg? — (Interjection) — Sure it is, it certainly doesn't exist right here. You people have just bypassed it because it would rely on some creativity and some action by the government. We can't turn that over to Edison Company. If there was some way in which the Conservatives could turn over the whole issue of electrification of public transportation to the Thomas Edison Company in the United States they'd do it. And then they'd announce the mega project right then, Mr. Speaker, but since this entails their acting, their planning, they won't do it, they won't mention it, Mr. Speaker.

You look at the economic impact of just government expenditures, Mr. Speaker. They're not prepared to do some very critical things that should be done with respect to hospitals. Look at the complete fiasco that exists with respect to Seven Oaks Hospital, brought about by the deliberate actions of the Minister of Health and the First Minister. Had nursing home cutbacks, look at the pile up of beds, the people in corridors as a result of that. Senior citizens cutback, Pensioner's Home Repair Program — what better time for the Pensioner's Home Repair Program to be activated again and enlarged. We have architects, engineers, contractors out of business, leaving the province never to return again, and these people will not see that the government can be used creatively in terms of its expenditure pattern. That's why the entrepreneurs are leaving them, Mr. Speaker, they're not only leaving the province but they're leaving them. You look at health, Mr. Speaker, and the minister likes to make grand statements about health and medical research.

This is an interesting thing in relation to the constitution where the First Minister tries to give the impression that there is so much agreement between premiers. We have a situation right now where

Alberta has set up a huge medical research fund and they're using that medical research fund to steal the medical researchers from Manitoba. Do we have the First Minister say one word about that? Do we have the Minister of Health say one word about that? No, because they're in the hip pockets of Mr. Lougheed, Mr. Speaker. They'll do anything, Mr. Speaker, a bunch of puppies, pussycats.

A. MEMBER: Puppets.

MR. PARASIUK: That's right, puppets. We have had as we said before, Mr. Speaker, the bias of this government in terms of pushing the profit motive in terms of health care. We don't believe in that. Our alternative, Mr. Speaker, is that profits should not be part of the health care system in Manitoba and we will bring that about, Mr. Speaker. We also say that we should be moving in the area of preventative health care. I would like to see the establishment of a Department of Preventative Medicine. The public health people did a lot of work in the past dealing with communicable diseases. I think we should go now and deal with lifestyle changes, we should use the school as a forum in which to try and communicate to people on that. We believe that approach, we did it with respect to the Dental Care Program, and indeed, speaking about the Dental Care Program, if we were still in office we'd have a universal children's dental care program right across the province. These people haven't had it; that's a positive suggestion. Where is the Dental Care Program? Why have you sat on it? You sold it down; we had an opportunity to do a lot, preventative care. They backed away from it, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many things that one could speak about and there's only one or two minutes left I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I'd just like to switch onto the constitution for one second. There are elements of that constitutional package which are wrong, dealing with the amending formula and should be fought. There are elements of a constitutional package which we believe in. If we don't believe in equalization at this particular state of Confederation, then we don't believe in this country. There are people who believe in a Bill of Rights; some people don't but a great majority do believe in a Bill of Rights. And when people like the First Minister get up and say if you believe in a Bill of Rights you're leading us down the slippery slope to Republicanism, that, Mr. Speaker, is outright lie. You look at John Diefenbaker, he believed in an entrenched Bill of Rights, does he want to get up and say that John Diefenbaker was leading us down the slippery slope to Republicanism? That shows you how the Premier is dealing with the whole issue of constitutional reform. He's trying to build up a confrontation in a way that will divert people's attention away from the real problems facing Manitoba, mainly the incompetence of the Conservative government and the incompetence of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, three years have been a shambles. It was one that was predicted and unfortunately for us all it's come true. We'll change that, Mr. Speaker. And in my final note, seeing as how it's my last speech before Christmas and I have to borrow a line from the Member for St. Vital, and in keeping with the tone of this Throne Speech, I wanted to wish everyone a very mega Christmas.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, first of all congratulations to you and your co-habitant of the Chair, and I wish you well further as others have during the course of this debate.

May I also offer my congratulations as others have to the Member for Minnedosa and the Member for Springfield for their moving and seconding of the Throne Speech debate and their contribution to it. One of the major factors that was noticeable in this Throne Speech moving and seconding was the degree of enthusiasm offered by both the Mover and the Seconder.

Mr. Speaker, before going further may I also offer congratulations as our leader has to the new Leader of the Liberal Party, who, although not sitting in the Legislature, has his work cut out for him outside the Legislature. Anyone who enters public life to devote themselves to it, although they may come under heavy criticism from those of us who are involved in it, do on the other hand receive the well wishes of those of us that have been involved or others who have been involved over some period of time in public affairs.

Mr. Speaker, also the best of the season to the members of the Chamber. This is the last day of our debate and it's two days now only away from Christmas and all of us will be closing down tonight at some point to start preparing for our own particular occasions, whatever they may be over the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, this is a province that traditionally has been pretty strongly dependent on strong family ties and the holiday season means something very special for those who have been here and particularly, I suppose, where it involves more than one generation and any number of generations as a matter of fact, I think that is one of the fortunate aspects of life in Manitoba is that we do have that generational sequence that brings to bear and brings to conscience the special occasions of this time of year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk directly about some of the contributions that have been made in the Throne Speech. I want to talk about some of the contents of the Throne Speech that I know are of particular importance. I think that this year the matters with respect to the economy have probably dominated more of the issues, more of the topics, certainly have dominated the topics that have been discussed in the Throne Speech Debate. In 1980 we had a number of special factors that entered the picture as far as the economy in Manitoba is concerned. Some of the negative ones of course are perfectly obvious, drought and the forest fires and the harvest conditions that reflected themselves, not only in 1980, but will likely do so to some extent in 1981. But I think that we came through 1980 without any excessive long-term damage even though it was a fairly tough year for the agricultural sector. Basically, the agricultural sector though has been left, the base has been left largely intact as a result of the 1980 ravages.

The overall result has been a slight decline in the gross provincial product in real terms but even after drought we are likely to finish the year with growth very close to the mid-point among the Canadian

provinces and higher than Ontario's. For 1981 we can look forward with reasonable expectations to renewed the expansion, but rather than use decimal point numbersd as some are inclined to use in the House, I will simply leave it at that until we can present information that we can more realistically look towards. All major forecasters are projecting that the Manitoba economy will rebound in 1981. Mr. Speaker, I am never inclined to quote the sources of statistical prognostications, whoever they are, because I have found not being one who has practised all my life in that field but one who has had to deal with the results of their prognostications have found that their trying to anticipate to the nearest decimal point can be a fairly dangerous course to chart. You can always tell more looking back than you can ahead when it comes to statistics and I think the sort of stock in trade that many use is that you are quite safe in making these prognostications because whether or not they come true most people, the vast majority, tend to forget some several months or a year down the line what you said in the first place. So I guess that's why we get so many that are attempting to use these kinds of forecasts.

I couldn't help but be somewhat really fascinated with the approach of the Member for Brandon East as he has gone about his stock in trade for the last several months and also in his Throne Speech contribution in this debate with his misuse of statistics.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk first of all — and I'll come back to that — I do want to talk a little bit about the capital projects that have been mentioned in the Throne Speech to perhaps underline some of the comments that were made by the Premier when he spoke last night. He said that there were four basic principles guiding the projects. First, that there should be clear guarantees involved in any such project of the investment and employment they are designed to create in Manitoba.

Secondly, there should be assurances that the private enterprises involved in such projects are capable and well financed.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Like Kasser.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns is helping me along and has made his contribution. Perhaps I would think that a closer analogy might be Saunders Aircraft. The airplane factory, Mr. Speaker, that was so successful to the tune of costing the taxpayers of Manitoba 40 million in that ill-fated venture that they would rather forget across the way.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, that no project should involve any more burden on the taxpayer than absolutely necessary and that means keeping government participation to the minimum consistent with other objectives as a province.

Fourthly, we should work to assure that the total benefits to Manitoba and to Canada of each of the projects that will come forth over the next number of months are being maximized and we can't achieve that, Mr. Speaker, as the First Minister pointed out, by buying Russian equipment that can be made in Canada. We can't achieve that by having Russian engineers doing work that Manitoba consulting engineers can do.

