

Time: 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has 19 minutes.
The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned for the supper hour I was saying that the farmers and people of rural Manitoba wanted to see the Premier and they wanted him to explain why the Crow had to go. They wanted to know why his Minister wanted to wrestle the Wheat Board to the ground.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to wrestle the Wheat Board to the ground to get rid of it, you can do it in other subtle ways. There are many ways that that can be done, Mr. Speaker, and that is taking place at the present time. There are moves afoot in this province and in Canada that are undermining the role of the Wheat Board at the present time, and one of the leaders is the Minister of Agriculture in trying to accomplish this. It can be done, Mr. Speaker, finally we've got them flushed out in the open. We finally, in the Budget, see there where the government wants to . . . I brought this up in the question period, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why my question was not accepted, I believe it was a legitimate question.

Mr. Speaker, to assure that primary industry remains strong Manitoba will continue to press for improvements in the grain handling system. And I interpret this to mean that this government would like to see rail transportation transferred over to the trucking industry. There are many purposes, you know. This is one way to get rid of the Crow, the Crow rate, and it's also a way to undermine the Wheat Board. And the paragraph itself is contradictory because it admits that this transfer of grain, movement of grain from rail to trucking, will be a detriment to the farmers. And, therefore, this government has to run to Ottawa to obtain funds to soften the impact. That's what this paragraph says. So it's an admission that the transportation of grain from rail to trucking will also assist in branch line abandonment. They will promote variable rates for the railways, that will undermine the Crow rate; and the many branch lines, this is exactly what an outfit like Cargill would want to see happen.

So, I want to point that out, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are concerned. It was brought up at some of the meetings that we attended during the federal election, but we flushed them out in the open because we could never get a clear-cut policy on the Crow rate or the rail abandonment. We were never able to get a clear-cut policy.

So there's also another thing happening, and I mentioned it briefly, that there were a number of meetings being held, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, and I am advised by people, or participants who are taking part in these meetings, that they believe that the meetings are solely for the purpose of undermining the Crow and undermining the Wheat Board. So here again you have another instance where a government wants to shaft the farmers of this province. But at least we've got them out, we've flushed them out in the open and they've put it very clearly in the Throne Speech that they would like to see progress by transferring grain from rail to trucking.

Now I spoke to a farmer in the United States last fall, Mr. Speaker, and when I heard he was a fairly big farmer in North Dakota I started to ask him about transportation because that was the word everywhere around here. Murta was saying get rid of the Port of Churchill and there were others that were attacking the Wheat Board, and so on. I asked him how things were over there and he said, "Whatever you do here don't do what we've done," and that's exactly what the Minister wants to do now is what's happening in the States.

He said that he had to truck his grain now and it was costing him \$1.20 a bushel to get it to the terminal and that they had no more roads left, their roads were shot, that's the words he used. And his last words to me were, "Whatever you do in Canada don't do what we've done because we don't have any roads left." I want to warn the Minister of Transportation, he's the one that's going to get the brunt of this. That Minister there is going to shaft that Minister because he's going to have to provide roads; and the municipalities are going to be shafted by that Minister because municipalities have to build roads and they have to maintain roads; and they're pressed very severely by education at the present time. They have been holding back on maintenance for a number of years because of the high mill rate for the special levy for school taxes, but they cannot hold on any more, they have to move now. So there's going to be a substantial mill rate increase throughout Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring that out in passing in my remarks. You know the federal budget came down hard -- well I'm glad that it's not coming down any more -- but I mean the budget proposed by the Conservative Government, defeated, came down hard upon the backs of the farmers, small businesses, municipalities, school boards, with cruel energy costs, high interest rates and the people said, "Enough, enough of this tough, stubborn, doctrinaire Conservative nonsense - enough," and the Conservatives came crashing down everywhere, except in Alberta. Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to shorten the five-day week to a four-day week. They've seen what happened in Lisgar, they've seen what happened in Portage-Marquette, they've seen what happened everywhere. They've seen the drops, the percentage drops, they've seen that thousands of Conservatives have stayed home and were ashamed to come out and vote for the Conservatives, rather, they stayed home. Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to compress the five-day week, they want to silence the opposition, they want to take away from our question period. That's what they want to do, because there's going to be Ministers crawling all over this province, they know by the results of the federal election. They lost 5 percent in the first year in office, now they've lost another 5 percent, so they're going to be crawling all over this province trying to mend fences again. Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we are being told that we will have to stay here only four days a week.

Mr. Speaker, the budget, the federal budget was a cruel hoax. It proposed a \$90 billion tax on the backs of the farmers, gouged out of everybody in Canada, \$90 billion. Eleven billion dollars in deficit, they said we couldn't live with that, the country is going bankrupt. Eleven billion dollars, that's what we heard here in 1977 from the Premier about the situation in Manitoba. Eleven billion dollars -- it's a coincidence that at the present time there is approximately \$11 billion in taxes owing by corporations that should be paid. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if everybody paid their taxes there wouldn't be any deficit, it would be gone. But that is what has happened, there's \$11 billion in outstanding taxes that is owed by corporations in Canada today and mainly by the multinational corporations and oil companies, Mr. Speaker; and the Budget proposes to hand over \$33 billion to the multinational corporations. Mr. Speaker, they couldn't spend that money if they wanted to. Even if they wanted to find oil they would never be able to spend that kind of money because we're talking about 8, 10 tar sands, there's no way that they can spend that kind of money, Mr. Speaker. So what they are going to do with that money, if that would have happened, of course, is that they would have -- and they've already been doing it -- is that they are buying up the next set of resources, coal and uranium and so on. And they know, they have already given up on oil. Last year they sent \$300 million to the United States for oil exploration. That doesn't do us any good, it's money that they got from Canadians, Mr. Speaker. So they are going to buy up the next set of resources with our tax dollars gouged out of the farmers, gouged out of the citizens of this province.

And ten years down the road, Mr. Speaker, we will suddenly realize that we will have to move to the next set of resources and we will find that these guys own it, and that they bought it with our money. And I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to have to hand them the money to buy these resources we had better develop them in such a way is that we will own them and that we don't have to pay for them twice or three times or whatever the world market is for coal or uranium ten years down the way. That is what is happened today, that is what has been happening in the last few years. The multinational oil companies now are the largest owners of coal and uranium resources in western Canada, and I hear we're going to hand them \$33 billion and they don't pay any taxes. We have all kinds of documentation of how much taxes they pay, Mr. Speaker, it's all in the record. In 1978 Shell made \$153 million and never paid a cent taxes. We're going to hand them over another \$33 billion. And in 1979 their profits increased from 151 to 243 or 263 million and still they don't pay any taxes, Mr. Speaker.

And here's an article that I came across, additional support for what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. There were further concerns voiced in the U of A economist paper, comes from the University of British Columbia from economist John Helliwell, and here's what he says in a recent speech to the Canadian Tax Foundation. He suggests that by 1985 oil industry profits will have risen by a staggering 1,000 percent since 1974. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how many farmers' profits have gone up that high; I'd like to know how many businesses profits, small business, have gone up that high. And he warns, Mr. Speaker, the transfer of such large volumes of profit to the oil industry is even more disturbing because it is 80 percent foreign owned and 90 percent foreign controlled. This means, Helliwell comments, that by the mid-1980s foreign-owned firms producing oil and gas in Canada will be either repatriating large dividend flows or acquiring large new investments outside of non-conventional gas producing sectors, Mr. Speaker.

