

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
Monday, 3 March, 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we adjourned at 5:30 I was at the point where I was talking about my honourable friends' contribution to the Throne Speech Debate and, at the risk of repeating myself, what I was trying to indicate to them, Sir, was that left-wing nitwittery and tomfoolery translate into political quackery of the worst kind, and really that's what we've been hearing for the past week or so in this House.

I say again to the Leader of the Opposition, and to the members who surround him, how can he or how can the opposition in this House expect to be taken seriously by the people of Manitoba when his speech provides no thoughtful comment, no alternative ideas, or even a hint of concern about the fundamental problems in Manitoba such as the whole keystone of our economy in this province, agriculture, the grain handling and transportation system in Manitoba, which is still one of the fundamental problems that faces western Canada. Not a word. Not even an acknowledgement that that problem exists. He is much more concerned, Mr. Speaker, about transparent issues that he attempts to raise about, for instance, the cost of the commission on Manitoba Hydro, about which I will have considerably more to say before I am through with him.

And, Mr. Speaker, what does he say about Canadian unity? We have a referendum coming up in Quebec in June. What are the views of the members of the opposition on national unity in this country? How would they propose to deal with their bedmates, the Trudeau Liberals, who are now in office? How would they propose to deal on this fundamental issue in Canada? Not a word on that, not a word on that at all. My honourable friend is too busy trying to manufacture quick tricks out of the Throne Speech.

What about inflation? What about inflation, Mr. Speaker - inflation which is the scourge of the poor, of those on fixed income, those under the so-called poverty line in Manitoba. Not a word about inflation from our honourable friends. And they are the party after all, Mr. Speaker, who claim the monopoly on compassion in this province. They are the ones who are concerned about the "poor". Mr. Speaker, they have very little concern about the poor or about those on fixed income, our senior citizens, and others in this province, if they can't devote one line in their response to the Throne Speech about inflation, which is the fundamental economic problem facing this country today. Not a word about that, however.

We have to talk about Autopac, we have to talk about McKenzie Seed, we have to talk about the other little Socialist trivialities that my honourable friends engaged in when they were wrecking the economy of this province for the eight years that they were on this side of the House.

What about, Mr. Speaker, hearing some profound thought from my honourable friends opposite about the size of the overall debt in Manitoba, and how that debt rose to be the second highest per capita of any debt in this country under their eight years of maladministration in this province. How about dealing with it?

And as I said to my honourable friend before, you're a great one to come out, and so are your colleagues - spend more on this, spend more on that, we want a road here, we want the road to Red Sucker Lake finished there. We want more teachers in School Division Number One. We want more of this, we want more of that. And where in God's name, Mr. Speaker, is the money going to come from? Out of the hides of the working people of Manitoba. But you never hear that from my honourable friends opposite, no, no, no. And we said across the House to my friend when he was making his alleged response to the Throne Speech, where are you going to get the money. Oh, he said, we're not going to have enquiries into Manitoba Hydro; that would save us \$1.3 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of reminding my honourable friend of what he should know, let me tell him this: 1.3 million to me is still an awful lot of money, but 1.3 million is what he and his colleagues spent annually on the Planning and Priorities Committee of their socialist government, which we disbanded on coming into office. So don't let him or any of his

Monday, 3 March

colleagues talk to me about the waste of expenditure. And he needn't rush up to talk to the Member for Transcona, because I can verify the fact that the Planning and Priorities Committee cost the Government of Manitoba \$1.3 million in the last year in which we had responsibility for giving decent criticism of the former government.

So, Mr. Speaker, he says, where is he going to get the money. He's going to get it from saving \$300,000 on an Autopac inquiry, says he or says his Member for the Interlake who was speaking this afternoon. Three hundred thousand dollars - that's not very much money when you consider the kind of wastrel spending that used to go on across the way, bringing their friends in from all over the world - their socialist friends - and camping them in Manitoba. Whether it started with Cass Beggs, and there were others on that list of infamy - and there can be no other name for it - that they brought in their socialist, their marxist friends from all over the face of the earth, who came here like bees to the honey. Their friends that they brought in from the United States, Mr. Speaker, to use our school children in this province, under the distinguished guidance of that great Deputy Minister Mr. Lionel Orlikow, to use our school children as guinea pigs for their outdated experimentation.

We all remember that, Mr. Speaker. And where is my honourable friend . . . The Leader of the Opposition laughs, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that he laughs at one of the greatest periods of infamy that the Department of Education ever was subjected to in this province, when he and the political operatives that his former Premier and the then Ministers of Education inflicted upon the people of Manitoba for many many years. Maybe the Member for St. Boniface would like to engage in the debate tomorrow and tell us about Dr. Tolchinski and some of the other socialist favourites who were brought in here, yes. And don't think that we are not going to talk about that, Mr. Speaker, later in this debate.

So let me hear from my honourable friends opposite about the size of the overall debt, which grew in their time to the second highest in Canada - at a time when the man who was standing in my place, and when I was sitting where the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, now sits, tried to convince the people of Manitoba that the statement of the debt that we were giving was ten times as large as it was. When that figure was being shown, that figure was being demonstrated in the different publications that were put out by the Province of Manitoba. That is on the record too, as are a number of other things on the record that will be mentioned here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Why doesn't our honourable friend talk about the multitude of real problems facing Manitobans. And I am going to talk a little bit later on about the demographic problem - not problem, the demographic situation, Mr. Speaker - that faces the Province of Manitoba, with a generally aging population. Not a unique situation to the Province of Manitoba; one that is common to the whole of North America. What ideas did we hear from my honourable friends about that? Not one? Do they have any idea what the projection for the age of the population will be in 1985, 1990? If they do, why are they keeping it to themselves? Have they no original thoughts? They are supposed to be here, not just to draw pay as members of the opposition, they are supposed to be here to help the public interest of the province of Manitoba. I would remind a number of them, Mr. Speaker, they are not here as advocates of Karl Marx or Engels. They are here to serve the public interest of the people of Manitoba. Some of them need to learn that lesson as well, Mr. Speaker.

We heard, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition - it is not so much of what we heard, it is what we didn't hear. He came to deal with the question of Manitoba Hydro, and what did he say? He said it is patently unfair for the members of the government to talk about Manitoba Hydro and the Tritschler Commission, because Mr. Schreyer isn't here to defend himself. Well, I want to tell my honourable friend that he can't hide behind the purple robes in Rideau Hall; that he and his colleagues stand indicted before public opinion in Manitoba for what he and their then leader then perpetrated on the people of Manitoba, and it is all in the Tritschler Report.

If my honourable friend thinks for one moment that he can avoid discussing the single most disastrous example of financial mismanagement in their disaster-ridden administration, he has surely got another think coming. The "damn the torpedoes" idea, don't bother me with the facts says the Leader of the Opposition, just go out and get me the money, somewhere, anywhere. That is the approach that the previous government took, Mr. Speaker, to the development of our northern hydro resources, now documented, chapter, line and verse. And I want to say to my honourable friends that the sum total of their response to this indictment of their wastrel tactics is to hide behind the gates of Rideau Hall. Well, it isn't going to wash in here, Mr. Speaker, and I want them to know right now, it isn't going to wash in here.

Monday, 3 March

I know that members like the Member for Inkster are prepared to give an attempt at a reasoned defence. But there is nobody else in that other group that have separated themselves from the Member for Inkster, who either can do it or have the gumption to do it, Mr. Speaker, because they stand indicted.

Hydro rates in this province that are at least 20 percent higher than they need be because of the wastrel tactics of these people opposite. Capital expenditures committed well beyond \$500 to \$600 millions, that need not have been committed at all. They know that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to quote to them tonight, if time permits, a number of interesting comments from that report, which I hope will stimulate them to some form of defence, if indeed they have any at all. But it's a chapter of this province which all of us wish, Mr. Speaker, was behind us. It's not behind us yet. It's going to be with us, it's going to be with succeeding generations for years to come.