It seems to me, not 10-15 minutes ago, that we had the former head of the Planning and Priorities

Committee of the former government standing on his feet talking about the opportunities for engineers and architects in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, what did he do and what did his government do at the time when they had the decision-making powers to affect these things? They contracted out to Russia, Mr. Speaker. All those generators in the Jenpeg plant, the engineers associated with it, the contractors who were brought in from Vancouver to administer the program of installing the Russian generators that were 24 months out of schedule, over schedule, brought in a plant that cost 100-and-some million, two years late, running up interest charges all during that course of time and he has the gall to stand up and talk about providing opportunities for Manitoba engineers. Mr. Speaker, that is the ultimate. Mr. Speaker, that is what these people who sit across at the present time are going to have to answer for when they go back to the people. We've announced that on the projects, the major capital projects that we have talked about, that there is going to be an industrial opportunity for the development of industry in Manitoba. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to invite the Member for St. Johns to speak because that's his usual habit and if I were him I would get up and do it. He would very likely do it but I am going to hesitate for a moment to see if I can't continue without the interruption from across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Russian turbines are probably a pretty good example to look at the fallacy of the arguments being presented across the way about industrial development. The great problem that the members across the way have is that when they were in government they had no industrial development policy. They had absolutely none and then towards the end, the dying days of their administration, the dying days when the then Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for Brandon East, was also looking after housing, all we ever saw of him in the last two years of his occupancy of that responsibility was his name appearing on housing projects around the province. It's well known that he ran around spending most of his time on housing projects. He hadn't the slightest idea that he portrayed, at least to the House, of what was going on in the industrial development field.

As a matter of fact, while we're on that topic, let's introduce one more example of what happened during that administration, how the Member for Transcona is going to provide industrial opportunity. He's going to provide it by making sure there are things happen in Manitoba. Let's look at one more example and it too relates to the hydro development. This is one of the things that we're after now. We are after as much opportunity in Manitoba as possible. Let's just look at the contrast of what the former government did.

In 1974, they had an opportunity with this new leading edge of technology, solid state conversion, to establish in Brandon, Manitoba, the newest plant in the world, Mr. Speaker, the newest plant in the world that was going to manufacture direct conversion equipment. It was a plant mentioned by — would you believe it, by the Member for Transcona in the last 10 minutes that he referred to the Thomas Edisons of the United States or whatever. Thomas Edison also, by coincidence, happened to be the

forerunner of the General Electric Company. Canadian General Electric offered to the province of Manitoba an opportunity to establish the world's most advanced new plant in solid state conversion equipment, the same sort of thing that the Minister of Economic Development has fostered at the University of Manitoba through Dr. Kinser, and that group who are now working on these sophisticated kinds of equipment, the same kinds of principles involved. But this, Mr. Speaker, was 1974, this was six years ago. The Canadian General Electric Company came along and said we will put a plant in Manitoba that will manufacture the equipment for the solid state conversion of the hydro plant output that is now located on the Nelson River and outside of the city at the Dorsey Station here involved hundreds of millions of dollars in each case, we'll locate it in the city of Brandon and will guarantee you that for starters there will be X-number of employees.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I still have the correspondence that went to the Honourable L.S. Evans on December 16, 1974, in which Canadian General Electric said, "You are aware of the importance of Manitoba Hydro's HVDC order to Canada. Canadian General Electric's proposal will provide 6,000 man years of total employment to Canadians. It will also allow CGE to establish a viable high technology business in Brandon which will employ, on a continuous basis, over 130 Manitobans in 1977 paying salaries well above the average income levels in Brandon. Mr. Speaker, that's the same Mr. Evans that's working for the people of Brandon.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the way may be interested in knowing that plant did not go to Brandon, in case they have looked lately. It's located in Peterborough, Ontario and it is employing in excess of 500 people, Mr. Speaker. They are exporting high technology products, all around the world, and they had the opportunity and they didn't even recognize it when it stared them right in the face.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone seriously believe that these people are going to pay one iota of attention to industrial development in this province? When did high technology get recognized? When did this particular technology get recognized by this province? That doesn't mean that this technology isn't being used in the private sector in Manitoba, it is. It got recognized by the provincial government formerly when the Minister of Economic Development came to the support of a fledgling group at the University of Manitoba and said to them, look we believe in what you're doing, we're going to support what you're doing, it should have been done long ago, it should have been done in 1974 on a scale that would now have had us on a world scale operation, in direct conversion equipment and, Mr. Speaker, it got recognized several years later when the government changed. And they have the gall and audacity to stand up that they have a program? Mr. Speaker, it certainly isn't evident from their track record.

One more quote taken from a letter of December 21, 1974: "Manitoba will support one of the few high technology industries in which Canada currently has a world leadership position." Mr. Speaker, those aren't my words. Those are the words of the people

who knew what they were talking about at the time but could not gain the ear of the government in spite of the fact that they were being reminded every day, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, that that was going down the drain because of their ignoring it, or inability to recognize it — and that is the key factor — inability to recognize it.

Mr. Speaker, so much for the comments from the experts across the way. But let's carry on. Let's look a little more at that track record. Mr. Speaker, the day the government changed, shortly thereafter, the top officials from the former Industry and Commerce Department came to my office as a matter of fact and said, we have been on the skids in the industrial development picture for the last three or four years. And when they came they said they wanted to demonstrate what had been happening and they brought with them all the necessary brochures and props, and these aren't mine, Mr. Speaker. These were presented to the former Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Here's what was happening to capital expenditure in manufacturing in Manitoba. They started out — he talked last night, I heard him say that he was concerned because our job creation thing had gone from 3.2 percent of the new jobs to 2.9 percent and he got on to Stats Canada figures. Well this is from Stats Canada. The Member for Brandon East seems to like Stats Canada. Let me show you what his people presented to him. He sent it back to his department, they presented it to me and this graph will show you that this ends prior to the change in government, in 1977. If you want to get a source further that can be done. It started out at 3-1/2 percent of total capital expenditure of manufacturing in Canada in 1970, when they inherited the government. When they finished they were at 1 percent.

Look what's happening in Ontario and Canada and Saskatchewan all during that period. Don't look at three years. Look at the full eight year period. He recently did a comparison in one of his nice selective comparisons. I say look at his own. He did that, the Member for Brandon East when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, had that graph drawn. That's real performance, Mr. Speaker. That's his graph, it is nobody else's.

Let's look at the rest of them, Mr. Speaker, these other brochures that he was preparing. Let's look at capital expenditures in manufacturing in constant 1971 dollars. Same thing. They start out in 1970, right after they inherited government, in manufacturing, they started out at over 100 million a year and they end up at about 40 million a year in constant dollars, less than half. A gradual slide — well a fairly rapid slide — and then a flattening off during that whole period. Again, Mr. Speaker, he drew those graphs. Those were in his office during the last year and when his former staff came in and said, we've got a problem, I said, you have got a problem. You haven't got a problem, Manitoba's got a problem. How do we turn around that kind of a locomotive that's racing down the tracks, downhill? How do you turn that around? How do you take eight years of disregard to industrial development and turn it around in sufficient time to make any difference in the kind of time periods he's quoting, three years? How do you turn that around that fast?

Look at this one. Capital expenditure percent of total investment by sector. Primary and construction; manufacturing; manufacturing from 1970-73 was 7.7 percent of Manitoba. In the 1974-77 period, the second part of their term they've gone to 5.5 percent, shrunk down there. Now we're talking. You know, he gets up and talks about population shifts. He stood up in the House at one time and said, gross population is not an indicator of economic growth. His words, he said that. What's the only reed he hangs on to now? It's not the unemployment rate. Can you imagine what the attack would be from the experts across the way, if in fact the unemployment picture had gone in the opposite direction it's gone? Supposing there hadn't been several tens of thousands of new employees in the matter of three years. Supposing it had stayed flat, worse still if it had gone down. Do you think they'd be talking about population shifts? You bet your life.

The best indicator of the works and they know it very well, not that it really matters whether they know it or not, because they'll use whatever happens to be convenient tools at their disposal. The major factor is the employment rate. And as a matter of fact, anybody with an ounce of observation capability in their head, knows that you can calculate employment figures much more accurately than you can count population, particularly when you are going on a 1976 census, Mr. Speaker.