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here again, Mr. Speaker, is proof of what foolishness, what a cruel hoax, the Conservative government, that has just been defeated, was going to foist on the people of Canada, handing over this massive massive swindle. It was a massive swindle, the most massive transfer of wealth in the history of this country dwarfing the giveaway, and we're still talking about it, the giveaway to the CPR by John A. MacDonald. We're still talking about it, every meeting we go to we hear about it, the giveaway to the CPR. That was peanuts, that was an ice cream cone compared to what that government was going to give and transfer over to the multinational oil companies, Mr. Speaker. It makes the giveaway by King Charles of Rupertsland to the Hudson Bay just like an ice cream cone, Mr. Speaker.

It makes the give-away by King Charles of Rupertsland to the Hudson Bay just like an ice cream cone, Mr. Speaker. That is what we are talking about here. The most massive transfer of all in the history of this Canada, past and future, and it was unacceptable to us as a party, and I would have been questioning my membership in the New Democratic Party if my colleagues in Ottawa had supported that budget. Not, under any circumstances, was that acceptable to us here in Manitoba, on this side of the House; it might have been acceptable to that side of the House, to that Premier that's leading that government there but it's certainly not on this side of the House and my colleagues here. We were opposed to that.

Mr. Speaker, it's a funny thing, the transfer of \$90 billion, and I saw a program on television the other day which said that Canadians were good savers and at the present time they had \$64 billion in savings in banks across this land. Mr. Speaker, the government was asking for \$90 billion. They wanted the entire savings of every Canadian to be paid over in the next three years in taxes and extra costs, on energy costs, not to mention the inflationary impact that this would have had on economy, and so on, and transportation. They were deliberately asking the Canadian people to hand every dollar of savings in Canada - and they would have been \$26 billion short - to come up with the \$90 billion, Mr. Speaker. That was the cruelest hoax.

So we've seen that in Ottawa; we've seen it here, Mr. Speaker, and I'm suggesting that unless they mend their ways this government is going to be sitting on this side of the House and we'll be over there come two years or next year.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Speaker on his return to that high position. I feel that the Assembly is fortunate in having a gentleman of his capability to serve in the partial fashion that he has for this session, as he did in the past two sessions.

I would also congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for continuing in the position that you are. And to the Mover of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with the humane and compassionate attitude expressed by the new member for River Heights, an expression that is so typical of the members of the party on this side of the House. I congratulate him and welcome him to the House, Mr. Speaker, as I welcome the Member for Rossmere and for Fort Rouge. I know that the Assembly will benefit from the presence of these people.

I would also like to congratulate the House Leaders on their appointment, Mr. Speaker. And also to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition because on being confirmed in that position, Mr. Speaker, it seems to have taken a great load from the shoulders of the Leader of the Opposition because you'll notice that he appears years younger this year than he did last, and I congratulate you on your transformation.

I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to congratulate the Member for Inkster on being a man of his convictions, being true to his convictions, and in changing what was just a drip in that ship that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was steering last summer into a genuine leak in December. I congratulate him, Mr. Speaker, for being a man of principle.

I also would like to make a few comments about the federal election, Mr. Speaker. I would say that the real concern is not the fact that the NDP gained two seats in this province and gained some seats across the west; that is naturally a concern to us and that we are not particularly pleased on this side of the House to see that happen, but I don't think that that is

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

the real concern that stems from that election. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the real concern stemming from that election was the cynicism and the hypocrisy with which the Liberal Party approached the people of Canada for re-election.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we are not now going to see a return to the days in federal/provincial relations when the gentleman that used to occupy the seat occupied by the Member for Fort Rouge now, the former Member for Fort Rouge, I hope we're not going to return to the days when he used to receive correspondence to Ministers of this government before the Ministers of this government received that correspondence. That's the type of federal/provincial relations that existed under the previous Trudeau government. And I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we have gone through seven months, the best chapter in federal/provincial relations in the last 16 years, when it was possible to deal with the federal government in Ottawa on a straightforward direct manner and not being concerned about someone doing a number on you.

Mr. Speaker, we naturally are going to make every effort to work with the federal government in Ottawa in a constructive fashion because I'm concerned. I'm concerned that the divisions, the potential regional divisions that might occur in this country can do a tremendous amount of damage to our country in a very short period of time, and we will be attempting to work constructively with that federal government. But I believe that when Prime Minister Clark, on the night of the election said, "Good luck to the country", that perhaps there was more meaning in that statement than is usually carried in a comment of "Good luck."

Mr. Speaker, I also should say at the outset that I hope that the steps that our government is taking to implement the Supreme Court decision, with respect to the use of the French language in the province, will prove to be a constructive step in putting together and helping to hold together the social structure of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the debate and the discussion during this session would be more positive and forthright than we had seen in the past couple of years. I thought that the Speech from the Throne, being such a positive document as it is, would perhaps inspire the opposition to debate the issues and this government's record in a more positive fashion. But my hopes in that regard were shattered, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke yesterday because he is attempting, once again, to perpetrate the shock-worn myths of the NDP upon the people of this province and, Mr. Speaker, those myths cannot go unchallenged. And I could perhaps refer to the first myth, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to population in the province. The myth is that people are rushing to leave Manitoba and perhaps some quotes from the Leader from the Opposition's speech would be appropriate. He said, "worst of all," and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "Worst of all, more Manitobans left this province during the years 1977 to 1979 to the greener pastures of Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta than ever before, a loss of 21,250 people in only 24 months. A staggering loss, despite the nonchalant attitude of the First Minister of this province." He also said, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the economic performance of the province, he said that this had, and I quote again, "Resulted in record setting out-migration in both 1978 and 1979." We need to examine the facts, Mr. Speaker, because the Leader of Opposition has evidently not been looking too closely at the facts. The facts of the situation are, and one need only refer to information supplied by Statistics Canada to verify this, and you will find that from 1969 to 1977 the average out-migration from this province was 34,643 people on an annual basis. From 1977 to 1979, the annual average out-migration was 33,333. Mr. Speaker, there have been less people leave this province on an average basis in the last two years than left each year of the previous administration. Now those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. They are confirmed, they are supplied by Statistics Canada. All the Leader of the Opposition need do, all the other members on that side need do is refer to those figures and they will find that there were more people left. That is out-migration, Mr. Speaker, that is out-migration. They are now aware, Mr. Speaker, of the facts of out-migration. I challenge them to prove that those facts are wrong. I also challenge them to stop making their misleading statements in the full light of the facts.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East on a point of order.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would submit to a question in order to clarify this very important point so that we can get the truth here.

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is prepared to allow me to deduct the time of the question from his time and add it to mine I'll submit to it, otherwise, I intend to proceed with my presentation. I know what his question is, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, this is a very important item, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I think the House, the press and the public deserve a clarification. Is the Honourable Minister — I'm trying to ask a question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Minister talking about net outward migration or gross migration? I gather he's only talking about growth outward migration and he should, Mr. Speaker, clarify this. I'd like him to clarify this because . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I had the floor in speaking to the Speech from the Throne. I decline to accept a question from the Member for Brandon East and I would request your permission to continue.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister continue?