And it will stand, if I may say so, Sir, as a lasting testament to the kind of incompetent political written administration that we had in this province from 1969 to 1977, which we have been blessedly rid of ever since, and which, God forbid, we will ever have in this province ever again.

Mr. Speaker, when I come to make some of the quotes from that Commission tonight, I would imagine that my honourable friends would agree, even with their bias, that there has never been in the history of this country - and I hope I am not using hyperbole that is beyond the situation - a period running over years in this province, when there was a combination of deceit, when there was a combination of hiding of the facts, when there was a combination of cover-up engaged in by members of the government, and by senior members of Hydro, the likes of which I hope we will never see in this country again. We are great in this country, you know, to talk about Watergate. We've had our own documented Watergate in Manitoba, and it's the Manitoba Hydro debacle that these people opposite - and a good number of them who still sit here - presided over. And some of them today, Mr. Speaker, still have the gall to stand before the people of Manitoba and say, look, everything we did was right. Everything we did was right because otherwise, we wouldn't have this great surplus of power.

And I say to them - and I'm going to read a few chapters to them tonight from the Tritschler Commission to impress upon what's left of their intelligence on this subject - the fact that they left this province a heritage which they should be ashamed of, and which their sons and grandsons should be ashamed of throughout the length of the history of this province, so long as it may continue to exist.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few other things tonight about what we didn't hear. It's not only the hydro debacle that you know my honourable friends across the way are trying to cover up. I think it's safe to assume that a great many of the red herrings that we have seen demonstrated in the House by their speeches over the last several days have been set out to prevent us from seeking some explanation from our friends for the kinds of decisions that have been made by the Honourable Member for Inkster, and the kind of decision that was made by Mr. Syms, the former Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, on severing their ties with their former colleagues in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the great diversionary tactics, of course, when you're in a problem, is to try to talk about something else, to draw another red herring across the trail.

What was it that Mr. Syms said? Mr. Syms said that he thought the party, which my honourable friend, the Member for Selkirk is now the leader, had been taken over by communists and radicals. Those were not the statements of a blue-blood Conservative or anything like that at all. Those were the statements of the man who was the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, appointed by my honourable friends for some eight years. Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker, those are the words of a former member of their party. A former President of their party.

Mr. Speaker, that's not to say that, from time to time, any party does not have defections, for whatever cause. But surely I would think that the Leader of the Opposition would be able to present some sort of a passing defence, Mr. Speaker, to the comment made by the former Chairman of the Liquor Commission, who was a lifelong, rib-rock member of the New Democratic Party, the Socialist party of Manitoba. What does he say about that?

And of our honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, he stood up with full candor the other day, and said he left because he thought the control of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, of the union movement in Manitoba, was too great over my honourable friends opposite. What did we hear about that, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech? Not a whimper, not a word. We had to wait until we heard from the Member for Inkster to talk about that.

Monday, 3 March

I used the expression once that my friend from Inkster - we've been friends for many, many years - reminded me somewhat of the piano player in the house of ill repute, in the Yukon at the turn of the century. Somebody came in and asked him what he was doing in a place like that, he said, "I don't know what's going on upstairs." And my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster should have known what's been going on upstairs in the NDP for a long time.

So I merely say, Mr. Speaker, when are we going to get some enlightenment on these fissures and cracks and dislocations that are taking place in this great socialist party of Manitoba, which is luxuriating - and I think that's not too strong a verb, or an adjective or a noun, to apply. It is luxuriating in its recent transitory success in a peripheral way in the federal election. And my honourable friends, when they got up in the course of the Throne Speech debate, that was all they could talk about.

And, Mr. Speaker, it provides an interesting contrast, do you not think? Last May, when the Progressive Conservative government, under the leadership of the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, was elected to the government of Canada, I don't think you heard the kind of breast-beating and luxuriating, -(Interjection)- no, no, not to the same extent. And I think that there's an interesting difference to be made, and that is this, and it's not I, I wish I could claim the quote. Someone once said that socialism is a disease, it's not a political philosophy. It's a disease and it tends to spread. And my honourable friends, I suppose, are luxuriating in the fact that they have maybe implanted some of these cells in the corporate body of Manitoba, and they hope that they're going to spread.

But I want to tell my honourable friends this, and it's only a political projection, and it's probably not even worth the time it takes to say it, because we all know that political projections are a dime a dozen. But I venture the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that within a year, 18 months or two years, the present national Government of Canada is going to be held highly in disrepute. And I venture the thought, Mr. Speaker, that along with them will be their bedmates down there, the NDP. And I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that people are going to read back to Mr. Broadbent and to some of his federal candidates, some of the utter nonsense that they spouted during the past federal election campaign. And I dare say, Mr. Speaker - and I could well be wrong - that we're going to have an awfully uncomfortable group of NDP MLAs sitting opposite us within a matter of a relatively short period of time.

The wish is not father of the thought at all, and I'm not wishing that, but in my years in politics, I have a suspicion that that is exactly what is going to happen. Because some of the phoney issues that were raised during the election campaign by the NDP, which still remains, Mr. Speaker, a form of aberration on the national political scene - it has got something like what? About 11 percent of the seats. It has got about 19.8 percent of the popular vote. And you would think, my God, on election night, if you listened to Mr. Broadbent with his teeth and his mouth wide open, that he had won the national election. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, maybe he knows more than we did. Maybe he did win it, I don't know, in the sense that the philosophies that he would follow that he dare not pronounce to the people of Canada might well be followed by those who did receive the majority election. Who knows? Who knows?

But, Mr. Speaker, I dare say that within a year, within two years, we are going to see a fair amount of discomfort from honourable members on the opposite side who have been luxuriating in the last few days about their transitory victory on the federal scene. There is no immediate transference of vote, as we all know, from the federal to the provincial seat. We all know as well that in the heyday of the Tory in Manitoba, when we held the vast majority of the seats in Manitoba, even in 1968 which was one of the lower ebbs, and in 1972 and so on, there were many more Tory seats than there were even at the present time, and what did we have? God forbid, we had an NDP government in Manitoba.

I am willing to admit that there is a generic difference between the two. But I still say, Mr. Speaker, that there are interesting times ahead that will readily be acknowledged by the more sage viewers of the political scene in Manitoba, such as the Member for Inkster and others, who will indicate to perhaps some of their younger and more jejune friends that "enjoy the moment, enjoy the moment, because the tide can well turn in a very very brief period of time."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a court of public opinion in this province, and I can assure the members opposite that this court is going to get all the evidence, not only on Manitoba Hydro, but on all of the other evidences of maladministration that we have been subjected to clearing up over the past two years or more. I am sorry, of course, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friends haven't really chosen to deal in a substantive way with that kind of an indictment, because it is one that historians will remember.

Monday, 3 March

I think we, all of us, from time to time have to remember the position that history regards of different administrations. And I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to let history make its judgment of the last two and one-half years that this government has been office, because we came in and we have done those things that we said we would do. I wonder if my honourable friends opposite, with the same amount of alacrity, can say that they are happy to have history judge their rather sordid record on the basis of the facts as they have already been laid out before the people of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Member for Inkster perhaps better than most of them. I can understand what his dilemma is. He has left this party because he says, in effect, there is too much control by organized labour. Organized labour controls a certain number of delegates at every convention they go to, and I say just by way of passing, can you imagine the kinds of noises we would be hearing from across the way if the Canadian Manufacturers Association, or if the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, or any of the other organizations that happen to represent the private sector, were to be able to claim a block of votes in the Conservative Party - or indeed, even in the Liberal Party?

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what they would be saying opposite? But we all know that they have modelled themselves very closely on the Trades Union Congress in Great Britain, and that's why my honourable friend is sitting at the end of the bench here today. Because, with his integrity, he will not accept the kind of imposed control that comes, not from the general membership of the Federation of Labour in Manitoba - God knows not from them - but from the leadership of the Manitoba Federation of Labour in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that. Mr. Speaker, much better minds than mine have talked and written about this for a long long time. I hope my friends will not consider me to uncharitable if I use the thoughts of the present Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, Lord Halesham, which I think may well be appropriate to describe their current internal relations and the dilemma that is pointed out by the situation of the Member for Inkster. And here's what Lord Halesham had to say in one of his recent writings, "I have no doubt whatever that the attitude of the Trade Union Movement and of the Labour Party with which it is organically connected has been a major, I would say the principal, cause of our national decline. Neither can ever make up its mind whether its role is to destroy the capitalist system and its values or rescue the capitalist system from its faults."