However, they avoid that. But let's just stop for a minute and say, what would be the issue? Supposing there weren't 30,000 new employees over a period of three years, there were 30,000 less, can you hear the cries ringing in the Chamber? Supposing it had gone in the other direction?

Let's have a look at another one. Manufacturing activity, value of shipments. Look when the economy in Canada turned up. Again these are Mr. Evans' the Member for Brandon East charts, when the economy turned up in Canada in 1975, Ontario went up, Canada went up, Alberta and Saskatchewan went up. Guess what? Manitoba is still going down. That is real performance. It went right down into — carried right on — the end of this is 1976. I don't know what happened in 1977 but I'm sure the Minister of Economic Development can tell you.

Now, so much for that, Mr. Speaker. In the legalese language, I wouldn't rest my case on those. All I'm telling you is that if you're serious about trying to put any credibility in what's coming across the way from the Member for Brandon East, then perhaps we should stop and have a look at what he presented to himself before he left his office and it was a catastrophic picture. The Minister of Economic Development has been trying to tell this House for the last year or two, this has reversed itself. The manufacturing jobs have turned round. — (Interjection)— If you want to look at that member's own nice little colour chart, you'll see where the jobs were being created. It's all government sector investment. It's not in that manufacturing sector. So what's he trying to mislead the people for? All you have to do is turn around — but he's not going to do it with these make work-projects that he's talking about. He's talking about a 30 million project. Thirty million dollars does not make a dent in that picture; 30 million a year, 60 million a year by the provincial government, does not make even a dimple on that

picture. You either have to have the confidence of the mixed economy system or it's just not going to work. That, of course, is what this government has said and that is what is paying off.

Mr. Speaker, the area in which it's paying off is the area that they have difficulty recognizing. I even heard the Leader of the Opposition stand up in this House and say that in the field of mines and minerals, that it still wasn't performing. The amount of activity in the field of mines and minerals is probably — well isn't probably, it is in constant dollars — feeder drill holes done, all the rest of it, investment, the entire amount is at a higher level now than it's ever been in the history of the province of Manitoba. You don't even have to ask the government about that. You can ask the air carriers who can't hire enough airplanes in the exploration areas of the province to carry the drilling equipment around. They can't get the equipment off the landings.

Mr. Speaker, they'll go to no end to try and portray their doom and gloom picture but let them carry on. That's a good tack for them to be on and I hope they carry on in it continuously. They're doing a good job of digging a fairly big and deep hole for themselves and they're going to find themselves buried right in the middle of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting by all of this that we haven't got a major challenge ahead of us, because we have. Manitoba has always historically been in the position where you had to run in order to even stand still and you had to run even harder in order to get ahead. The only problem is that during that period of the former government, they relied on the initiatives of the Roblin government who had started the major construction projects on the Nelson River, had the Kettle Dam under construction, and carried on piling taxpayers' money into it, and were able to sustain the economy for a period of time and ignore all the rest of the economy of the province while they were doing it, and go along doing their other disorganized things that they did during that eight year period and then ran out of steam at the eight years because they ran out of money and ran out of justification for carrying on on the stimulus of using Manitoba Hydro as a dumping area for large amounts of money. Large amounts of money, Mr. Speaker, which ended up doubling the hydro rates in the last three years of their administration, right in the face of the wage and price controls, Mr. Speaker.

They talk about bringing rent controls back, which incidentally they said they were going to do away with when they were in government. Gave an undertaking to the people of Manitoba that it was a temporary thing, but at the same time when wage and price controls were brought in, rent controls were brought in that government, to show you what kind of a government they were, came in and in a period of two years increased the hydro rates by more than 50 percent, right in the face of wage and price controls? That government that was here before did that. Do they really think that they're going to go back to the people of Manitoba and tell them what nice guys they are, at some point in time, and how lily white and pure they are, without the people being reminded of all those things? Do they think people have memories that are that short, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, they do.

MR. CRAIK: No, I think they're basking in a fool's paradise, Mr. Speaker. In overall terms, during the period of three years, to tell you some idea to get back to these charts, we knew what it was going to take to turn around that kind of a dismal performance. We knew it was going to take time.

The Leader of the Opposition complains about the fact that there has been a repeat of things in the Throne Speech. I'm surprised that he even recognized it. There has been. But let me tell you what it really means. It means that it takes a little while to make these things happen. We started on the Western Power Grid three years ago right now. Within a matter of weeks after the government changed in 1977, we realized that the decision that had been made by the former government to close down the Limestone plant in July of 1977, which they never told the people before the election mind you, because they were an open government. They talk about secretiveness in government, why didn't they tell the people in 1977 they closed down Limestone? We knew that within weeks of the government changing that we couldn't criticize them for having made that decision because the hydro ratepayer couldn't afford it anymore, that there was going to have to be another series of increases to catch up with their debt serving that they'd accumulated with there .5 billion in foreign currency losses and other things that they had played away at. So we decided that there had to be another way around it and that had to be to find a market for the power and that's when the discussions started intensively with the provinces to the west, Alberta in particular at that time, and with the United States. It's three years later, Mr. Speaker, and that's how long it takes when you undertake large projects like this, you don't do these overnight and we're probably, even at this point in time, achieving somewhat of a track record in getting the programs under way at this point in time.

But, Mr. Speaker, without them to stand up and say that you can justify further power development without having a market for it and if you haven't got a market for it, then I think maybe whoever wants to go ahead with it should be honest with the people and tell them that again they're going to be able to double the rates of the power consumers of this province, because that's exactly what would happen. The minute that that government of that day had decided to go ahead with the next phase I don't think they knew, well it's obvious they didn't know, they never did know what the impact on power rates was because they used to laugh about it. The Member for St. James, the Minister of Community Services used to get up in the House in Opposition and they literally laughed on this side, and he said what about the power ratepayer? They literally laughed. They never did know what the impact was on the power rate. But they found out in the election of 1977 that they're not going to get away again with promising these mass projects without also telling the people, before the next opportunity arises, when they have to face up to some of the answers to the panaceas that they're presenting, the impact of the panaceas they're presenting. They're going to have to stand up and say that if they go ahead without a market it's going to double the power rates in

Manitoba. You'll not be paying 2.2 cents per kilowatt hour, you'll be paying 4 cents per kilowatt hour by the time you've completed it unless you find a new market.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to let that happen but we're convinced that we can achieve the benefits of harnessing renewable resources without putting it all at the feet of the ratepayers in Manitoba. That's what happens, I'd like to think that's what happens, when you have a government that is prepared to look beyond its own boundaries and raise its sights on some of these projects, raise its sights so that we can not only get the development that is required to develop and harness the renewable resources, but get the spin-off development.

The full intention of this government, Mr. Speaker, is, if and when the projects move ahead on the Nelson River, that the equipment that is going to be associated with that, which is massive amounts of equipment in the direct conversion field again, the same opportunity that presented itself in 1974 is not quite there but it's still there and this time, Mr. Speaker, there's going to be enough foresight to try and establish a Manitoba industry that can capitalize on that, and that plant, Mr. Speaker, if we have anything to do with it at all will go back in Brandon, Mr. Speaker, it will go back in Brandon.

MR. SHERMAN: Possibly not in Brandon East, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there are other recommendations and suggestion in the Throne Speech that have been criticized by the members opposite. The one glaring thing that does come out of their criticism that I think characterizes mostly what I perceive as being a shift in the grounds of the Opposition, is that they used to operate from a basis of principle and there are no solid principles emerging from them this time around. Mr. Speaker, they're attacking, they're critical, they're running down the province of Manitoba, they're on the doom and gloom kick. The Leader of the Opposition most resembles a person I remember when I first came into this House and I will refer to him directly, Mr. Molgat, who is now a Senator, the Leader of the Opposition comes the closest to representing what we came to know as the Molgat syndrome over a period of time, which effectively destroyed his position as a viable alternative in order to join government, to take the government side. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition at the present time has all the same characteristics. Perhaps in due course, Mr. Molgat being a man who I respect personally but became extremely preoccupied with the negative attack, destroyed his only opportunity to have ever formed the government of the province of Manitoba. The NDP at the time did not win it, the Liberal Party at that time lost it, Mr. Speaker, and they lost it because of their predominantly negative attack and that is basically what they have. At the present time they're running down the province of Manitoba, they have nothing good to say about it, and people will take so much of that but then it will stop.