MR. RANSOM: The honourable members opposite are particularly exercised about the figures that have just been presented, Mr. Speaker, because they happen to be the facts. But when you speak of out-migration, when you speak of out-migration we are speaking about the number of people leaving the province, that is out-migration. Now, fine, if you wish to talk about people coming into the province, Mr. Speaker, then that is quite another question, another consideration, and there are. . . --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I would remind the honourable members that when there is a member speaking that he should be given the close attention of all the other members and be allowed to continue and, in addition, I'm having great difficulty in following the debate and I would appreciate for my sake that we give him the proper consideration.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I simply wished to bring to the attention of the members, Mr. Speaker, was the continued statements that the members of the opposition like to make about the droves of people leaving Manitoba. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that there are fewer people leaving Manitoba now than there were during their administration. The difference is that there happens to be fewer people coming into the population by way of birth, there happens to be fewer people coming into Canada, and hence Manitoba, by way of immigration and people moving from other provinces in search of employment opportunities are to a great extent moving to the resource rich provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, which is exactly what one might expect and is exactly as it should be, given the circumstances in those two provinces. So when the opposition wants to speak about changes in population levels in the province let them deal with the facts, Mr. Speaker, and not make misleading statements about people leaving this province in droves.

The second myth, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to address is that there are no opportunities for youth in Manitoba. And in this sense I should quote again the Leader of the Opposition, when he said during his speech, he said: Unfortunately, under Lyonomics, Manitoba exports young Manitobans. And you no doubt will have heard the reports in the media, Mr. Speaker, where they caught that catchy little phrase - not a phrase but the descriptive terminology - used by the Leader of the Opposition about B.C. exporting timber and so on and Manitoba exporting young people.

Let's examine the facts of that situation as well, Mr. Speaker, because from 1975 to 1977 there were 4,000 people in the age class 15 to 24 who joined the work force in this province - 4,000 people. How many new jobs were created for that age class from 1975 to 1977? Exactly none. The 4,000 people coming into the work force, the youth, found no net increase in jobs from 1975 to 1977. From 1977 to 1979 there were 6,000 people in the age group 15 to 24 who joined the labor force in this province and there were 6,000 new employment

opportunities for the people aged 15 to 24, and the members opposite want to talk about no opportunities for youth in this province. Deal with the facts. --(Interjection)-- oh, the Member for Burrows says how about the Keewatin Community College. It happens that roughly 90 percent, plus or minus a percentage point or two, of the community college graduates in this province find employment in this province.

Another of the NDP myths, Mr. Speaker, is that there are only part-time jobs available for the people in the province. Again reference to Statistics Canada information will show that the greatest number of jobs created in this province in the last two years was in the managerial and professional group. Some 14,000 jobs from 1977 to 1979 were created in the professional and managerial group. These are all Statistics Canada figures, Mr. Speaker. I would challenge the Opposition to prove that any of those statistics are not correct.

The fourth NDP myth, Mr. Speaker, is that the economy is floundering. The facts of the situation, Mr. Speaker, are that the economy is making steady progress after stagnation for the last two years of the previous NDP administration. Again, we must deal with facts. And from 1974 to 1977 numbers of persons employed in this province rose from 419,000 to 429,000, four of those glorious years under the NDP administration; 10,000 jobs over four years. And during one of those periods, Mr. Speaker, from 1974 to 1975, the number of jobs in that year actually declined by 2,000. Unemployment went from 3.6 percent in 1974 to 5.9 percent in 1977.

Okay, let's look at the facts for 1977 to 1979, Mr. Speaker. The employed rose from 429,000 to 452,000, an increase of 23,000 jobs in two years with 6,000 of those jobs going to the people in the 15 to 24 year age group. 14,000 of those jobs are professional and managerial jobs. Unemployment declined from 5.9 percent in 1977 to 5.4 percent in 1979, hitting a low of 3.9 percent in October of 1979, and the unemployment rate was 5.9 percent in January, Mr. Speaker, which is a full percentage point below what it was a year ago. Those are some of the facts, Mr. Speaker, concerning job creation in this province.

The Opposition is fond of quoting lately some conference board projections, Mr. Speaker. Well, let us overlook any shortcomings that there may be in the conference board projections. Let us overlook the fact that they have consistently underestimated the performance of the Manitoba economy. Let us just deal with the facts as the conference board presents them, the alleged facts as they present them.

I have to read this one to you, Mr. Speaker, just to set the tone in order to get the proper perspective on the statistics which we have available here. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, "Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to comprehend how honourable members across the way can hail a growth rate of 1.3 percent, 1980, Province of Manitoba, as an opportunity for joy in Manitoba. I fail to comprehend. At least we ought to be reaching towards a growth rate of 3 percent and, to be realistic, if we are to undo the damage that the government of today has done to the economy of the province, we require a growth rate of 5 percent, 1980 and 1981."

Let's just return to reality for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and examine those projections. And no one on this side is going to take great consolation at the fact that the gross domestic product was projected to rise by only 0.8 percent in 1979. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaking again from his seat is further indicating their lack of understanding of some of the basic economic facts of this province, just as the Leader of the Opposition did when he spoke about our First Minister allegedly misleading the people of the province when he spoke of the annual provincial output exceeding \$10 billion in 1979.

The Leader of the Opposition said, "Production of gross domestic goods in Manitoba was 4.5 billion. The difference between the government's own assertion and the Throne Speech and the Conference Board figures is a hefty 5.5 billion."

Mr. Speaker, this is another mischievous use in Lyon economics. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and his economic adviser don't seem to know the difference between the gross domestic product figures put forward by the Conference Board of Canada and the gross provincial output figure referred to in the Throne Speech. The 4.5 billion referred to by the Leader of the Opposition happens to be based on 1971 constant dollars. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition should replace his economic adviser.

In 1979 the Conference Board says that the increase in the gross domestic product in Manitoba is going to be 0.8 percent, and I say we can take no great pride in that. But we still are not the lowest on the projection for 1979, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that you would be unable to guess which province had the lowest gross domestic product in 1979. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; Saskatchewan is projected by the Conference Board to have a negative gross provincial product in 1979. What was that headline in the Weekend Magazine about "Socialism pays off in Saskatchewan"?

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

The comments of the Conference Board with respect to the Manitoba situation are perhaps rather illuminating in that in their release in January they referred to three items in particular, one the construction activity slowdown in the province, and of course that has been debated a number of times. We know that a major part of that slowdown is because the previous administration had stopped the hydro construction at last in late 1977 and that this government has stopped building some of the monuments that the previous government was building, and there is some weakness in the construction field.

The Conference Board also says, Mr. Speaker, that weather-related problems beset agricultural production in 1979. That contributed to the lower gross domestic product. But they also said that the manufacturing sector expanded considerably more rapidly last year than did its national counterpart. And of course that demonstrates where the strength lies in the economy here and what the opportunities are for recovery, especially when part of the reduction in the gross domestic product is due to, as the Conference Board says, weather-related problems. And I'm only sticking to the facts as presented by the Conference Board, Mr. Speaker.