And, Mr. Speaker, having said those few words, am I not putting my finger to some considerable extent upon the dilemma which causes the Member for Inkster to be sitting where he is, and the other members of that socialist party to be sitting where they are.

You get the Member for Brandon East, my finger just happened to stop at. He stands up in this House. He's as good an example as any. A former Minister, if you'll pardon the expression, of Industry and Commerce in Manitoba under a socialist government. That's like being a Minister of Tourism at the North Pole.

Mr. Speaker, he stands up in this House and says, we want to do more for small business. He and his colleagues did more to drive small business out of this province in the eight years they were in, and they haven't come to understand it yet. The hundreds of millions of dollars that farmers, that small business people, that ordinary working people and so on, invested in other provinces because they couldn't stand the confiscatory taxes in this province, and he says that they're all in favour of small business.

And I asked him the question, Mr. Speaker, that I've asked him before. When does one of these small businesses that they allegedly love start to become one of those big businesses that we know they all hate. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, of any big business today that didn't start out as a small business? I don't. But what I'm trying to find out from my honourable friends, and it's the age old question you can ask of any socialist anywhere, why is it that you are so in favour of big government but you're so against any kind of business, medium, large-size, or multinational, if you want to use the knee-jerk expression of the Member for Transcona. That really gets them heated up.

And here you have this fundamental dilemma because my honourable friends opposite and the Member for Inkster sits here as a living manifestation of this fact. My honourable friends opposite haven't made up their minds yet whether they want to be purer Marxists and destroy the system, or whether they want to be reasonable people and improve the system and work in concert with the private sector. When they were in office they talked for instance about expropriating the mining industry. --(Interjection)-- Well that's true. The Member for Lac du Bonnet has made up his mind. He knows that there should only be one oil company in Canada, and that should be owned by the state. The Member for Lac Du Bonnet also made up his mind when he was Minister of Agriculture that the land-holding system in Cuba was the best

Monday, 3 March

land-holding system for the people of Manitoba. He went down there and saw it, and he said the state should own all of the land, and we haven't heard my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, deny that particular shibboleth of their belief.

My honourable friend, it's said that the Leader of the Opposition was on the same trip. I suggest he's been on a funny trip for a long long time with respect to . . . He's one of these strange people in Canada, Mr. Speaker, who is much more concerned about the situation of the people in Chile than he is about the situation of the people in Selkirk, Interlake, with respect to farm ownership and state ownership of land.

Why don't they took a look around him, in his own constituency, and see what his policies, his government's policies, with respect to state farm ownership are doing? Why doesn't he take a look around him? Why doesn't he say to this House, I think two-and-a-half times one, the restriction of incomes of the people of Manitoba, to two-and-a-half times one, I think that's wrong? Does he not say it because he doesn't believe it? After all, that was said by somebody who is no longer here. My honourable friend can disengage himself from that anytime he wants. But we know that he believes in it. And there again, Mr. Speaker, the fundamental dilemma of my honourable friends opposite.

They want to be pure socialists but they don't dare tell the people of Manitoba, or the people of Canada, that's what they believe. They say just elect us and we'll do these things. We'll never tell you what we are doing. We'll do them. We'll buy up this company, we'll buy up that company, and they'll all be money losers. And we'll continue doing all of these things and we'll tax, tax, tax, and we'll raise the deficit and we'll spend, spend, spend. And we'll engage in debacles like Manitoba Hydro, but for heaven's sake, don't ask us ever to admit that's what we want to do. And that's the kind of fundamental dilemma that we see with our honourable friends opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard from the major wing of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba. We had a brief this year from the Manitoba Federation of Labour. And I have a copy of that brief here and I am going to ask my honourable friend some interesting questions about that brief as soon as I get to it, because the major component of the socialist party in Manitoba, if we are to believe everything we hear, even the Member for Inkster, is the Federation of Labour. And you ought to see some of the things that they are saying, Mr. Speaker. And you ought to hear some of the things, as the Member for Inkster told us the other day, that they are trying to get the New Democratic Party in this province to inflict upon the people of this province.

Some speaker this afternoon said something about Autopac. He said, when is the government going to have - and I am paraphrasing his words - the guts to do what it really believes it should do? Mr. Speaker, we've had, to use the street expression, we've had the guts to do what we think should be done in the public interest with Autopac and that's it, period, paragraph. And I say to my honourable friends, if they would be as forthright with the people of Manitoba as to what they intend to do with taxation, deficit, state-owned industries, the state farm program and so on, then we would have a real debate going in this House instead of having them hide behind royal robes at Rideau Hall on the Hydro debacle and other areas where they would like to say, nobody here but us chickens. Well we happen to know that those cackling chickens are all Socialists, Mr. Speaker, and we happen to be able to point out to the people of Manitoba just what that kind of government - with the same people by and large that we see in front of us today - inflicted upon this province for eight long years, from 1969 to 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to debates on which means of production should be nationalized or any of the shibboleths that my honourable friends happen to believe in, but haven't got the intestinal fortitude to talk about. None at all. I have a strong opinion, Mr. Speaker, about the humour of the Rhinoceros Party in the last election, and I tend to bunch my honourable friends with the Rhinoceroses, because I really don't think either of them deserves too much attention. Mr. Speaker, there are other interesting appellations that have been applied, even by the new Cabinet Minister in the Liberal Government, with respect to my honourable friends' capacities in other respects.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we have been, in this province, subjected to eight years of their funny ideas. And in this debate with themselves, it has taken our government the better part of two years to patch up the worst holes of the combatants and the social engineers. What about the roughly 2,000 contract employees that are now down to 200, where did all of those camp followers get to? I suppose they have mostly now dispersed out to Saskatchewan and other oases of Marxism around the world, after having bled the people of Manitoba. Why don't we hear some talk about that? No, Mr. Speaker, we don't. If one wanted to be

Monday, 3 March

uncharitable about the population outflow, we could account for a fair number of them who have gone to other socialist oases in other parts of the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have got a great deal of territory to cover tonight, and I want to talk for a few moments about other things that will be equally uncomfortable to my honourable friends opposite. Much of our work in the last two years - and we acknowledge it has been housekeeping, cleaning up, cleaning up a rat-infested nest. Not always a particularly pleasant job, Mr. Speaker, and not always a very easy one, but one that was absolutely essential to permit us to get on with the job of rebuilding our economy from the devastation of that party when they were in office.

What we faced when we came into office has been well-documented, although easily forgotten by my honourable friends opposite; well known by the people of this province. But since the members opposite conveniently didn't and don't mention it at all, I am going to refresh their memories for a few seconds, so hang to your seats.

First of all, government spending was totally out of control, and I am talking about 27 months ago, not 27 years ago. A record deficit in this province, Mr. Speaker, several times higher than the Member for West Kildonan, who is conveniently not here tonight, was willing to admit, with all of that frankness and candor that he had when he was Minister of Finance. The second-highest per capita debt total in the country, which even the First Minister was not prepared to admit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a matter of privilege.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, rather than, as the First Minister indicated the Member for Seven Oaks being conveniently absent tonight, the Member for Seven Oaks is present. He was present as of five, ten minutes ago. The First Minister is fully aware of that.

MR. DOERN: He went out to get a shovel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that whether the Member for Seven Oaks is present or is not present, he is hard to see. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Seven Oaks was pretty hard to hear in September and October of 1977, when he was still Minister of Finance; and when he failed to divulge to the people of Manitoba - in fact deny to the people of Manitoba - that they were facing the kind of a budget deficit that we had to inherit from them, \$191 million, and he had nothing to say about that. He is the little man who wasn't there and who wasn't heard from, whether he is here or not tonight.