Mr. Speaker, there have been other leaders, there have been other leaders in this House who have got caught in the same trap and I recall one of them

being referred to as the Member for St. Johns, I don't listen to him very often, but I recall one time when he was sitting on this side of the House and in a great rage he stood up and he said to a member across the way, you are our greatest asset. Mr. Speaker, that was a fairly telling remark, as I say it's one of the few ones that maybe I recall him having made during his period as a member on the government side. But he said it and when he said it most people in the House knew that it had a lot of meaning to it. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is falling into the same trap, he's telling too many lies, he's distorting too many facts, he's using too many misleading statistics, Mr. Speaker, and he'll get away with it for awhile, he'll be able to crank through his statistics, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — that's right, Mr. Speaker, and it'll wash for a while and they'll be documented in due course and when the day comes that it's required to do it the case will be made. (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface is getting somewhat exorcized but it's not too hard to document it. But the series that is occurring with the use of their statistics, in particular, are not going to wash in the long run but what more particularly is not going to wash is the performance record that they had in government when that time comes because mostly they're the same old gang, they haven't really got any new ideas, they're mostly the same old gang despite the fact that one or two or more may not be with them the next time around, but basically they're the same old gang that was here before.

Mr. Speaker, we had a number of other things that I wanted to speak about. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've referred before on many occasions to the lies, damn lies, and NDP statistics in that order of worsening. Mr. Speaker, that's the sort of thing, the stock in trade that they dwell in, day in, day out, and if you want chapter and verse it can be given to you. And at some point in time it will be, it'll be presented to you. In the meantime, if you insist on getting caught in the syndrome of running down this province which you're attempting so hard to do, this leader is running down this province, this Leader of this Opposition has said more things detrimental to the people of this province, not to the government, Mr. Speaker, but to the people of this province, more things than he is going to be able to escape. Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I know my time is finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all, to thank you and members opposite for an opportunity to make a contribution to this debate, and I say that in the context of the time that was lost during the Throne Speech Debate on, I guess in the considered opinion of some, more important matters, and we find ourselves in a position where not all members are going to be able to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. I also want to take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you on again assuming that important role as the impartial chairman of our Legislature. Although when I make those comments, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate because I recognize that you were so severely threatened in

that role only a few days ago by the First Minister. The admonishment, the open threat that was directed at your position, Mr. Speaker, is something that I have not witnessed in all of the years that I have sat in this Legislative Assembly. It is the first time in my memory at least that that has occurred in the way that it did occur, and it's a reflection not on you, Sir, but it's a reflection on the government and indeed the Premier of our province that he should have resorted to that kind of tactic in order to achieve his desired results at that particular time, something that I hoped that we would not have to deal with ultimately and fortunately for all of us, and I suppose in particular you, Sir, that the matter resolved itself before you were in a position of having to either bow to the demands of the Premier or to vacate your position. It seemed to me that we were very close to that kind of a situation at that time and I have to say that my sympathies were with you, Sir, at that time because I believe it was an untenable position that you were in.

Mr. Speaker, in perusing the Throne Speech I find that we have a document here which very much demonstrates that the government entering its fifth session is indeed in a very desperate position and that, Mr. Speaker, is very well identified in every page of the Throne Speech. If you just take a moment or two to read it through and examine what it is suggesting that the government's position is, one cannot help but recognize that there really is no government position with respect to meeting the needs of Manitobans today and indeed the challenges that face Manitobans tomorrow, namely, in the area of the economy and in the area of energy, and that is something that is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, because the government is indeed on the even of an election — I say on the eve in the sense that the government is in its home stretch, so to speak, even though it may carry on for another year and a half or so, but in essence, I think it's recognized by all that we're in the final phase of this particular government, Mr. Speaker.

The government has not found answers to the economic ills of our province. The government in its Throne Speech refers to the statistics in a way in which I think ought to be embarrassing to themselves because their choice of statistics in their presentation, and that applies to all members that participated in the debate, were so selective as to be embarrassing, Mr. Speaker. All the important indices were not alluded to, the ones that truly reflect on what the economy is doing. The Minister of Finance picked on one area this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, where he saw some area or some opening where he might be able to reflect negatively on the previous administration and he chose to do so, and he dwelt on it, Mr. Speaker, because that is the only thing he's got, and that fully demonstrates the problem that faces members opposite. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance and members opposite in the course of the last several days have talked about the manufacturing industry in Manitoba as compared to Canada as a whole and the amount of tonnages shipped out of the province and so on, compared to the rest of Canada or the Canadian average and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what they didn't say is that the main reason for the shift, a negative shift as far as

Manitoba is concerned with respect to output in manufacturing and indeed in shipments, is the fact that we have had a massive devaluation of Canadian currency and the more devaluation we have, Mr. Speaker, the more we will be able to manufacture and export to other parts of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall the members of the Conservative Party in Canada when John Diefenbaker was Prime Minister, talking about the need for a lower dollar in order to create stimuli for the Canadian economy in order to give us some advantage, a competitive advantage in terms of world trade. So let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, that today we have a dollar that is trading at 20 cents below the U.S. dollar. As of yesterday, it was 20 cents. That is, if you went to the bank and wanted to get some American money, you would have to pay a premium of 20 cents on every dollar. So you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what advantage that is to Canadian exporters, to the Canadian manufacturing industry. It's a tremendous advantage, and I know that in Selkirk that if the Canadian dollar was at par with the United States dollar, that we would have massive layoffs at the Manitoba Rolling Mill, a subsidiary of Dominion Bridge, Mr. Speaker. We would have a massive layoff at Sault Ste. Marie and throughout the Canadian steel industry if the dollar was at a par with the U.S. dollar. But the fact that we have such a difference in currency gives us an opportunity to compete more readily with American industrial people and gives us an opportunity to put our plants to work three shifts a day, 24 hours a day, which has indeed helped the situation in this province and in other provinces in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hate to think of what our economy would be like if it were not for that because we are struggling very much under the present economic situation, but if we had a level dollar I could see mass layoff and serious problems in terms of employment in Canada, from one end of Canada to the other. So, yes, we have grave problems, Mr. Speaker, but the devalued dollar has to a degree rescued us or ameliorated the situation to the point where we can at least deal with it in a reasonable way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech talks about the private sector investment as being the key factor in the Manitoba economy and it's as if to suggest that someone was going to argue that point. I don't believe that anyone wants to argue that the private sector is an important element, an important part of the Manitoba economy or the Canadian economy. I think what is evident, Mr. Speaker, is that the public sector by and through the policies of this government — and I don't believe they will deny it, they have said it openly — that the public policy is to play down the role of the public system as far as investment in the economy is concerned and to that extent they have managed to reduce public involvement, something in the order of 2 percentage points of the Manitoba gross provincial product. Therefore, to the extent that that has taken place, we have had a levelling off or a deepening of the recession that was already upon us and a recession that is largely part of the whole world trend and certainly part of the North American trend of the moment.

So what we had was a government, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, that although they recognized that the

North American economy was in recession they decided that they were going to aggravate that recession somewhat more by withdrawing its role in the economy of this province. That's in essence what has taken place over the last three years, a withdrawal of public support of a public role, an active public role in economic stimulation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is where we differ largely from members opposite and that is that we believe that government has a role in stimulating the economy when other sectors of the economy are sort of falling off or slowing down, that government has to play a counter cyclical role in order to play down the impact of the recessions that hit from time to time by lack of private investment and so on. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that makes a lot of sense that government ought to act as a catalyst, ought to act in a way that would try to shave the peaks perhaps or if not shave the peaks at least fill in the valleys, but you would probably have to do both at times, in order that we have a fairly stable economic situation instead of wide fluctuation.