Another significant factor in their figures is that they project the 1.3 percent growth for 1980. Now that's the one that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition took such exception to. But if you'll look closely at the Conference Board Statistics you will find that only two provinces are projected to have an increase in gross domestic product in 1980: Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Even Alberta is projected to have a decline in the gross domestic product in 1980.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates a basic strength in the economy of Manitoba when we are one of only two provinces in this country that are projected to have an increase in the gross domestic product in 1980. We further should examine briefly some of the components that go into that growth, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let us look at when you have a negative rate one year you would expect to have a higher rate the next year.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is expected to go up 9.9 percent, as compared to 3.2 percent nationally. Mining, 7.7 percent as compared to 5.3 percent, nationally; manufacturing, 2.4 as compared to -2.9 nationally; utilities, 5.6 as compared to 3.5 nationally; and the total of the goods industries, 2.4 percent as compared to 0.9 percent nationally. Do those strengths sound like the symptoms of a sick economy? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. Those sound to me like the kind of statistics that demonstrate a very strong, steady base in the economy of this province. On top of that, the Conference Board predicts that unemployment in Manitoba will continue to decline while unemployment in Canada will increase. We'll buck the national trend on that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could advise me how many minutes are left.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ten minutes.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps we should therefore, in the time remaining, Mr. Speaker, have a brief examination of what we know about the NDP economic policy. There seem to be three things that I can detect from the statements that they have been making. One is that we should build generating plants from which we can't sell electricity, but that's an old one. Secondly, they somehow are going to create jobs. Now, I can only assume that that creation of jobs would be done at the taxpayers expense and I can only assume that for some reason they believe they would be more successful than they were in the last two years of their previous administration. But the third one, the third one is what they are going to do for small business, and again I must quote the Leader of the Opposition because he says: "We shall work towards the aiding and the encouragement of the small business community in Manitoba so that they may flourish and improve, so that they can take their rightful economic position in Manitoba, one which has been denied by members across the way during the past two years."

Mr. Speaker, let's examine on the basis of their record just what they might do and just let me count the ways in which we could expect them to assist small business. I suppose first of all the first thing they would do would be to appoint the Member for Brandon East as the economic czar. Now, that has a nice ring to it I know, the economic czar.

The second thing that we might expect them to do, Mr. Speaker, would be to reintroduce succession duties and gift taxes. That would be of considerable assistance to small business in the province and I suppose then that they might reinstate the corporate capital tax in small business, that I'm sure would be of great assistance to small business. Then I suppose that they might reimpose the corporate taxes to the previous uncompetitive level which existed in this province when we took over in October 1977, that would help a lot. Then they might also

raise the personal income taxes back to the level where they were before. Then they would support the policy of opening PetroCan service stations. I'm sure that would be of great assistance to the small business in this province as well. They would return to the forced partnerships with small business as well as large and in mining developments in this province. They would return to buying farm land so that more farmers could be tenants of the state once again. And last of all we might expect them to increase Hydro rates by another 150 percent because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that would be very valuable for small business. On the basis of the record of the gentlemen opposite, when they were in government, that is what we might expect them to do to assist small business because they simply were things that they did while they were there before, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have timed it so that I would have been able to deal with the energy question further, or to some extent, because I believe that the position of the members opposite is rather one of. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Their position with respect to energy has an aura of unreality about it, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to live somehow in this fool's paradise of cheap energy when from 1973 to 1979 we have gone from being self-sufficient in energy to being an importer of over 15 percent of our oil requirements. We're subsidizing 2.7 billion on the imports to the east, the industry is going to require 200 billion to develop oil or energy alternatives in the next decade. Where is that money going to come from, Mr. Speaker? The gentlemen opposite haven't told us yet how they are going to keep the prices low and also generate the money at the same time. What the Liberals in Ottawa and what the gentlemen opposite need to realize, to become more concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the supply and the production of energy and not be so hung up on the kind of corporate structure that is used to try and find that energy, because if their policies are pursued we are going to find in a very few years that we may have complete national or government control of the mechanism by which we produce oil but we may very well have no oil. And like the butcher who has no meat to sell they'll be able to sell it cheaper.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to close on a slightly more positive note by briefly outlining some of the steps that we have taken to try and create the kind of environment in this province that allows people to do things for themselves, to take advantage of opportunities that are presented to them. We have in two years been able to reduce the deficit, we have been able to gain control of spending, we have reduced the annual deficit, Mr. Speaker. We have controlled spending, we have made the tax structure more competitive, the economy is on a sound basis again, employment is vastly improved, as a matter of fact we've put people to work. The numbers of people on the welfare rolls are 4,000 lower the end of December 1979 than they were in December 1977. We've improved labor relations in the province, we've removed the threat of state intervention in the economy, we've improved the level of health care, we've improved the infrastructure, such as highways and flood control, we've established mechanisms to deal with energy problems, we've done things like the establishment of the SAFER program to help elderly residents maintain rental accommodations. We've done the kinds of things that government can be expected to do to protect the people from the excesses of big government and from big business, from big unions if you like. Those are the kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, that government must do and I think that the Throne Speech that we heard in this Chamber a few days ago outlines the kind of positive things that we have done and that we intend to do, that that speech will commend itself to the people of the province and our government will have the opportunity to serve those people for many years to come.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I got up to ask the honourable member a question, if I may.

MR. DEPTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister. . .

MR. RANSOM: Yes, I'll permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

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

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

MR. EVANS: The Honourable Minister indicated in his speech that under the Conservative government provincial corporation income taxes are now competitive. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate then, because of this reduced provincial corporate income tax, how many new manufacturing establishments of any significance have been established in Manitoba under this new policy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: That's a very interesting subject that the honourable member has raised, Mr. Speaker. One has to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable members opposite do not really understand the necessity of creating the the kind of positive climate for investment in this province, which is required, and that it's not always possible to look at any given action, to look at the reduction in the corporate capital tax or succession duties and the gift taxes or the ending of the compulsory participation in mining or not buying farmland any more so that people can be tenants of the state.

These are the sorts of things which, taken individually, it is difficult to show where any one of those has a definable impact but taken in total - and this is one of those situations, Mr. Speaker, where the sum really is greater than the individual parts - but taken in total it shows the kind of positive relationship that the government has, the attitude that they have towards private capital doing productive things within the province. And the particular tax that the honourable member refers to is simply one out of the package that we have used to create that kind of positive feeling and that is why we now have things like the manufacturing, bucking the national trend. That's why we have agriculture bucking the national trend. We have mining bucking the national trend in decline. That's why we have the kind of good solid base that we have now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the last couple of contributors from the Conservative side, and I will leave the dissection of the last contribution to my colleague from Brandon, who is the pre-eminent economist in this House. I'm more interested in the remarks of the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Government Services, who unfortunately isn't here.

I wanted to deal with some of his analysis, which was very interesting indeed, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me there has been several major events in the past year, which apparently have not registered on the minds of the government. For a very good reason, namely that they are unpleasant experiences. Well, the three things are the May election in Manitoba last year, the by-elections and, more recently, the February general election. That one apparently passed unnoticed by the members of the opposition and I thought, when I listened to the Minister of Government Services as he talked about the events of the federal election seat and so on, how the members of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, their favourite two years ago, when Joe Clark ran for the leadership, was none other than Jack Horner. —(Interjection)— Four years ago, pardon me.