The second highest per capita debt total in the country I have mentioned, a directionalist and an demoralized Civil Service in this province, where the technique and the dodge of using these kinds of contract employees to get around the merit principle of the Civil Service was part and parcel of the operations of my honourable friends opposite.

I listened this afternoon to some speaker from the other side, Mr. Speaker, talking about a form of patronage, as he chose to describe it, on behalf of this government. Mr. Speaker, there was never a more cynical, patronage-ridden government in the history of this province than those people when they sat in the government benches of this side of the House. We know that. As I have said before, it was like the great Gilbert and Sullivan operetta, the sisters and the cousins whom they counted up by dozens, and the aunts, they were all on the payroll. We know that. And there was a directionalist and a demoralized Civil Service subject to layer-upon-layer of competing and redundant central agency planners - some of them sit now in the House - and evaluators, and secretariats, and a long list of failing and close-to-failing government corporations.

The Member for Brandon East likes to tell us about that great profit-making centre known as McKenzie Seed out in Brandon. Wait, Mr. Speaker, until the report of that company is heard. It is a company we want to strengthen and sustain and improve in the City of Brandon, but not in the kind of hoodwink-way that he was attempting to do, he and his colleagues, losing \$1 million a year for the people of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- Yes, as the Minister of Finance says, in the beautiful tradition of Saunders Aircraft, \$40 million of public dollars and then down the drain. That is the kind of operation that my honourable friends were best at

Monday, 3 March

running. An economy, Mr. Speaker, this was what they presided over, an economy which showed the consequences in virtually every sector, of the kind of maladministration and funny ideas that they bring to public affairs in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the word "aberration", I mean it. Do you know, the Socialists, the really true Socialists, in this country represent just a fraction of the thinking. Because if they really came out and 'fessed up to the people of Canada or the people of Manitoba as to what they really believe, they would be laughed off the stage. So they have to pretend they are something that they aren't. You get Mr. Broadbent in a pin-striped suit, at public expense, out of the taxpayers' pocket, with his ads on TV saying, I am just one of these nice guys. I am not a Marxist. I don't intend to make PetroCan the major oil company in Canada, and so on and so forth. You know, all of this kind of nonsense. They have to hide what they really believe in. There is an elementary hypocrisy, if I may use that term, to the stance of any Socialist in Canada today, because he wouldn't dare say to the people of Canada what he really believes in, or he wouldn't be elected dogcatcher.

So I am saying to my honourable friends opposite, that is part of the fundamental dilemma that puts the Member for Inkster in the corner seat where he is tonight, because he can't stand that kind of hypocrisy. He is a confirmed Socialist and he says and he has got the candour to say so --(Interjection)-- Well, my honourable friend will be considerably more than dogcatcher. But I am wondering about some of his erstwhile colleagues on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, they talk from time to time about the state of the economy in Manitoba when they had responsibility for public office. You have to look back to those days prior to price and wage controls going on in 1974. You know, it was like shooting fish in a barrel. The economy was doing reasonably well under that false kind of last blowout that we were having in this country before some of the chickens came home to roost. We all know what happened in 1975, 1976, 1977. As the Conference Board said, Manitoba was in a recession, and a recession that my honourable friends never admitted. No, no, no, they never admitted Manitoba was in a recession.

My heavens, Mr. Speaker, we were in the Socialist Valhalla. We were building power plants that cost hundreds of millions of dollars when we had no damn need for them. Oh, this was the Socialist Valhalla, spend, spend, spend, put more people on the payroll. And even then, they tried to bolster the figures by ersatz means to make them look better than they were. The ultimate irony, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so - and I will be talking about this in a few minutes, when we come to talk about the so-called depopulation in Manitoba - the ultimate irony is this: If you read the Tritschler Commission, where the evidence is laid down very very firmly, you will see that most of the capital works upon which my honourable friends and their colleagues at Manitoba Hydro were engaged in the mid 1970s, were not needed. Indeed, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the last major hydro project that was commissioned last June should not have been built for another two years.

And you'll find, Mr. Speaker, that that greatest albatross of all, Jenpeg, need never have been built at all. That's not a partisan statement on my behalf, that's the record of the Royal Commission looking into Manitoba Hydro. \$330 million that my honourable friends, collectively, plus, committed on one project that didn't have to be spent in Manitoba at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see this nonsense now, of the Leader of the Opposition and others of his ilk from that side of the House, talking about the alleged depopulation in Manitoba. And I merely say to them, Mr. Speaker, that if they had followed a sane and responsible course with respect to the phasing of construction on Manitoba Hydro, we would still be building today, works on Manitoba Hydro in northern Manitoba, the product of which is still not needed, because as the Commission demonstrated, and as many have demonstrated for years before, Manitoba sits today in the unenviable position of having a 45 percent overcapacity of hydro-electric generating ability. And the ratepayers are paying for it. And my honourable friends try to sit opposite and say that that was good, sage planning for the people of Manitoba.

And the report, Mr. Speaker, of the Royal Commission stands there, like Gibraltar as a testimony to the kind of wastrel maladministration, political cover-up and outright misleading statements that were made, not only, Mr. Speaker, by those identified in the Tritschler Report, but indeed by members of the former government, including the person who stood where I now stand in this House. And so, Mr. Speaker, that indictment is there, and I am confident that history will interpret that indictment the way it should be interpreted.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my honourable friends tonight, that if they think that they can escape, for one moment, the record that they left to this province, they've got a mighty long think coming. And if my honourable friend can sit there, in holy unctiousness, as he sometimes does, and try to say, well that's all behind us, just elect us again so that we can



Monday, 3 March

inflict more of our nonsense upon the people of Manitoba, he hasn't been in a debate yet, the likes of which he has never seen before. And I can give him a personal guarantee of that, Mr. Speaker. Because we haven't begun to fight yet with respect to the record of this group of probably the worst maladministrators that this province has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that the accomplishments of our government in the last two years are all the more significant when you consider the kind of heritage that we had to take over. And all the more important for the people of Manitoba. The members of this side of the House can take pride in their record for the last two years. We faced a formidable task as our first priority in office to secure and to stabilize our financial and our economic base, and we have accomplished it. Clearly, the process of correction and consolidation had to begin on the budgetary side.

The members opposite have been strangely quiet on this point, and I can well understand their silence. Even with the special measures that we took as soon as we came into office in the fall of '77, the deficit in '77/'78 was \$191.3 million, the largest deficit ever in the history of this province. And let some of these paragons of fiscal virtue, such as the Member for St. Johns, and the one who's still not here, the Member for Seven Oaks - former Ministers of Finance - attempt to stand up in this House and tell us why well over \$100 million of that was on current account. Unheard of in the province of Manitoba. Unacceptable in the province of Manitoba. Had to be corrected in the province of Manitoba, and it was corrected.

Now, in the current year, Mr. Speaker, we're projecting a budget deficit at the present time of \$36.2 million, on the same basis as the \$191 million just two years ago. And we add to that the cost of the hydro rate stabilization - a real cost which the Member for St. Johns hasn't really fully comprehended yet - and it's still only \$73.3 million. So when we say that the budget deficit of this province is under control, we mean it, Mr. Speaker. We mean it.

And Mr. Speaker, we intend to keep it that way, and we are still budgeting on a deficit basis in Manitoba; have been and will continue to for some time. As we have emphasized in this House time and time again, we have been able to bring down the deficit to a manageable size, while at the same time reducing a broad range of taxes in this province, for working people, for pensioners, for small business and for key resource industries. And we've proved that it could be done while maintaining, and indeed improving, essential services in Manitoba.