The Minister of Finance was just at a federal-provincial conference and the most that he was able to present at that conference is some concern about interest rates, Mr. Speaker, but I don't know of any positive suggestions that were made by the Minister of Finance while he was at that conference. In fact, the documents that were tabled here yesterday, or was it earlier today, no, it was yesterday, did not indicate any particular position on his part with respect to what the Bank of Canada should be doing or with respect to what the Government of Canada should be doing about interest rates. So, while it's all right, and even in the Throne Speech, to mention that we have to monitor interest rates, monitoring interest rates is not going to solve the problem of those people in business that are carrying large inventories or have sort of newly expanded or acquired new business ventures and people that are carrying huge debt loads, Mr. Speaker. It's important in the area of new businessmen, new beginners and new farmers, if you like, people that have just established themselves and haven't had a chance to get hit by 20 percent interest rates or 18 or 19 percent interest rates, it's just a disaster, Mr. Speaker, it's nothing short of disaster and the government talks in the Throne Speech about monitoring interest rates.

The government prides itself in the fact that there is something that is going to happen at the Trout Lake ore body, Mr. Speaker. Well, I think it's a reason to be proud, yes, I hope that something happens in that find, but I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Manitoba maximizes its own wealth out of that exercise. Yes, that is the important part, not that it simply provides an opportunity to have other people rate the province of Manitoba and there is a huge difference as you can appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, the resources belong to the people of this province and public policy ought to be such that we maximize the benefits of their development for all the people of this province and not to be raped by international conglomerates who are only in there for a fast buck, to deplete the mine and then to look elsewhere throughout the world for another opportunity. This is in essence the real difference between the philosophy of members on this side and

that of members opposite, Mr. Speaker. It is important in the natural resource field that the public maintain a very important role in their development, Mr. Speaker, and in the distribution of that new-found wealth.

So, Mr. Speaker, in that particular example we recognize that the government has an opportunity or had an opportunity to retain a large share of that particular operation but has chosen to play a very minute role compared to what its opportunity was, very much along the same lines as the Tantalum situation where the government didn't take up an option which would have given it much more benefit, which would have resulted in more revenues to the people of Manitoba as a result of that development. Well, the Minister of Finance talks about gold. Yes, even gold, Mr. Speaker, we must have it. If we must have it, I would prefer that it be developed in such a way that all the people of Canada maximize their advantage from its development.

Now the Throne Speech alludes to the government's intention of further developing ManFor the Manitoba Forest Products complex at The Pas, but if you look at the wording, Mr. Speaker, it isn't an indication that the government is going to be aggressive in trying to provide greater opportunities for employment at The Pas. It looks to me very much like the government is looking for a way to unload the complex but in a way that would somehow pacify those in Manitoba that have taken some pride out of the fact that the people of Manitoba have a resource and that they are extracting that resource for the benefit of the people of Manitoba in the best way possible and that, Mr. Speaker, is through the people of Manitoba owning and extracting that resource themselves.

They are prepared to compromise that, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to members opposite, that is not in the best interests of Manitoba, that if we are going to have an expansion it ought to be in such a way that the province of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba benefit most. Now I know the Finance Minister or the Premier would argue that, well, we will only invite other interest groups if it means creating more work. Mr. Speaker, if you read the wording in the Throne Speech, they talk about examining ways to meet the need for additional capital. Does the Minister of Finance not know how to find capital? If he doesn't, he's the first one in the history of this province that doesn't know how to find capital to expand the forestry complex. He would be the first one in Manitoba's history that doesn't know how to do that. So, Mr. Speaker, that tells me that he wants somebody else to do it and he wants to unload his responsibility to the people of Manitoba in the hope that he can throw away the interests of the people of Manitoba in favour of another venture which can only succeed at public expense because the public has paid a high price for that particular facility, much more than what it is actually worth, and we all recognize that and we needn't go into the history of that although it is something that it would be of interest to delve into for some period of time. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the government's commitment in that direction is nothing more but a means of selling out the interests of Manitobans.

The Premier also talks about additional generating capacity but tied to market. Now, Mr. Speaker, I

don't know that I want to argue with that. I don't think we need generating capacity if we have no use for it, there is no question about that, Mr. Speaker. But I think that it seems reasonable to look at even firm power contracts and that a firm power contract could possibly pay for the next plant, or the next two or three plants, for a specific period of time after which those plants are returned to Manitobans for their use. I don't rule that out as a reasonable proposition, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that something happens in that at this particular point in time, we could use the economic stimuli that would result from the launching of a major project in northern Manitoba and everyone recognizes the need for it.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province in enunciating an intent of trying to develop greater generating capacity, he places some very important conditions on that development and this is an area that one has to be very careful on, because in announcing those conditions, the Premier alluded to the idea that we are going to give people in Canada, businessmen who want to participate in those projects, an opportunity to participate without being competitive and that is something that I think would not be in the public interest, Mr. Speaker. And I know that the Premier throws that in because of the history of hydro development and the fact that in the '70s the Russians came in with a bid on generators that was so low that it was impossible to resist, notwithstanding the fact that it was going to be at the price of Canadian or American labour input and engineering input, Mr. Speaker.

But given that as it is, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that we cannot give an advance commitment to anyone in the private sector, that no matter what your price is we will pay it because you are located in Manitoba, or because you are located in Toronto or in Vancouver. That's a blank cheque approach to business, Mr. Speaker. And I don't believe it's in the public interest to give notice in advance, that regardless of competitiveness we are going to spend that dollar in Toronto, or Vancouver, or Winnipeg or whatever. Because if that is the case it amounts to a direct subsidy to that particular industry. And if we need subsidy then say so and give them a subsidy and justify it, Mr. Speaker, but this is not the way in which it should be approached. Competitive bidding is important and it keeps business people on their toes and it seems to me that that principle ought not to be lost sight of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the desperation of this government can be found in the paragraph or two that alludes to the possibility that we might have an aluminum plant in Manitoba. And, you know, given the fact that all of the members are aware of the fact that it is merely a feasibility study, and that it's at least two years before the Alcan people could determine whether they have a viable proposition before them in Manitoba; and given the fact that they are exploring other locations in Canada for that particular site, Mr. Speaker, for that particular plant, it seems to me somehow misplaced in a Throne Speech. Unless of course, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is admitting that he has nothing to offer and therefore he's got to offer rainbows that may or may not materialize and that pot of gold that may or may not be there.

You know, is Rene Levesque going to have in his Throne Speech, at the next Session, that the aluminum people are going to establish the same plant in his province? You know, I think that's what we have here, a proposition that is possible of being part of any Throne Speech in any part of Canada. And if you look at the requirements of Alcan, you know, they talk about infrastructures, such as roads and sewage; they mention the need for a port facility. Now I don't know whether the Premier wants to build a canal from Churchill to within 60 miles of Winnipeg, wherein this plant is supposed to be located if it's built in Manitoba. Maybe that is what he has in mind but he hasn't said so, Mr. Speaker, in order to make it attractive for Alcan to locate in an area within 60 miles or kilometres of Winnipeg, having a port facility and rail facility and so on. I don't know what the intent is, but it seems to me it's a degree of desperation and it's so much demonstrated by having it in a Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's deal with the other question. The establishment of an industrial benefits group. Now that is common sense. Who says anything is wrong with that? That's common sense. But you know it wasn't common sense, Mr. Speaker, when we were the government and we instructed our institutions to buy products made in Morden by the food company in Morden, Mr. Speaker. There was a debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, because members opposite alluded that the patients in the Selkirk or Brandon mental institutions might prefer Heinz Ketchup to Morden Ketchup, you see, and that we were denying them their option, we were denying them their option, Mr. Speaker. And now we have here a paragraph that suggests we need an industrial strategy, and in that strategy we're going to have an industrial benefits group that will report to a Cabinet committee on economic development, and they will be responsible for negotiating the highest possible levels of Manitoba and other Canadian content in major projects. That makes an awful lot of sense, Mr. Speaker, but it took them three years of government to realize that we knew that years ago. It took them three years to put that kind of idea on paper, Mr. Speaker. But a few years ago they didn't want Morden to supply the Brandon Mental Hospital; they didn't want it to supply the Portage Home; they didn't want Morden Foods to supply the Selkirk Mental Hospitals or the general hospitals throughout Manitoba, because they felt that was intrusion in the marketplace that was not in keeping with our free enterprise system.

We've come a long way, even they have learned something, Mr. Speaker, in three years. Yes, they have learned something.