I remember the great enthusiasm of the former Government House Leader, Mr. Jorgenson, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the Minister of Government Services. They looked at Jack Horner as a God-fearing, free enterpriser from Alberta. A big cowboy, a true blue Tory; it was Duke. He was going to ride out of the west and show those softies and bankers and wishy-washy Liberal Tories, Red Tories in Eastern Canada, what it was all about. They backed that man and they really felt something emotional about Jack Horner. And did he ever let them down, Mr. Speaker. What a shock to find out that two years later he became a Liberal - the ultimate, the ultimate cut.

And then I listened to the Minister of Government Services and he gave the following analysis, Mr. Speaker, of the federal election. This was his analysis. The winners were the Liberal Party of Canada; they won. The loser was the New Democratic Party. That was his analysis, a very simple analysis. The Liberals won, the NDP lost. They didn't say anything about the fortunes of the Conservative Party of Canada or the fortunes of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, of progress of Conservative -- not to forget the Bracken amendment, not to be confused with progressive meeting, advancing or broadminded or right thinking in the sense of advanced or open thinking.

And when I listened to the Minister speak, I was reminded of the 1973 election when we came into this Chamber. The Leader of the Official Opposition was the Honourable Sidney

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

Spivak, and he took great pains to explain to the New Democratic Government that his party had won the election. And he explained this several times in the House very carefully, how the victory was, in fact, a victory for the Conservative Party. Just as the Minister of Government Services explained to us today, that the loss of the federal election was the loss of Ed Broadbent in his pin-striped suit with his Havanna or El Ropo cigar and how he had failed to make that particular breakthrough.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read to you the analysis of the Premier. You know the Premier of Manitoba, he's hardly ever here but I think you'd recognize him if you saw him, if he's not in Florida or somewhere else, and he had several interesting articles in the election. He said there is no effect whatsoever, of the defeat of the Clark government. That was a very interesting analysis, Mr. Speaker. He said, for example, "I suppose there are always the pundits who say it reflects on the provincial scene." And he said that what he wanted to point out to Manitobans was the danger of splitting their votes. That was the message from the Premier to the Liberals. He said, "Take heed" - it sounds like an Old Testament prophet - "Take heed in another provincial election you can't afford the luxury of splitting a vote." And he said, "I'm not concerned about the Socialists because most people have the sense to know they don't function that well."

Well, that was his analysis. He also said in another article a few days ago that although they lost 5-1/2 percent of the popular vote and although they lost a couple of federal seats that it really didn't reflect on the provincial government. --(Interjection)-- He said, that's right, it's a federal election. My old colleague from Rock Lake, he says there's no affect, you can't draw any correlation between the two, they're separate parallel events. The Premier said a federal election is a federal election, I mean, that's good logic. He also would probably would say a provincial election is a provincial election. And he said it's instructive and interesting but it doesn't mean a change in our plans.

Mr. Speaker, if anything would warm the hearts of the official opposition it is the notation that the Conservative government of Manitoba is going to continue in the direction that they're heading, they are going to continue their policies, they're going to continue their programs and their dynamic thrust. And we can only be encouraged by that kind of statement coming from the First Minister that the people of Manitoba are going to get more of the same. It's going to hurt the people of Manitoba, it's going to kill the Conservative Party but it's going to help the New Democratic Party and it's going to help the people of Manitoba once they get over the next election.

Now what did the press say about the election? Well, just looking at the headlines from February 19, the Tribune: "Wins Seven in Manitoba, NDP Gains Seats on Tory Backlash", that's the Tribune. The Free Press . . . well, didn't this marvelous Conservative Party get the backing of both newspapers? Yes sir, they got the backing of the papers almost from coast to coast. They were supported by the publishers and by the editors of the local papers. We have Le Devoir. --(Interjection) - That's right, we were almost storming the gates in Quebec, not quite. The Free Press said: "NDP Spirits Soar Over Upset Wins". Well, you know, those are the facts of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, if you examine what happened in the past nine months in this province it must be a stunning shock to the government benches because last October 1978 they had 11 seats in Manitoba, we had 2; 11 seats to 2, Stanley Knowles and David Orlikow; they held St. Boniface. Remember Jack Hare, Bugs Bunny with running shoes. Well, hey didn't have Winnipeg South, that was sort of held by a Liberal but a Liberal who, in this election, became an Independent and who sent out his letter to all good people of Manitoba in the area saying that he was going Tory, urging the people to vote Conservative. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, you didn't see the letter? --(Interjection)-- I see, no no, Mr. Axworthy, we'll deal with him later.

So you had 11 seats, Mr. Speaker, and 2 New Democrats, and then in April or May of 1979 you had 7 Conservatives and then you had 5 New Democrats, up 3, and you had 2 Liberals. Well, I remember that day, I remember coming into this Chamber and we remember the shock registered on the faces of the Conservative benches. The Minister of Highways is still stunned by that particular event. He can't believe those results, Mr. Speaker, and we can't believe that he's a Minister in the Conservative Government so this is a countershock, 2 Liberals. And then finally a couple of months later, pardon me, nine months later after Joe Clark became Prime Minister, after six months of refusing to meet the Canadian people, after two months in Parliament, after an election campaign, the incredible happened, the Conservatives blew it. And they went in Manitoba down again, down again from 11 to 7 to 5. The NDP went up again from 2 to 5 to 7. We're now the majority party in Manitoba. That's

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

right, if we could only get the Premier to campaign around the province; we all remember his boast, he was going to go and fight for Joe Clark, he was going to go and take time off and he would go anywhere in Canada, wherever they wanted him. He said, where do you want me to go? They told him where to go and he said he couldn't go there but he said he would go to Florida and take a little time off.

Mr. Speaker, does the Conservative administration really believe, I mean, I cannot believe that one person there actually believes there is no correlation, no effect between the federal results and between the results in the provincial arena. And I also remember in the late 50s what went on in Manitoba. I remember those slogans at the time because John Diefenbaker came in with a minority in 1957. He then won the biggest majority in Canadian history, 208 seats I think it was in 1958, and Duff Roblin squeaked in at 58 and then he campaigned on the slogan: "What Dief has done Duff will do". That was the slogan, it was the correlation, the federal scene and the provincial scene, it was riding Dief's coattails. --(Interjection)-- That's right, "Follow John". --(Interjection)-- No, that was "Follow John", that was the federal slogan. The provincial slogan was "What Dief has done Duff will do". I say, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to Clark will happen to Lyon. That is the effect of the federal election.

We had the three by-elections, Mr. Speaker, we have three new members. They are so new in fact that they are still sitting in the Chamber listening to all the speeches where some of the pros have been in and out a few times throughout the night and throughout the afternoon. And I found the by-elections very interesting. I thought that was fascinating, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that what happened in the by-elections, in terms of the way the government brought in certain programs and did certain things, is a preview of what will happen in the next provincial election. It's totally predictable. The government is going to pull out all the stops, bring in all sorts of programs and hand out all sorts of election goodies because they no sooner called the by-elections one day when within 48 hours the government sprang into action. The Minister responsible for Recreation immediately announced - he held a press conference and he said that he had suddenly discovered 2-1/4 million dollars for an arena. Couldn't find the money before, the money, the cupboards were bare, the NDP had spent all the money and there was nothing in the kitty but he was able to find, just by chance, two and a quarter million dollars for that arena and he made that announcement.