All we had to do, Mr. Speaker, was to start to render down some of the Socialist fat that we had inherited from my honourable friends opposite, layers of Civil Service that weren't needed, a number of whom were friends and party card holders of my honourable friends opposite. Those are the ones they hired by contract, because they couldn't get them through the Civil Service Commission, to which, I am happy to report Mr. Speaker, integrity has now once again been restored, so that the merit principle is back in force in the Civil Service Commission in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to insure that not even the debacle of the return of my honourable friends at some long distant date in the future would return the kind of cynical back-door treatment that they gave to the Civil Service when they were in office. And my honourable friends know as well as I do that that comment doesn't come from a partisan source, that comes from leaders in the MGEA who knew the kind of administration that my honourable friends, the cynical administration, that they were carrying on with respect to the Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite try to be so unctiously self-righteous all the time. Unctiously self-righteous. I can think of no better term. And, as I've said before, they have presided over perhaps the most cynical administration, riddled with patronage, of any government ever in the history of this province. They were incompetent managers, they were incompetent in office, and they deserve to stay where they are for many, many years. Mr. Speaker, what I said at the beginning tonight is that they're incompetent in opposition.

So Mr. Speaker, we can soon see that my honourable friends have an awful lot of jacking up to do. And they've lost one of their best members in the Member for Inkster. He is not there to help them, except to give them a bit of advice from the outside. They're a pretty sorry lot, in a pretty sorry state, and they're going to have to answer for their sins of omission and commission before they're through with this government, and before the next election is called, and it's going to be an answering that not too many of them are going to like to face up to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they like to pretend there's no relationship between the province's financial position and its ability to undertake economic development programming. The essence of what they say is, quite simply, keep on spending. Where the money comes from is from increased taxes or from borrowing; we can deal with that all later. It's essentially

Monday, 3 March

irrelevant to our theory - their theory - of economic management. But, as they themselves found out in the case of their many attempts to force-feed the economy, there eventually comes the day of reckoning. And what we've been dealing with, Mr. Speaker, in the past two years, is the day of reckoning that was left to us by the maladministrators who were in office before.

The Member for Transcona, I'm happy to see, sits there with a benign smile on his face. He was one of their senior bureaucrats in that organization that we were able to dispense with overnight. Overnight. Planning and Priorities. Just gone, like the flick of an eyelash. And the Government of Manitoba has never looked better than from the time we got the Socialist planners out of some of the wild-eyed planning that was going on in this province. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. Who are they trying to kid?

Mr. Speaker, you can't force-feed the economy. In the case of Hydro, as the Tritschler Report made very clear, they were given clear and very precise warnings every foot of the way about what they were doing which was so wrong, wrong, wrong. And their obtuseness, their pigheadedness, drove them on merely for the sake of what? I don't know. Were they erecting monuments to themselves as the Member for Elmwood was when he built the garage that nobody needs? One can never tell what motivates this strange band of people, Mr. Speaker, who dare not tell the people of Manitoba what they really believe in.

Let them stand up in candor and say, look, we believe, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet does, we believe that all the farmland in Manitoba should be owned by the state. When have they got the guts to do that? They haven't. Let them stand up and say that we believe most of the industry in Manitoba should be owned by the public sector. They haven't got the intestinal fortitude to do that. No, not at all, Mr. Speaker.

So I say that hypocrisy has its place, but not in this Legislature. And if my honourable friends think they are going to get away with it in here they have got about a fourth or fifth think coming, because they are not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what Professor Kierans wrote to the then Premier of this province on August 13th, 1973, deserves to be repeated, because obviously my honourable friends didn't pay too much attention to it when it was sent to them, and I quote, "During the several months that I have been a member of the Hydro Task Force" - what was that, Mark III - "I have become increasingly troubled by the current expansion program of Manitoba Hydro and their requests for Cabinet approval of an even greater acceleration. Given Hydro's demands on the capital markets during the next decade, I can only conclude that your government will not be able to find the dollars needed to carry on your own plans for investment in the human condition, 'housing, education, health, welfare, the stay option, resource exploration, and development and elimination of poverty'." That is the advice they were getting from their own hand-picked advisors in 1973. And the Leader of the Opposition stands up in this House a week ago and says, "We can't talk about Hydro, because after all that might be a reflection on the Governor-General." I say if he thinks he can get away with that nonsense, he has got another think coming. Let him go back to his own reports that he had here, when they were warned by their own left-wing friends as to what they were doing.

Professor Kierans went on to make a series of recommendations, one of which was "There should be a cut-back in the existing pace of investment and capital construction. If this is not done, the province will pay heavily for the excess investment in Hydro facilities by being forced to limit growth in other sectors of the provincial economy." This was 1973, Mr. Speaker.

My honourable friends stand up today and say everything that went on with Hydro was proper. My honourable friends stand up today and have the gall to attempt to castigate this government for the outflow of construction workers from the Hydro construction that they turned down in 1977 when, if they had followed a proper system of development on Hydro, that construction would still be going on. Talk about reverse English, Mr. Speaker, talk about trying to get into the chicken coop and steal the chicken and say nobody here but us chickens. You see them sitting opposite, my honourable friends the Socialists, who say that they are fit to govern Manitoba. They are not fit to run a peanut stand, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, that advice wasn't heeded, we all know that, Mr. Speaker. We all know the result.

MR. ENNS: And they paid for that advice I am sure.

MR. LYON: They had to scale down Hydro activity themselves, just before the election. Mind you, they didn't bother telling anybody about it. That is another great mark of

Monday, 3 March

our Socialist friends. They don't tell you about the size of the deficit until the new government gets into office and you have to summon the Deputy Minister and say, all right, what is really going on. And the Member who isn't here, for Seven Oaks, was the one who didn't tell us about the deficit in 1977. He can answer to his own conscience, I am not worried about it.

And they didn't bother telling us, Mr. Speaker, about when they turned off Limestone in 1977. No, that is something we don't have to bother the people of Manitoba with. That is the kind of integrity we show, said they, to the people of Manitoba. Well, we know something about their integrity, Mr. Speaker. We, of course, had no alternative - and have had no alternative since - but to continue the policy of not building at Limestone until markets catch up to our capacity.

There is no government in the history of this province that is more committed to the development of the Nelson-Churchill System than this government. After all, many of us in this government at the present time were members of the party and of the government that devised it and were part of the conception of it in the first place. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that as soon as it is fiscally viable to get on with it, it will be gotten on with. But no more of the Cass Beggs and the so-called phoney engineers, whose main claim to fame is that they were former Socialist candidates. No more of that nonsense will be inflicted on Manitoba Hydro.

If my honourable friend, the Member for Burrows, thinks that that is a laughing matter, let him read the Tritschler Report. Let him read the Tritschler Report, and I think that will remove any smile that he has from his face. It is a pity the TV cameras aren't looking at him, Mr. Speaker. How anybody can smile at the waste of \$600 million because you appoint one of your political friends to the chief office in Manitoba Hydro, and thereby prostitute it, I don't know - but that is what you did.

So, Mr. Speaker, how typical that is of the attitude of members opposite. How typical that they say the actions of individuals should be controlled. You heard Lac du Bonnet the other day saying that people should be forced to do this, that and other thing in the energy field, and so on. But then they resist the argument that there should be some control and accountability on the power and the decisions of what is supposed the instrument of the people of Manitoba, government and the Crown corporations for which government answers.

It is interesting to contrast the comments of the Member for Lac du Bonnet with another piece of advice to the government from Professor Kierans back in 1973, and I quote from pages 226 and 227 of the Tritschler Report. "It is not enough for a government to have aspirations. It must also have the dollars that will enable it to carry them out. Making the hopes of Manitobans come true will demand not only a continuing adherence to the objectives outlined in the guidelines, but careful and prudent planning to ensure that financial resources, scarce in Manitoba as anywhere else, are devoted to their attainment and not squandered in the premature building of dams that will serve to provincial needs until 1995. If Manitoba cannot invest in human conditions, housing, education, health, welfare, pensions, and stay option, resource development and the elimination of poverty because Hydro programs have exhausted the credit of the people, it will not be sufficient to damn the money lenders of the east or New York. People can and will rightly question the integrity of a government which promises greater equality and pursues profitless grandeur."