The Finance Minister talks about the abdication of principle, Mr. Speaker. That is a good example but I compliment him for it because it makes sense, and has always made sense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture isn't here and he had reason to make mention of need to improve legislation with respect to ownership of land, about plugging loopholes. Well the loopholes that he's plugging are the ones that he himself created only ten months, eight months ago. And it was pointed out to him at that time that when you compromise the legislation in the way that he did that the inevitable result would be that anyone could

buy land from anywhere, it's a matter of setting up the legal mechanisms to do so. And now he finds that is a problem and he wants to deal with it as if it was some new thing that has come on the scene that has to be dealt with. It is really an admission, Mr. Speaker, that he has not been able to control the situation under the legislation that he introduced only a short time ago.

Now the Throne Speech deals with the question of the City of Winnipeg and the centre core, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me that there is an area of great need, not only in the centre core but throughout a number of areas of Manitoba, pockets, but the centre core of Winnipeg seems to me ought to have, well it has to have a tremendous amount of government involvement and input along with the City of Winnipeg. But it seems to me that there should be a social-economic study done by the Province of Manitoba, perhaps in co-operation with the Government of Canada, to come up with sort of strategy that would deal with the hard core problem. It is not going away no matter which government is in power in Manitoba. I don't believe that we dealt with it adequately. I think it has worsened since the new government has had the responsibility, Mr. Speaker. And it is a problem that is growing, it is not going to go away and it is going to cost Canadians, but certainly Manitobans, huge sums of money if we don't grapple with it, much more than if we deal with it at the present time. And it is a problem of such magnitude that, you know, one can't find ready answers to. But it certainly has to be tackled in what I would call a grand scale if we are to at least make an important dent in the situation that we have in the centre core of Winnipeg. And it has to do more with the people themselves, their attitudes, their lifestyles than it does in bridges and streets, Mr. Speaker. Putting in some new buildings and some bridges and streets isn't going to do very much there. There is a major undertaking that has to be taken in order to rescue, Mr. Speaker, and put into the main street of Manitoba's economy those people that find themselves living in that area.

The Throne Speech complains, makes mention of the fact that the Government of Canada is somehow retrenching on its commitments to the provinces on cost-shared programs. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you that the Government of Canada has been severely criticized by every Conservative administration in every province that has a Conservative administration, with respect to its deficit. Yes, every year, the chant — and it was led from our Premier, Mr. Speaker, three years ago — the chant was to get that deficit down, that the Government of Canada was irresponsible. Yes. But whenever the Government of Canada trims its cloth, Mr. Speaker, and it impinges on the people of Manitoba, or on the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba reacts. They're doing the same thing there as these people have done to the people of Manitoba for the last three years. Mr. Speaker, that kind of thing doesn't wash.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are important areas that members opposite ought to be addressing. Mr. Speaker, we are, at a time in Canadian history where we have to face up to major economic crises, and in particular a major crisis in energy. And it seems to me that there are a series of important questions

that have to be addressed. Among them, Mr. Speaker, has to be a desire on the part of all Canadians in all the provinces, to rationalize their railway system in Canada, in particular in western Canada, a problem that has been with us for so long and has aggravated so many people, particularly in the area of agriculture; the grain producers, the livestock people and so on and it seems that we can never get to the bottom of that question. Only because governments have been afraid to face up to the vested interest groups that are in control, in control of the railway system in Canada. And it seems to me that it's time, so they say, we should bite the bullet — that's the expression, Mr. Speaker — and we should take a position on railway rationalization, to take out the duplication. Yes, even if that means integration of the two railways into one, Mr. Speaker. Yes, even if it means that.

We have to gain more public control, in fact, public ownership of all our energy resources. PetroCan is just tinkering with the system, Mr. Speaker. But anybody with an ounce of brains will know that if you have a serious energy crisis that you ought to be in control of it, Mr. Speaker, and you ought to control it by owning it and directing its use. That there isn't room there to be taken advantage of, to allow excessive profiteering. How can we allow excessive profiteering in energy, Mr. Speaker, when we recognize that the costs of energy are going up so dramatically every few months, and has such an impact on inflation, has such an impact on the standard of living of our people. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't hear anything from members opposite about how to develop energy in a way, and how to control its use that would minimize its negative effect on the people of Canada, the people of Manitoba. We only hear the screeches and howls about federal intervention by not allowing the oil companies as high a margin profit as they have been accustomed to, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's the cry from the other side, that we are going to chase away our drilling rigs is the cry from Joe Clark, unless we do something. Unless we give them what they want, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this country should have never allowed itself to be in a position of being blackmailed by anyone in the energy field. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it's not hindsight, it's common sense.

Mr. Speaker, there are right-wing philosophies in governments throughout the world that have nationalized their oil, but somehow that fails to impress my friends opposite. So it seems to me if we're going to do something meaningful in energy we ought to own the energy resources, we ought to develop them for the best public advantage, and we ought to control their use. The members opposite talk about the need to push prices upward in order to conserve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't subscribe to that philosophy. I admit that there's room for part of that to take place. But as long as we allow anyone to misuse our energy resources, to abuse them, we have no right using the marketplace as a means of conservation because that is crude justice, Mr. Speaker, an penalizes those that can least afford to be penalized. If there are people that have no limit on the use of natural gas or oil in the production of commodities that may not be important to

Manitobans or to Canadians, then it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that someone should inform them that they will not be allowed to further consume these energy sources without regard to the public interest; that if there's an expansion or a new development in areas which are not important to us that perhaps someone should say, no you can't have a permit to consume natural gas for that particular purpose; but if you want to cut some wood and use wood, yes, we have plenty of renewable resources in wood, but you must not do it with gas or oil or hydro or whatever. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not living in Montana, we are living in Manitoba with an overabundance of energy in wood which has been by-passed for a long time, Mr. Speaker, but which can make a strong comeback if you had a regulatory authority that would designate energy use.

A MEMBER: It's hindsight.

MR. USKIW: That is not hindsight, Mr. Speaker. The tragedy is, Mr. Speaker, that we are shipping oil in barrels on tractor trains to northern communities that are surrounded by bush. Yes, and we do it during the winter on winter roads, Mr. Speaker, at a very high cost and when we run out of time, Mr. Speaker, we fly it in. —(Interjection)— Yes, I think we made some progress. But, Mr. Speaker, there's a long road to hoe in that respect. It seems to me that before we talk about conserving energy through the price mechanism that there ought to be some very important decisions made with respect to who uses the energy and for what purpose, and whether it's in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, if you examine the car industry there was no need for the tragedy of Chrysler or Ford or any of the car companies. But the public did not have the gumption to integrate private and public policy. The public did not have the gumption to say to the car companies that by 1982 you must have cars of a certain size, dimension, horsepower, etc. so that everybody would be competitive on the same level and the same plane. They allowed each car company to guess what the market will be, whether it will be the large car or the small car. Yes, it seems to me that public policy, from an energy point of view, should have been to sit down with the car manufacturers and to develop a blueprint to change the method of gas consumption, the size of vehicles. If that is the objective it ought to have been done in a way that they could have all retooled, retooled at the same time and remained competitive, Mr. Speaker, remained competitive with foreign imports, yes. But, Mr. Speaker, we are now reacting to an after-the-fact situation and we have Chrysler pleading with its employees to give them a holiday for two years on pay raises so they could survive and at the same time pleading with the government of Canada for loans and grants and giveaways in order that they can restructure their corporation and become competitive again. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Japanese have a means of working government and industry together much better than we do in that regard, and it seems to me there's a lesson that could be learned from how those people manage those kinds of problems in a better way than we do in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there's another important area and that is greater monetary independence from the rest

of the world economy, and indeed from the United States, that has to be looked at. There are mechanisms that can be put to work. They may not be total and complete but they can be effective enough to reduce the impact of foreign fiscal problems, foreign monetary problems on the Canadian people and certainly on Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, these are the areas that were not mentioned by the Premier in his Throne Speech, and these are the important areas. The arguments over Saunders Aircraft and CFI are old arguments, Mr. Speaker, we have greater arguments and greater need to address ourselves to the real problems that face us today. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all congratulate you in renewal of your mandate, the way you're conducting the affairs of this Chamber, a very difficult job. I promise you as I make my New Year's resolutions that I'll not be more unruly in the year ahead than I was in the past year. May I also express the similar sentiments to the Deputy Speaker. I don't know if any of the honourable members recognize him from time to time relieving the Speaker. I think he does a very admirable job and I'd like to express my appreciation to him.