The Minister of Labour, he suddenly discovered the gas connectors and we'll have an opportunity to discuss that particular matter. It was a matter that goes back eighteen years; it was a matter that occurred under the Roblin administration; nothing happened under the Roblin administration. Apparently it didn't happen under our administration. For two years he was in that portfolio; suddenly he discovered it within 24 or 48 hours of the by-election. Well, we'll have more to say on that.

Then the Minister of Economic Development, a man with a heart that we never saw before, suddenly he came up with \$3.5 million for a rental subsidy, a rental subsidy. And boy, I mean, we didn't realize he had a social conscience. He was suddenly worried about the older people, suddenly worried about people in certain ridings like Fort Rouge, they were worried about Fort Rouge. They wanted to get a program where the renters, and so on, would be helped. So he came up with this program and they advertised it. Boy, those commercials went on, Mr. Speaker, they were played during that by-election. And do you know what, they were played again during the federal election. I didn't hear very much in between. I notice the Member for Fort Rouge, she was mentioning in her pamphlets that she didn't hear too much about the SAFER program in between. But those ads were revived, they were good for another run during the federal election. I'm sure they'll be good for another run and another thrust. Half a million dollars on advertising? --(Interjection)-- Well, my leader told me that, I think it must be true.

So we found that very interesting, that all of a sudden there was activity, there was money, there was \$6 million appeared for those provincial by-elections. There's 50,000 people who apparently were eligible to vote. They were, in effect, spending something like \$115 per voter; and then the results came in.

Now you know the results are very interesting because I think all of us probably have different interpretations. It's probably a bit like that story, I guess, of the blind men and the elephant because everybody claimed the victory there and I think you really have to look very very carefully at those seats to see whether in fact those were victories and, in effect, who won. All I can do, Mr. Speaker, is to give you my analysis of what happened in those particular by-elections.

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

One seat was won by the Conservatives, River Heights. Well, Mr. Speaker, River Heights has to be historically, in modern times at least, in the fifties and sixties and seventies, just about the safest Conservative seat in the province. --(Interjection)-- Pembina is as well. That's right, they'll elect anybody in Pembina.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at River Heights, I used to always say to the old Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Sidney Spivak --(Interjection)-- the former Leader of the Opposition, the drummer boy as we used to call him when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I used to always say to him, "When we get River Heights we'll have the other 56 seats." That's exactly what will happen, Mr. Speaker. When you line them all up, let's take them in terms of hardest for the Tories to win and easiest for the Tories to win, Pembina and River Heights, they're the bedrock seats.

Now what happened in River Heights? I want to first of all welcome the MLA for River Heights to this Chamber. He's a young man with a career that's still ahead of him. He was a big wheel on Council and now he's coming to try the provincial arena. I don't know whether he was promised a Cabinet seat or not, he was touted as a Cabinet Minister but he didn't make the cut.

In any event we welcome him here. But I have to point out to him and remind him that the Liberal vote in River Heights was way up and I don't know if that was a pro-Liberal vote or an anti-Conservative vote but that vote was way up, Mr. Speaker, and there's a message there, I think, for the MLA and for the government, that there is something wrong about that particular riding.

I also found the member's speech very interesting, his maiden speech. He started talking about all these poor people and so on, I thought he was talking about some of the ridings in the north end of Winnipeg and he almost brought a tear to my eye about people working hard and saving their money and paying their mortgages and raising their families and then I realized he was talking about the poor people of River Heights. I found that a bit difficult to understand but perhaps he can enlighten us on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other interesting seat was Fort Rouge. Now there was an interesting seat. There was a seat where there was a real battle royal. The Conservatives, I guess, struck out there. I don't remember how many votes the Conservative got but he didn't seem to be in the fight. Now, it seemed to be a straight fight between the present member and Vic Savino and the Liberals poured in there from all over Winnipeg and they backed -- (Interjection)-- all five of them? No, there's more than that. And they fought. It was the old Axworthy machine --(Interjection)-- I don't think eunuchs march, I think they mince, minced into Fort Rouge to help the honourable member.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the former Member for Fort Rouge later but I think I'd better make that comment now in case I run out of time.

You know they're going around the country looking for members and I just make one reference there. He said, "voting for the NDP is liking voting for a eunuch in a harem." That's what he said and he couldn't understand how the people of western Canada could vote Tory and vote NDP, he just couldn't understand it. Well, neither could the other Liberals for the last sixty years. That's been their problem, and they're going to have some interesting solutions. I really like this stuff. Bob Bockstael and Lloyd Axworthy, they're full of ideas, they're brimming with energy and insight and they've got a really dandy idea. They're going to twin people from the rest of Canada with western Canada. Guys are going to come in from Quebec into Alberta and represent Alberta. They're going to pour in from Ontario into Saskatchewan and into B.C. and the people from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and P.E.I. they're going to come here and they're going to introduce themselves to people in Manitoba and represent us. I mean, poor silly westerners don't even know how to vote and they're going to represent us. The actual members from down east are going to represent the poor poverty-stricken areas from western Canada.

Can't you just see them coming in and saying like, "Hi, I'm so and so from Nova Scotia and I'm going to represent you." It's like going into a Playboy Club and when you go into a Playboy Club the bunny comes up to you says, "Hi, I'm so and so your bunny."

A MEMBER: How do you know that? --(Interjection)--

MR. DOERN: Well, I read about it. Mr. Speaker, I can just see Lloyd Axworthy coming out there into that Playboy Club, all those guys sitting around the Playboy Club, coming up to the table in his bunny costume and saying, "Hi, I'm Lloyd Axworthy your bunny,"

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

and the customer will say, "Wait a minute this guy's a eunuch, get me a bunny." That's going to be the reaction.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate winner. —(Interjection)— Yes, I want to talk about it. The ultimate winner in Fort Rouge was the honourable lady and she also has good background on City Council and she has now come to fulfill her role.

Now we're going to have a couple of harsh words for her later -- not too harsh -- but I think at some point we're going to discuss election expenses. . .

MRS. WESTBURY: Let's do that . . .

MR. DOERN: . . . and we're going to debate her on that particular motion.

I want to say to her though that although she probably will not have that much of a difficulty in filling the former member's shoes, I want to tell her that when it comes to press she will have a lot of trouble because the former member had better press than anybody in this Chamber. For I don't know how many years he had a free ride, for all those years, and I think that it will be difficult for the honourable member, no matter how effective, no matter how hard she tries, to be able to equal that because I think that was a very interesting experience.

Now we come to my amiable lawyer friend from Rossmere. I think he's going to show, Mr. Speaker, he's going to show that he will be one of the finest MLAs to ever come into this Chamber. He's articulate, he's quiet, he has a good sense of humour which will make itself evident, good looking, handsome and he just came from a real battle, a real battle, in that particular riding.

Now I think that riding was one that had to be watched very carefully as well because in that particular riding the Tory myth -- you want to talk about facts and interpretations -- here's a Tory myth, the Minister for Resources, he's the one who's talking about facts, hard facts, give me the facts. He sounds like Dragnet. He would be one of those who would say that when Ed Schreyer leaves the NDP's finished. That was the old myth, the NDP was Schreyer. When Schreyer's gone the party's finished.