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said the other day - and I give him credit - without imputing the integrity of the Royal Commissioner, he said, "I think this is a political report". I ask him, was Professor Kierans' statement a political report as an indictment of his administration? It certainly was. It was foretold by Kierans, foretold as to what they were doing, and still they wouldn't listen. Six hundred million dollars later, they still weren't listening. Twenty percent increase in Hydro rates, and they still weren't listening. And they today stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and say, but we are fit, we are fit to occupy the offices of government in this House." Mr. Speaker, what greater charade could you ever hope to see than the collection of individuals we see opposite, who have had their chance? You know it would be like the song that we heard at a concert recently, Bring on the Clowns. The clowns are there. I don't think the people of Manitoba are going to bring them on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have people standing up in this House talking, as I have said, about the outflow of people when there still should be Hydro construction going on in northern Manitoba. And how often did they think of that when they were in office? The members opposite like to characterize the Hydro slowdown and its impact on the economy as an example of our tight-fistedness on this side of the House. They are the ones who slowed it

Monday, 3 March

down. They are the ones who stopped it, and because we've continued that stoppage of construction until we can see markets, now they turn around in their hypocrisy and say, "But you've got to start building again." Mr. Speaker, any party in this province that would turn around and repeat the disastrous errors that were made by my honourable friends opposite in their eight years deserves to be written out of the province. That is a precedence for disaster and I can assure my honourable friends that we won't follow that kind of precedent. I don't expect my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, to concede to anything that I am saying because they live in their own private little socialist nirvana. Their own little dream world, where spend, spend, spend, somebody else's money is the only thing they know. They can go around, all twenty-three or twenty-two of them - is it about to be twenty-one pretty soon? - I don't know - they can go around with their own pet little chips on their shoulders as long as they want, but for heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, don't let them try to inflict that upon the public interest and the public will of the people of Manitoba. Just because they are strange is no reason to inflict their strange ideas on the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, despite the transparent efforts of the members opposite to discredit what the people of Manitoba have been able to achieve in the last two years, the record is filled with ample and clear evidence in the statistics that count of significant and genuine recovery - and I am only going to highlight them: 24,000 new jobs between 1977 and 1979 in the private sector, double the number in the last two years of the NDP despite their so-called economic planning and the shells of special projects that they had and the multitudes of programs and hidden deficits and so on. And between 1975 and 1977, only one-twelfth of the employment increase in Manitoba under their administration was in the private sector. They were building up non-productive government jobs for their friends. That's where the employment growth was. Make work, look after your own from any part of the world, bring them in here and let them inflict their damage and then let them flit back out again. Well that was the employment policy of the NDP.

What about the percentage rate of employment growth? In 1975 it was .5 percent. In 1976 it was 2.2. In 1977 it was .7. In 1978 it was 2.6 and last year the annual average was 3 percent. And my honourable friends opposite say that we are in a state of decline in our economy. They have never yet admitted, Mr. Speaker, that we were in a recession in this province from 1975 to 1977, out of which we are clawing ourselves at the present time, after overcoming the albatross of eight years of their maladministration and their taxation and all of the other confrontation tactics that they had on every sector of the private economy in this province. And contrary, Mr. Speaker, to what members opposite try to imply, the part-time component in the increase was not up substantially. And here is another one of their little cute half-truths that has to be knocked on the head, in fact the increase in part-time employees relative to the total increase was lower between 1977 and 1979 than it was between 1975 and 1977.

Mr. Speaker, there were nearly, in the last two years, three billion dollars in private sector investment despite the effects of national interest rates with which we don't agree, and threats by the members opposite to turn the clock back if they're ever sent back to this side of the House. And following an increase of 7.2 percent in private investment in 1977, the increase was 22 percent in 1978, and 4 percent last year, and that only tells part of the story. My honourable friends can't deny those facts, much as they might wish to. A 34 percent increase in projected manufacturing investment in 1979, double the national average. A further sign of the strengthening of this most important sector that bodes well for the future. Manufacturing shipments up 20 percent last year following a 16 percent increase the year before, which in turn came on top of a 3 percent increase in 1977 under that marvellous group of socialists opposite who were such great friends of industry and manufacturing and job creation. Mr. Speaker, let's have enough of that. We've had quite enough of that hypocrisy.

A few weeks ago the Member for Brandon East put out what was purported to be the official socialist economic review of Manitoba. It was like, Mr. Speaker, reading Alice in Wonderland. In it he said that the increase in manufacturing investment is, and I quote, "not significant" unquote, because it only amounts to relatively small proportion of total investment. That's a strange statement indeed coming from a strange collection of people, Mr. Speaker, who don't understand the importance of manufacturing investment in Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, who don't understand the importance of the overall private sector in Manitoba. They really don't.

Mr. Speaker, but let us be more specific about some of this investment. The list is familiar to members on our side of the House who are interested in what is really happening

Monday, 3 March

in the province. But to my honourable friends and some of their rare journalistic camp followers who see them around from time to time and who hang on every word of theirs, what is really happening in the province really doesn't always get reported.

Mr. Speaker, for those opposite who may have had their heads buried in the sand, let's give them a few of these facts. Shell Canada's 14 million-dollar oil refinery expansion took place this year, not when they were in office. Versatile's 26 million expansion on farm machinery manufacturing, giving 800 new jobs over the next five years, making Manitoba the biggest tractor manufacturing centre in Canada, that's happening here in this so-called despoiled economy that they are talking about. Great West Life, right across the street, a 62 million-dollar expansion of headquarters and related projects over the next ten years.

And typically using the technique that I hope my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, will abandon - typically what you hear them talk about - there are 42 jobs, they say, going down to Colorado. There is \$62 million worth of development going on right under their noses but they want to talk about the 42 jobs going to Nevada. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that had that government of socialists been re-elected in 1977, that whole head office complex wouldn't even be here now occupied by those tenants. They'd be all down in Nevada. Mr. Speaker, Boeings' five million-dollar expansion plant, we heard some talk about that today. The rolling mills in the Member for Selkirk's own constituency. They're putting in a five million-dollar expansion and modernization, and he says the economy is going to hell in a socialist hand basket. Tan Jay's got a four million-dollar expansion. Simplot Chemical's got a multi million-dollar expansion.

I haven't even mentioned the exelceration of activity in the area that they least like to talk about, in mining and the oil industry, precisely because, and the industry has said so publicly several times, precisely because of the decision of this government fought tooth and nail by my doctrinaire friends opposite, because of the decision to return our resource tax system to the mainstream of public policy in Canada and to make our taxes once again competitive in Manitoba so that we can get more jobs in Manitoba, get more mineral development in Manitoba and not be hung up by some 19th Century idea of the state owning and operating mines, that only people as naive and hypocritical as my honourable friends opposite would tend to believe.

Mr. Speaker, can they not see, can they not hear, can they not read, what is happening in mining in Manitoba? Does it take the President of International Nickel to come out here and say look, your mining taxation in Manitoba, the Member for Inkster was the Minister, was confiscatory, so we cut off all exploration outside of the immediate Thompson area in Manitoba. And Mr. Speaker, we are now resuming it, said he, because again, we can see that we can make a dollar in Manitoba. And they're committed - Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend can sit and mutter all he wants, but INCO have committed \$20 million in the next five years. Not of the taxpayers' dollars. And those aren't taxpayers' dollars. Taxpayers' dollars should not be spent on that kind of risk at all. If my honourable friend wants to spend \$5 million out of his own pocket, let him spend it. But the taxpayers of Manitoba, the senior citizens, those under the poverty line, should not be playing this kind of dice game with respect to mineral and oil exploration. And members opposite who were great at using other people's money for their own ideas should not be confiscating taxpayers' dollars to spend it on their own airy, fairy, funny, 19th century ideas.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the other day, the Member for Transcona launch into one of his typical attacks on multinationals. He made a great attack on the multinationals. You know, that's one of the great by-words of my honourable friends opposite. You've got to have slogans. And my honourable friends live - you know, in human nature, there are two qualities that are very, very unfortunate, one is hate and the other is envy. And my honourable friends subsist on both. And my honourable friends opposite, they have to have somebody to hate, or some organization to hate. And their current hatred, Mr. Speaker, their current hatred, Mr. Speaker, and you've heard it from Tommy Douglas on through and that dear old chap, David Lewis, people like that, the multinationals. They've got their own form of demonology. Their own form of demonology. They've got to inspire a class difference of some sort of other, and the Member for Transcona best personifies it - a shame, I really say it's a shame that a man with his background, with his education, with his promise, should be so captivated by that kind of myopic thinking which history denies, but you know, he's going to mature.