May I also express the gratitude of the people of Roblin constituency to the new leader of the Liberal Party. We wish him well. I don't suppose he'll have much fun in the Roblin constituency but nevertheless we welcome him to join the fray at any time.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, express I'm sure the wishes of all the members of the House to our friend Ray Sly and wish him the best of health and an early recovery. In all the years that I've been in this Chamber he's been a very important fixture to this Legislature and I certainly miss him around here very much and we look to see him back at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, before I address the Throne Speech I have lost a couple of dear friends in my constituency that I think I should put in the record; the late Mrs. Belle Busch from Shellmouth was buried a few weeks ago. Of course she is the lady that developed the crocus which is so famous to this province and became a symbol when premiers of this province, I think starting from the time of former Premier Roblin, that any distinguished guest that visited our province, or maybe not any, but many distinguished guests were favoured with a photograph or a picture of our flower, and the late Belle Busch was the author and the artist that designed and put those pictures in our libraries for distribution by the heads of state in this province. So I'm sure that as we call her the Lady of the Crocus that the House would join me in condolences to the family of this great Manitoban who did so much in the field of art and developing the crocus.

There's another old gentlemen, Mr. Crossley, an amateur archaeologist, who's been a pillar of the Historical Society in our province; the museum in Grandview is named after him, he lived a good, long life but he did a lot for archaeology, for museums and the preservation of our history and left a benchmark that very few will attain in their lifetime.

So those are two names that I thought should be in the record of great Manitobans, great Canadians,

that had done their best to make life a little better than they found it in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate to the Throne Speech, I became confused from time to time, then the debate seems to get back on team. I enjoyed the remarks very much of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who I think was the first one that I have heard that stood up and made some positive statements on behalf of the Official Opposition and gave us some indication of where maybe we should be going in this province, and I commend him for the attitude that he used in his address and the way he expressed himself.

Mr. Speaker, we have many things to be thankful for in Roblin constituency in Manitoba, Canada. I was pleased to learn today that one of the implement dealers from Roblin, a Mr. Gaber, is declared the Manitoba Dealer of the Year and that includes the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. So you think that things aren't happening in Manitoba, they're not happening in Roblin as the Leader of the Opposition put in, that's Manitoba and Saskatchewan — Manitoba Dealer of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to commend the Manitoba Pool and the Saskatchewan Pool for seeing fit to place the rapeseed crushing plant on the boundary of the constituency that I used to represent or in the boundaries of the new Russell constituency. This is really going to stimulate some interest in that area and create a lot of jobs — there's already people moving in there and setting up new business in Russell already as a result of this announcement of that crusher plant going in there. As that came across my desk the other day I wondered, and I still would like to ask the Honourable Member for Brandon East, what happened to that crusher plant that was supposed to go into Grandview when they were government, where I humbly, and a lot of others, put our own capital dollars into that feasibility study of that crusher plant and we thought we had it, we thought for sure that that crushing plant was going to go into Grandview those days. Unfortunately, and I'll never know, maybe someday in the papers it will be leaked out, that crusher plant went to Hamilton. But the government has changed and there's progress for us for the Opposition. Now we are putting one on the border of both provinces so that the people of Manitoba and Saskatchewan can enjoy the benefits of the rapeseed crushing industry. And if you think that isn't progress, even though the Saskatchewan people are over here drilling for oil, is there anything wrong with putting a crushing plant or them sharing our resources? Not at all. But it shows it's a different attitude that we're gaining from this government than we had from that government, because they left that crusher plant, I'm sure that I will find the answer some day from the Member for Brandon East why he, as minister, let that industry slip out and it went to Hamilton. I'm sure the Member for St. George likely knows why.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I was most encouraged to hear the Premier's narration last night. I'm sure that any Manitoban that takes that speech and reads it will have great courage for the future, great courage for the going into the next year. Mr. Speaker, with that kind of leadership, with that kind of an order, with that kind of a Premier, there's only one place that this province in Canada

can go and that's up. No, that's the kind of leadership, that's the kind of dedication we want from members opposite. And I watch the wishy-washy attitude of the members opposite.

And the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, I watch him, he's tempted at times to cheer us on this side with programs we're announcing and then he'll pull his hand back, but when his own leader gets up I very seldom see him pat his desk. Whether he doesn't like what his leader is saying, and that seems to be the general attitude over there. They're sitting there like a bunch of bumps on logs, they're not sure if they should cheer their leader or which leader but nevertheless there they are spreading all this doom and gloom and not offering very much for me to stand up and speak about today.

Mr. Speaker, Roblin constituency is very happy that the United Grain Growers reported the other day that their crop year profits are up 20.3 million. That's farming, that's our No. 1 industry and there's nothing wrong out in the area. Pool, what do the Pools say? They reported pre-tax earnings of 20.5 million for 1979-80. That figure is more than double than the year before. That's our No. 1 industry, agriculture that's functioning very well, Mr. Speaker. A lot of things have happened in the Roblin constituency since the last year, Mr. Speaker, a lot of things and they are very positive things.

A MEMBER: I hope so.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I can start off with the Provincial Trunk Highway. How many times do I have to tell that story where the former Minister of Highways would build the 20 up to my boundary, pave it, and then the PRs and shut it off as soon as it came to Roblin. We have progressed to a Provincial Trunk Highway now and we've got it almost over to Cowan. That was performance. Why would those people in Camperville be denied a paved road I would never figure out but the former government, the former Minister of Highways, as soon as he came to my constituency, he shut it off.

Sewer and water, Mr. Speaker, is also going into the village of Camperville. That didn't happen when the members opposite were government for some strange reason. In Ethelbert there is a health unit gone in there with an ambulance and a nurse. We tried for years to get some kind of health care between Dauphin and Swan River; members opposite were not able to put any in. At least we've got a health nurse in there, we've got a clinic and we've got an ambulance, that's a start, far more than we got from members when they were government. The drainage programs that's gone on in the Ethelbert municipality and in the Pine River area is something that I wish the former Minister of Resources, the Honourable Member for Inkster was here and the struggle I had with him over the years to get even 50 bucks for drainage. He should go up there and see the drainage that is taking place in that constituency this time. It's a treat to behold and those people are extremely happy of what this government is doing for them.

The town of Grandview celebrated its 80th birthday. Lots of housing starts going on in Grandview, lots of new businesses starting up in Grandview. That community is booming and I know where they get all this doom and gloom from

members opposite. Let's look at the town of Roblin. The first sewer and water system this province has ever seen that's going to use the effluent for irrigation is installed in Roblin today. First ever. No thanks at all to the members opposite, none whatsoever, but there it is in place and that's going to be an interesting development for especially those that are interested in agriculture to watch, to see what can be done with the effluent. I'm sure the pilot project will be a successful one and we're certainly pleased that they are doing it in Roblin.

Mr. Speaker, Roblin is enjoying extensive growth in the business community, their housing starts, the new senior citizens home. Roblin has only one place to go and that's more and more growth. Roblin, today, I daresay is in the 10th or 12th most fastest growing towns that we have in this province and the members opposite over there stand up and say that there is nothing happening with this government? As soon as the Minister of Highways sees his way clear to hook up the Roblin with that Yellowhead route which gives us Trans-Canada transportation and put another layer of pavement on, then we will see further development.

So, Mr. Speaker, go out and look at the parks. We've got ski trails now in the Duck Mountains. I wonder what happened when old members opposite were over there. That doesn't cost very much money; it just takes a little bit of planning and a little bit of dedication. We now have people doing cross-country skiing and there are all kinds of opportunities, Mr. Speaker.

Cottage sites, all kinds of cottage sites are being developed in the Duck Mountains, along the Shellmouth reservoir and people are very pleased. Look at the developments in the Blue Lakes area, at Shingoose Lake and Wellman Lake. One only has to go in there and take a look at it and if the members opposite would come into this, to see and take a look, they wouldn't be standing up and spreading the doom and gloom that we're hearing here hour after hour.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, and it may come up later when we're dealing with it in the Estimates, but I am a member of the board of the Manitoba Telephone System and I should put on the record a few other things that have happened with the Manitoba Telephone System because I sit on the board. I can report gladly that the financial situation of the Telephone System has improved substantially during the past year because we had some problems with the offshore borrowings that took place when the former members were government. It did create some problems to deal with that matter. The foreign debt charges were a difficult one. However, the matter has been resolved, Mr. Speaker, and with the approval of the auditors and that, a system has been set up that the Telephone System can handle it.