Well, a couple of points, Mr. Speaker. First of all, in the Federal Elections this party showed it was tougher than ever and it broke through like it never broke through before, federally and in particular in the Province of Manitoba, and we were able to win the seat of Rossmere in spite of some pretty big onslaughts. We know all about Henry Krahn and all of his full time campaigns, and Martin Bergen. Here is a very touching thing from John Froese, I don't know John Froese but he wrote this letter, half of his thank you in the local paper was to the people who helped him in his campaign; and the other one was a special thanks to Martin Bergen.

A MEMBER: A fine gentleman.

MR. DOERN: A fine gentleman. And he said this, he said: "Seldom does one find an individual who is willing to work so hard for the principles he believes are important for a better country." Well, that was really touching. It probably will guarantee a continued funding and continued financial support in future elections.

I also want to welcome the three new Ministers to this House, Mr. Speaker, and I would welcome them, I guess, in the same way that the Captain of the Titanic welcomed the passengers to his maiden voyage, because although they finally made it it's unfortunate that they're making it in the last year of the Lyon administrations, however, better late than never. It may be a while before they have a shot at it again but at least they're going to get that initial experience which will carry them well into the future.

I want to particularly welcome the Minister of Corrections because in my judgment he probably is one of the more able people on that side of the House, although I have to tell him that we want that seat back. I'm told that in the federal election we may have won the new seat of St. James and we used to hold the old seat of St. James and we're after that seat, so he's going to have to fight for his place.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'd like to welcome him, a nice fellow and he's going to have a difficult time and I want to tell him what I said when I was in Swan River a few months ago. I made a prediction at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, that he would be appointed to the Cabinet. We could see the signs, the signs were evident. Asking questions, that was the tip-off that the Member for Swan River was getting back into the fray or into the fray and I made the prediction.

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

Well, the Member for Wolseley, we're not so certain about him. We saw what may be, what could be the beginning of his comeback. But, you know, it's going to be a long comeback, Mr. Speaker. It's a bit like the guy who lives in a sub-basement who's trying to get up to the basement, he's trying to move up to that suite in the basement and that's going to be his problem.

But the Member for Swan River, he's made it into the Cabinet and I said in Swan River, I said that I believe that one of the reasons for his appointment was to hold off Leonard Harapiak, who is one of the finest candidates that we had and there's going to be a very key battle taking place in that riding. Whoever wins that riding is going to be a good indication of who wins the next government.

And then we have the Minister of Highways, the new Minister of Highways and Transportation. Mr. Speaker, is he really the Minister of Highways and Transportation? We find it hard to believe. He's one of the younger, vigorous, right-wing members, one of the people who best reflects his leader. He is. His thinking is identical, he emulates the Premier in terms of right thinking, philosophy and approach to government. But I have to point out to him, because I don't really think he grasps this point, he thinks that Pembina is Manitoba and he thinks that the area he comes from is representative of the entire province and it isn't so. His area is an old bedrock, a bedrock of Conservatism in the province and has been so for many years, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose I have five minutes, is that my time or more?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Seven minutes.

MR. DOERN: Seven minutes, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly on the connection between the Clark government and the Lyon government because I think that those two are related, because when this government came in they went down to British Columbia and studied Bill Bennett's campaign. I think it was the Minister of Finance, if I remember correctly, he went there. I don't know who else went with him but they went there to study what was done in British Columbia. They then brought it back to Manitoba and then they passed it on to Joe Clark, because the Bennett success was, in their minds, repeated in Manitoba and the Clark's success was, in fact, a reflection of the Lyon success. That's the sequence and that's what a lot of people thought. It was sort of like that old famous team in American baseball, Tinkers to Evers to Chance. I suppose it was the second baseman, the shortstop and the first baseman. You had Bennett to Lyon to Clark. No, that's the Abbott and Costello routine. And so we had a series of winners. We had these right-wing winners starting at '77 and continuing until the apex in '79, and all the governments in Canada, with the exception of the P.Q. in Quebec, with the exception of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party, became Conservative. That was the height of Tory fortunes. Remember that?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, the honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, remember that, that was the height of Tory fortunes in Canada, May, 1979. And now, nine months later, we get the slippery slope. We see, first of all, the Clark government out, the federal Clark government defeated in nine months. What a shock! And now we see the Lyon government slipping badly in Manitoba, going from 11 seats federally -- the federal party 11 seats federally to 5; the New Democratic Party going from 2 to 7, and the writing appears to be on the wall. And then we see what's happening in British Columbia. You cannot separate the federal results from the provincial results. No one can tell me that the breakthrough in British Columbia doesn't mean that the Barrett team will probably be back in office within a year. It's partly a combination of policies; it's partly the Lettergate scandal and it's partly the defeat of Clark. But I think there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that it is because of a series of programs and of the fumbling and bumblng of the Clark government that he is going to help drag all the Conservative governments in Canada down.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that I think the federal results indicate for the New Democratic Party that we will win in Manitoba and in British Columbia in the next provincial elections. And I want to tell you this, that in 1969 the spirits in the New Democratic Party, the spirit in the New Democratic side was high and it was high in '73. When we fought the '73 election, in a sense, that was the turning point psychologically in our government. In '77 some of that enthusiasm was gone, some of that old fight wasn't there,

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

some of those workers didn't come out. I want to tell you that I was around to some of the election headquarters when we had the federal election and the New Democrats are full of fight and their spirits were never higher and when we go into that provincial election you're going to see an all out effort behind our new leader to push this party into power.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are in exactly the opposite position. Frances Russell did an interesting analysis of the results and she pointed out that one of the reasons the Tories lost in Manitoba was that their own supporters didn't go out. They didn't like Clark, they didn't like the Conservative policies. They didn't have the heart to go and vote Liberal or New Democratic, although I'm sure some did, but a lot of true blue Tories stayed home and that's what hurt the Conservative cause.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude at this point by saying that I believe that there is a direct correlation. If the Clark government had won that election I think you would have seen an election in Manitoba between now and September. There would have been an election in the summer or in the fall of this year. There would have been an election; they would have tried to ride Clark's coat tails into a renewed mandate, but they blew it and as a result I think we're going to see an '81 or an '82 election. And I simply say, referring to history and referring to that old slogan which Duff Roblin rode into power, "What Dief has done, Duff will do," that what has happened to Clark will happen to Lyon.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns that this House now adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? All those agreed that the House do now adjourn. (Agreed)

The motion is out of order. I need a motion for adjournment.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): You recognized an honourable member who took the floor and made a motion to adjourn which is always in order, can be voted against or voted for. It is always in order, anybody who is recognized by the Speaker can move adjournment at any time.--(Interjection)— I'm going to tell the Clerk it's not out of order, put the question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, if it's in order to speak, I'm hardly prepared but I really would like to get in a contribution if it's not contrary to our rules.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks will withdraw his motion, or if the House votes against the motion, then the member can . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm entitled to speak as any other member is, and I am suggesting on a point of order that the only way of dealing with this is if the Member for Seven Oaks withdraws his motion or else the House votes on the question, defeats it, then the member can speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I think the motion I made was in order, it's always in order. The House could defeat it if it so desires. On the other hand, if the member wishes to speak I'll withdraw that motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion has been withdrawn.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure to rise, someone mentioned some 14 or 15 times, on the Throne Speech and maybe I can say I have had the chance some 21 times, and I believe that to be correct. Firstly, I must congratulate the new elected members,

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

the madam and the two other gentlemen, and also congratulate the new Cabinet Ministers. I know the task that's before them and it's always easy to envy a Cabinet Minister, but I know the problems that they do face, and I said public a few days ago how pleased I was with the Throne Speech, and I really was, because it has shown input to rural Manitoba and I certainly am waiting for my Minister of Health and Social Services to give us some real indication where the hospital construction is going in. I can guess where but I'd only be guessing, likewise to the personal care, and I hope that if I could guess it would be the extreme east and the extreme west of my constituency, which I've got a large delegation in the gallery tonight on another problem.