But Mr. Speaker, here's what he was saying. He was talking about the multinationals, and how bad it was that multinationals should be coming into Canada. I remind him, Mr. Speaker, that INCO is a multinational, Inco employs close to 2,000 people in the town of Thompson. I'm interested in seeing INCO employ another 2,000 people in Thompson, so are the steel

Monday, 3 March

workers, a union which is fairly strong, and the support, from time to time of this party, even though not in the town of Thompson. And I say to my honourable friend that he'd better think twice before he goes around branding loosely, multinationals. When he goes up to Thompson, he's talking about INCO. When he goes into Flin Flon, he's talking about HBM&S. And there are many, many multinationals in this province, I want him to know, that are welcome citizens. They are good corporate citizens. We want them here, we want them to expand in this province. We want them to create more jobs for our young people in this province.

My honourable friend has got to learn something yet, and that is that the viability of a company's operations is extremely important to the north region of this province, and to our entire province, and so he'd better learn a fundamental lesson about politics in Manitoba. Sloganeering of that kind of 19th century variety is lots of fun, but it ill befits a mind of his calibre, and it ill befits a party that wants to become a government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard doom and gloom from that side of the House about other numbers as well, the retail trade and so on. In 1978 the retail trade was well in excess of the 4.4 increase in 1977. Funny, isn't it, that they never make these comparative statistics or things available to the people of Manitoba?

They talk about migration, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources drove about eight six-inch spikes into that fragile argument the other night, and I'm not going to waste the time of the House in repeating. I merely say to my honourable friends opposite, read that speech and you'll find out that the net annual out-migration in Manitoba is less than it was in the years of the NDP, and if you had the candor and the honesty to admit it, you would admit that what has gone down is the in-migration, not the out-migration. The statistics have been available since last year, they were given to my honourable friends, they were given to the press, everybody knows it, but my honourable friends can continue to repeat their half-truths. And I suppose they'll get a fair amount of success, so long as somebody still publishes what they say, regardless of the validity of it.

So Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends are talking through their hats when they're talking about attracting and holding our skilled young people. We're doing a better job of it in terms of out-migration than they were. The fact is that in the market economy system, there is a strong degree of labour mobility, and there is a strong degree, Mr. Speaker, of capital mobility, too, which is something that my friend from Transcona can't seem to understand, when he talks about FIRA and some of the other little toys that he and his friends would like to play with. FIRA, I can tell him from personal experience, acts as a dampener to investment in Manitoba from Europe, from the United States and other places, from people who would like to invest money in Manitoba and create jobs for Manitobans. My honourable friend and some of his Walter Gordon lily-pad friends in the Liberal Party would like to pretend otherwise, but I merely say to them, that FIRA may be a good thing for the eastern triangle, or for the golden triangle, and maybe that's where my honourable friend ought to sit from, but it's not a good thing for Manitoba, I can tell him that. And it's not a good thing for western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the real problems and challenges that I suggest my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition should be talking about, I think deserve some attention before this debate ends. They are many, and they are not easily categorized. They are inter-related, and I'm only going to have the time to list but a few of them. Energy, obviously. This is the issue that is foremost in the minds of most Canadians and their governments, if not the foremost in importance in our economic scene, next only to inflation. Energy is surely the key to our prospects for the 1980s, and as the Throne Speech emphasized, it is critical to our development in the next ten years in this province.

Regional development - this issue is inextricably tied in with energy and other resource developments. The shift in economic activity from east to west in the last decade is likely to accelerate in the next few years, and this means major adjustments and specific problems in areas such as supply and allocation of investment capital, both domestic and from outside sources, and the supply of needed manpower.

Inflation and the other general economic issues, such as interest rates, productivity, the size and growth of the public sector, and so on. These are still fundamental issues in the real political life of Manitoba, not the political life that goes on in my honourable friend's caucus.

Shifting demographic trends, as I talked about before, Mr. Speaker, including the changing age distribution in Manitoba, with respect to not only our senior citizens, but with respect to the general aging process that is afflicting our whole population, and the need to prepare for the major impact that that is going to have, in services such as health, education, housing, on income security program, particularly pensions and so on.

Monday, 3 March

We look in vain, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, for any suggestion of thought by my honourable friend or any of their colleagues, on these fundamental issues that affect Manitoba today. They're still playing around with their little dogmatic 19th century ideas, worrying about whether or not this Crown company is going to be sold, or that Crown company, and not getting down to the real fundamental problems that afflict the people of Manitoba.

But of course there are other problems, including transportation, of which improvements in grain handling remains a major priority. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a political party in Manitoba, that stands up and beats its breast and says that it's going to be the next government of Manitoba, in a Throne Speech, in 1980, not talking about agriculture and grain handling and transportation? Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what we've just gone through. They have no ideas. They have no ideas. They've got slogans, they've got a few old catch phrases that they can haul out. They phone up some of their socialist friends in Saskatchewan and get the odd idea, and then they haven't even got the gumption to talk about them here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they've got to measure up and do a better job in here, because we could use their help. As I said before, we can use their ideas, but heaven knows, when you face that kind of bankruptcy from across the way, you're not getting too much help in the fundamental job of improving and helping the public interest in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite are great ones, as I said earlier, at ignoring the problems that face the people of Manitoba, and great ones at trying to talk about the short-term, myopic things that really will have no lasting effect or benefit upon the province.

Mr. Speaker, we saw today the swearing-in of a new federal government in Ottawa, and I re-echo tonight what I said at the outset of our proceedings this afternoon; that all partisan views aside, I suggest that that government will have the co-operation of the Government of Manitoba in respect to those matters that it wishes to carry out in the interests of all of Canada. I fear however, Sir, that if some of the previous attitudes of that government, of the Trudeau government, are carried forward into this new administration, that the country may well face some very severe times ahead.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the new federal government, I hope they will continue with a number of the initiatives that were started so well under the Clark government, the practice of medium term budgeting; the attempt to open up the budgeting process; the implementation of the Key Lambert Commission recommendations for improved financial management and accountability at the federal level; the acceleration of efforts to reduce duplication of services among the various levels of government; the higher priority assigned to regulatory reform; and specific efforts to deal with our grain handling and transportation problems, through such measures as the appointment of a new grains co-ordinator.

We intend to work in co-operation with that government in our efforts to build on those important steps toward dealing with the challenges of the 1980s. I only hope that we can enlist my honourable friends opposite in those attempts to benefit Manitoba in the 1980s, and to get their minds out of the 1880s where they seem to have been mired during the course of the Throne Speech debate.

And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that all other provinces will offer similar co-operation. I only hope that the new federal government will accept that co-operation and not engage in the kind of confrontation tactics that marked its approach in the latter years of its administration, prior to the election of May 1979.

This is a time, Mr. Speaker, for a great deal more than gestures and posturing. This is a time, Mr. Speaker, for some fundamental thinking to be done with respect to the problems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I note for the record, the rudeness of honourable members opposite, and I note that it is not the first, nor will it be the last time in this House, when speakers have had to interrupt private conversations so that my socialist friends can engage in their own kind of petty bickering. I just note that for the record. It doesn't bother me, because I expected nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, we in this party remember the WEOC Conference in 1973, the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, as a response to the 1972 electoral setback in western Canada, and we remember the let-down that occurred afterwards, and I know that let-down was shared by some members of the opposition when they were in government here. We must insure, Mr. Speaker, that if there is to be a future Western Economic Opportunities Conference, that we get meaningful commitments from the new federal government to do and to play its full role in the development of western Canada, in a way that is good for the national public interest of this province.