Mr. Speaker, 72 million on capital construction was spent in this past year in the Telephone System. The figures show, Mr. Speaker, I think some 3.6 million went towards improving local telephone service to the rural subscribers in our province and that's, I think, a fair amount of progress. The 7,300-some party lines that were on the rural — where there was more — have been reduced. We also saw the openings of phone centres in several of the larger towns across the province, Portage la Prairie, I think,

St. Vital, and a bunch of the mini-phone centres have been set up and they are being used rather extensively. It's very interesting how that new concept has taken the eye of the public, so interesting.

Mr. Speaker, we can move on and tell more things about telephone but I certainly strongly urge the members opposite to take a close look at the project at Headingley and Elie. Those developments have only one place to make in this province in the electronic world, is to grow and grow and grow. It's going to take all the expertise and all the technology of all the experts that we have in this province and I expect great things for the years ahead, Mr. Speaker.

I was going through some comments on education the other day and it's interesting that Stats Canada was talking about the graduates from the universities and the community colleges in our province. I don't know why the Member for Brandon East, being an academic, a professor, didn't put these figures into the records. It says here and it comes out of the Brandon Sun, by the way, the article, quotes that, "The employment picture," it says here, "for graduates improved considerably within a year and by June, 1978, the unemployment rate for university graduates had dropped to 8.8 percent." It went on, it said, "However, the drop for community college grads, including people finishing nursing schools, was even more dramatic with only a 4.4 unemployment rate." The article goes on, Mr. Speaker, and it says, "These figures for Manitoba graduates compare favourably with the national averages. The full-time employment rate as of June, 1978, for university grads was the same as the national average, while 5 percent more Manitoba community college students were employed than the national sample." The article goes to say, Mr. Speaker, "Over 90 percent of the community college grads were living in Manitoba two years after graduating and 84 percent of the university graduates remained in Manitoba for more than two years." Now where is all this doom and gloom that we hear from the Member for Brandon East?

Mr. Speaker, I picked up another document and somebody dropped this in my mail today and it's a project forecast for Manitoba. It comes under the hand of the Winnipeg Business Development Corporation. I don't know if the members opposite have heard of this organization but there's their forecast — they say that they project a growth of 27.7 in capital investment in Manitoba manufacturing in 1980. Now, is there anything wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? It says it was 24.6 last year. It means for the period of 1979-80, a two-year growth of just under 60 percent in that industry, the largest single growth rate of any province in Canada. He goes on, Mr. Speaker, and lists the many projects that are going to take place in the ensuing months and they are an interesting list. So where is all this unhappiness, this doom and gloom that I hear coming across in most speakers opposite?

Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry, this is interesting coming out of the last edition of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, what they are projecting, especially if we use the fishing season in the wintertime more extensively than we have. We have a lot of experts over there in the fishing industry.

Strange, but a few comments by Bill Bennett who is the board member and he says, "Last year we did make progress. Winter production increased by more than 5 million pounds over the previous year and we are able to take advantage of important sales opportunities but we still have a long way to go." But, nevertheless, that wasn't the attitude of Mr. Bennett before. He goes on to say, "The matter is in the hands of the fishermen, they are ones that can turn this situation around." I agree with him most wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, the clock is moving on. Before I would like to put a couple of comments into the record about the constitutional debate that is taking place across this country, in this city and in towns and villages, it's the discussion of coffee shop people as to where the people should go and where we should proceed, whether the Constitution should be patriated, I became very excited when I picked up the editorial of the Grain Growers Guide this September. I don't know if any of the members in the Chamber have read the attitude of the editor of the Grain Growers Guide as to how our constitutional matters are being handled but I do strongly urge, if you have the time, get a copy of it and peruse it because you will find then where some of this vein of western separatism is coming into the picture of the constitutional debate when you read editorials such as that on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Canada or Manitoba has any problems with the people in the Roblin constituency. The people that I represent are strong federalists; we're dedicated Canadians; we're dedicated Manitobans in the fullest sense of the word. We are certainly western Canadians on the other side of the coin and we're certainly going to make certain that our rights are fully protected whatever constitutes.

I find it very strange that this man, Trudeau, has now found that the polls of this country are turning against him. I understand the poll the other day was 58 percent; 58 percent of the people in this country are opposing what Prime Minister Trudeau is trying to do to the Constitution. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's time that we stand up and be counted on which side we're on in this Chamber on this matter. Just two short months ago, Trudeau went in and the averages were completely opposite. I say he's travelling this country and he's telling that the people are with him. The people are not with Trudeau, as I understand it today, because the polls are true and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that he certainly has the NDP on his side in eastern Canada. They still haven't committed themselves in this Chamber as to where they stand but we certainly know where they stand in the east. But I say, Mr. Speaker, we already said, the people of Roblin constituency that I represent will make sure that we have a Constitution that is good for Canada, it's good for Manitoba and it's good for the west. I support the position of the Honourable First Minister and the one he's laid on so skillfully last night.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I know you have to have a vote and I again, Merry Christmas to everybody.

MR. SPEAKER: Rule No. 35(4). At 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, all questions on the motion shall be put. The ordinary time of adjournment as agreed by all members of the

Assembly today would be 5:30, therefore, at this time I would like to put the question on the main motion as moved by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield. All those in favour of the motion?

MR. FOX: Please, Mr. Speaker, would you read the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that an humble address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: "We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present Session.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may at this time once again remind honourable members that during the holiday season the Youth Parliament will be using this Chamber and if there are any things in particular you want in your desks you want to protect I would suggest you remove them.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 3, 1981 at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows on a point of order.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe you will recall over your number of years in the House, that it is customary after the passing of the motion which was just passed, to do four other things: No. 1, Table the Estimates for the House and then followed by the three appropriate motions which should be passed at this time and this, Mr. Speaker, has always been done. I think it only behooves a government to explain this radical departure from a procedure which had been followed. Mr. Speaker, this is something that some of the youngsters in the back row may not recall, may not be aware of, not having been around here long enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I have checked the rules and I fail to see anything in our rule book which calls for that at this time.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, further to the same point of order, may I draw your attention to No. 1, the custom of this House, which had prevailed for many many years, where the Estimates were tabled upon the conclusion of a debate of the Speech from the Throne. There was only one departure from that, Mr. Speaker, and that was by leave and the First Minister will remember that very well I would think. In 1966 there was a departure from that and the Honourable First Minister of the day asked for leave of the House to depart from that practice.

I would also like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, although it is true that the most recent edition of Beauchesne is silent upon the matter, our rules are silent on the matter, but nevertheless in the previous edition of Beauchesne reference is made to the fact that Estimates ought to be tabled upon the conclusion of the debate to the Speech from the Throne. And, Mr. Speaker, another authority which I am sure you will agree we do follow, and if you will refer to the 1976 Edition of Mays Parliamentary Practice, the business — and I am quoting for the benefit of the Honourable Minister of Highways, perhaps he may learn something too — Section 17 of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, Westminster, the business of Supply shall be appointed as an Order of the Day at the commencement of every session, as soon as an address has been agreed to in answer to Her Majesty's Speech and so from day to day during the continuance of the session. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that it is incumbent upon this government to table the Estimates now. Now the First Minister is laughing, to him everything is a joke. The rules of the House are a joke? The First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I point out to the House, in the old edition of Beauchesne, 1958, there is indeed mention made of the Estimates and I would like to read from the second paragraph on Page 201. "There is no time limit under the rules for the Estimates to be brought down", but a Standing Order 55 provides that the Committee of Supply, and Ways and Means shall be appointed at the commencement of every session, as soon as the Address has been agreed to. It is good practice to table the Main Estimates shortly after the Address has been disposed of. They have sometimes been brought down during the debate on the Address. I have listened to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Burrows and I find there is no substance in it.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll complete the motion then. I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 3, 1981 at 2:00 p.m.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands ajourned until 2:00 p.m. Tuesday, February 3, 1981.