I wish I was prepared because I would have brought a question that I gave to my then Minister of Mines, sitting directly in front of me, regarding the surface oil rights and I think I started that about '75. It got to the floor and the then Minister's Estimates in '77. While I met him in his office, if he had been a little bigger I'm sure he would have physically thrown me out of his office, but, however I was somewhat persistent. I met him some weeks later in the hall and I addressed my Minister. I said, "I'm still putting the question to you in your Estimates. I'm warning you how I will handle my question. I think when I was an opposition member I always addressed my Ministers and tried to give them as much lead time to come back with a proper answer and I thought that answer, while it didn't come as far as I wanted it, that it did come some way further than at my first meeting in his office some months earlier.

I also think when I rise I rise proudly. We hear today whether we're maybe going to have more hours and shorter days - I have no real qualms about that; I hear where there's some thrust that we get more pay - I have no great concern. But my own concern probably is what was quoted in the Brandon Sun - and they're not too known to quote me correctly - but I did say regarding my First Minister, that if it was true my First Minister is one of the lowest paid in Canada, then I indeed as a person was a little bit ashamed of myself as a member of this House to have a pretty prominent keystone province of our nation be indeed one of the lowest paid.

Likewise I said, to support Cabinet Ministers. I feel that Cabinet Ministers' wages, in comparison to a regular member, that they're getting a pretty bad deal.

I would like to be over there and fill one of those seats, but however, if I was there I would feel likewise, that economically the dollars they get is pretty low.

I might say I have not made a lot of noise in here, but when I'm further afield I do seem to carry some personality with me and I'm always proud to carry a Canadian flag, be it on behalf of my Minister of Highways. Last fall when I went down to Texas on the International 83 and I happened to get off the plane at Liberal, I was taken to the Tourist Bureau and just by chance the cameras were there. I presented a Canadian and Manitoba flag and we do have good Manitoba and Canadian boosters down there and I'm always proud to be at those kind of functions where we're selling a little bit of Manitoba.

On another occasion, when I was going to Edmonton last fall on the train, and I just wish I had that letter in my office this afternoon to bring in whenever it was my chance to speak and read it back. Now this was sixty ladies from Quebec, young and old, middle aged, I guess, and I went into the dining room and there was a spare seat so I sat down with them and they couldn't get over what Winnipeg was like. They said the artifacts - and they were out on an art tour - it was most impressive. But the thing that they said that most impressed me was the cleanliness of Winnipeg, and for that of course my hand goes in my pocket and I had some pins - I think they were Canadian pins on that occasion - I later sent them Manitoba pins and I did have one of the nicest letters, maybe at Budget time I can read back. And again I was proud to be a Manitoban, to sell a little bit of Manitoba, and I think it just shows that maybe we don't understand all parts of our nation just quite as full as we should, or open ourselves - I happen to have the privilege of having served a little bit of my life in Quebec and understand a little bit better probably than some, and I think we do have a pretty good province that needs a little broadmindedness on both sides to understand theirs and our problems.

Likewise I might say we can surely do that with our American friends who I have come to know. When I was going south someone at Denver picked me up at the airport to spend the night and the first thing I got a blast. We were up on our natural gas and I said, "Well, folks, you know we are Canadians; that is our gas; and if the price does go up a little bit and it does cost you another \$100, it is a Canadian product, we also have to buy a lot." So, things like that, that we don't see our American friends further south to tell them our real Canadian story.

Tuesday, 26 February, 1980

I think I was awfully proud to be a Canadian the other day when our national team played the Russians and came so awfully close to beating them. A couple of laps and they may well have been in the position of the United States. In any case, I was certainly happy to see that World Cup stay this side of the Atlantic.

As I look at my Minister of Sport, and I hope his new program comes out that will benefit places like Elkhorn that have a very good arena; they might want an addition in Virden, Miniota and how many other places. I know I have a delegation to meet him later this week. --(Interjection)--

Yes, that's another. I think in the last year by luck or by chance someone thought I should serve on the Peace Garden, and that was a very easy position to say "yes" to, and I've really enjoyed it. I not only served as the government representative - someone suggested I should be on the executive and that's where the workload is. It's an unpaid executive position and I'm surely looking at my Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because while that stall or freeze in our construction gave our government a chance to get on its feet and find out where all dollars were going, it did cost them some extra money. The original estimates of the waterworks on the Canadian side of the Peace Gardens, I think, is in excess of or very close to \$400,000 and that's not quite bad enough. I sit with the Chairman, a North Dakota Legislator, a North Dakota Senator, a North Dakota lady legislator and the press man from Killarney, and when I had to tell them the other day that maybe we weren't going to have the Canadian waterworks and the whole system of the Peace Gardens works, pumps on the Canadian side, well if you've seen a Senator hit the roof that Senator hit the roof that day because he had been holding off his people and telling them, "Well, we've got to wait till next summer, the music camp . . ." The terrible part of it is this, that some of the lavatories have been completely disconnected, completely taken out and we've got to have the new system to make this function, there's no way of hooking onto the old system like they did last year. So, seeing that little nudge came from my Minister, I have to nudge him and say we've got to get into the Treasury Board real quick and get a couple of hundred thousand dollars and a few panel boards and absolutely and urgently need to get an order, in order to have any chance to have that operational this July. The music camp starts much before that, but I think if, Mr. Speaker, there could be a date like June or July I think even the Senator will have to accept it.

Their side is done almost on price but it was still a very high figure. It was a little less than ours even though our original estimate was a lot less than it's going to cost later this year.

Our highway program, I must say I haven't got an awful lot of highways over the years I've been here, but some say I've got all the hardtops and I just hope that come Estimates time there is a couple of key ones that I think my Minister has been told of and hopefully I do see a little more hardtop.

I know that it's a costly venture. Municipal people say why not have a fund to do our municipal roads? And I am proud to say Wallace municipality have hardtopped some of their municipal roads but when the retopping comes it's lucky that they've a lot of oil revenues that help their economic base to do these extra things.

If I had anything to say who guides me and has been a lot of influence to me in trying to be a proper member, it has been my mayors and my municipal people. We often have coffee together; we often don't vote the same; we often don't think exactly the same but the net result is, I think, to their benefit and the benefit of my constituency. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure tomorrow I'll say a dozen things, my notes are blank, I'm just racing to think what other things I did want to say.

Anyway, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of saying those few words.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be the disposition of the House at this time to call it 10:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Wednesday afternoon.