Monday, 3 March

Mr. Speaker, the opposition on the energy question likes to paint the oil pricing issue in simplistic black and white terms - or is it better described as blue and red terms, I don't know. But they should remember their own position when they were in government with respect to provincial resource ownership, and the federal government's disallowance of royalty deductibility. And they should remember, Mr. Speaker, that they were in a position, in those days, to take some positions based on integrity; and one can hope that they will return to that position while they are having their free-for-all in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the round of consultations with defeated Liberal candidates that were carried on by Mr. Axworthy and Mr. Bockstael last week was great fun, but I really don't think it's going to contribute too much to an understanding of what the west is all about. Our government is prepared and anxious to work for the new federal government, and we're prepared to start that co-operation from Day One. And I want to emphasize that our administration recognizes the need for a strong federal government. Anyone who doubts that fact should take the time to read what has been said consistently by this government at the First Ministers' Conferences on the Constitution, and the Economic Conferences as well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, time has flitted by and I have not been able to talk on all of the topics that I wish to speak upon tonight. But I want to assure my honourable friends opposite that there will be many many other opportunities, and that they haven't really begun to hear all that they're going to hear, not only in the recapitulation of what I have described earlier as being the greatest piece of cover-up and deceit ever practised by a government and by a Crown corporation in the history of our country - namely the debacle of Manitoba Hydro - but with respect to the other matters over which they have presided so negligibly during their years in office. And those will not be done as a rehearsal of history, Mr. Speaker, but rather in terms of how we can improve administration in Manitoba at the present time, and how we can avoid the clear-cut errors that were so clearly etched by my honourable friends opposite in that meandering trail that they followed when they had the responsibility of government on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk tonight, if time permitted, about the misunderstanding that the Leader of the Opposition apparently has - I would say it's not a misunderstanding, he really doesn't comprehend what the province's energy position was at the November 12th Conference. There is a copy of that statement that was made at that Conference which I will gladly send to his office. I hope he will read it, and then he may come to a fuller understanding, rather than reading news clippings or bulletins from the New Democrat as to what the position of the province was.

We believe in self-sufficiency in Canada by 1990. Anyone with half a brain believes in that. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the price of fossil fuels has to go up. Anyone knows that is going to happen, notwithstanding the protestations made during the election campaign.

We believe that the differential price on old and new gas works a detriment to the people of Manitoba. And we would like to hear my honourable friends opposite comment upon that policy, because we have heard nothing yet with respect to their general indictments on energy that get down to cases, and talk about the prices that Manitobans may well have to pay if that kind of policy is implemented in our province. The Leader of the Opposition looks at me in astonishment, as well he might. I doubt if he's ever heard of the topic before. But I say that he must inform himself. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that mental sloth has no place in this Legislature. You can get away with that in the hustings, but you can't get away with it in the Legislature. And I say to my honourable friend that we will continue our process of his education, and try to make out of him a better Leader of the Opposition, although God knows he'll never make a Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that, in responding to the Throne Speech utterances that have been made by members opposite, I am now fast running out of time. I wouldn't want the Member for Brandon to have me sit down, of course, without reminding him that I know, when it comes to the topic of outflow of population, I have in front of me those words that were quoted the other night by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, by my honourable friend when he was Minister of Industry and Commerce, when he was saying that population growth, in fact, may be the antithesis of real economic growth. Those words should be inscribed and hung on some form of a brass plate in this House to demonstrate to my honourable friends opposite that when you're in government, when you're defending your proposition, you may say one thing; when you're in opposition, you say another thing, but sooner or later the truth catches up with you.

And I say to my honourable friend that I appreciate the candor with which he spoke in that debate back in 1970, was it, when he was speaking about crude growth, and when he was



Monday, 3 March

speaking about population not being an indicator of growth at all. And at the same time, then he turns around and goes before the people of Manitoba and says that because there is an alleged discrepancy of 3,000 in the population of Manitoba, the economy of Manitoba is going to hell in a Socialist hand basket.

Well, I say to the people of Manitoba tonight, Mr. Speaker, that they should perhaps judge all of the comments of my honourable friends opposite, on the basis of what my honourable friend, the Member for Brandon East said on an earlier occasion about population growth and what he is now saying. And what we have been saying all along, Mr. Speaker, is that the economic condition of this province is improving, after the devastating buffeting that my honourable friends gave it with their taxation policies and so on over the years from 1969 to 1977.

We rest content with our record, there is a new era opening up in Manitoba, and we are going to vote against, Mr. Speaker, their ill-considered amendment against this Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. According to our rules, Rule No. 35(3), the hour being 9:30, the question of the amendments to the Throne Speech, first of all we'll deal with the sub-amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster, and that amendment be further amended by adding thereto the following: "And this House declares its want of confidence in the present government for the following reasons:

1. That the government has made no progress in the direction of providing socially financed and universally accessible post-secondary education and child care;

2. That the government is embarking on a program of using public funds to support private business;

3. That the government has and intends to continue the privateering of viable publicly-owned commercial enterprises such as Tantalum Mines, Cybershare and Dormond Industries, which have failed in the private sector and have been made viable through public effort and initiative; and,

4. The government is failing to take advantage of opportunities available for public investment and ownership in the resource based industries, and has instead demonstrated its abject dependence on private companies for mining exploration and development."

QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.

MR. GREEN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. All those in favour of the Sub-Amendment, please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS

ADAM	CORRIN	GREEN	PARASIUK
BARROW	COWAN	HANUSCHAK	PAWLEY
BOSTROM	DESJARDINS	JENKINS	SCHROEDER
BOYCE	DOERN	McBRYDE	URUSKI
CHERNIACK	EVANS	MALINOWSKI	WALDING
	FOX	MILLER	

NAYS

ANDERSON	DRIEDGER	JOHNSTON	MERCIER
BANMAN	EINARSON	JORGENSON	MINAKER
BLAKE	ENNS	KOVNATS	ORCHARD
BROWN	FERGUSON	LYON	PRICE
COSENS	FILMON	MacMASTER	RANSOM
CRAIK	GALBRAITH	McGILL	SHERMAN
DOMINO	GOURLAY	McGREGOR	WESTBURY
DOWNEY	HYDE	McKENZIE	WILSON

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22, Nays 32.

Monday, 3 March

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Sub-Amendment lost. We are now dealing with the Amendment as proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Same division?

MR. SPEAKER: But this House regrets that this government:

- 1) has shown its incompetence in managing the economy of Manitoba causing an exodus of businesses and people from our province, and depressing economic growth rate to the lowest in Canada,
- 2) has shifted funding in taxation resulting in increased user fees, post secondary tuition fees and a heavier burden of property taxation,
- 3) and has permitted the deterioration in comprehensive health care for Manitobans while at the same time, increasing user fees for nursing homes and Pharmacare.

QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.  
Order please. All those in favour of the Motion please rise.

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

YEAS

ADAM	CORRIN	GREEN	PARASIUK
BARROW	COWAN	HANUSCHAK	PAWLEY
BOSTROM	DESJARDINS	JENKINS	SCHROEDER
BOYCE	DOERN	McBRYDE	URUSKI
CHERNIACK	EVANS	MALINOWSKI	WALDING
	FOX	MILLER	WESTBURY

NAYS

ANDERSON	DRIEDGER	JOHNSTON	MERCIER
BANMAN	EIN ARSON	JORGENSON	MINAKER
BLAKE	ENNS	KOVNATS	ORCHARD
BROWN	FERGUSON	LYON	PRICE
COSENS	FILMON	MacMASTER	RANSOM
CRAIK	GALBRAITH	McGILL	SHERMAN
DOMINO	GOURLAY	McGREGOR	WILSON
DOWNNEY	HYDE	McKENZIE	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23, Nays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Amendment lost.

On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wondered if you wanted to call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement to call it 10:00 o'clock? (Agreed)

The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)