

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 1 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. ROLAND PENNER, Attorney-General (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a copy of the Regulations filed since the last sitting of the House, being Regulations No. 224 of 80 to 32 of 82 inclusive.

I would also like to table The Report of The Uniform Law Conference of Canada, being the proceedings of the Sixty-second Annual Meeting held at Charlotte-town, August, 1980.

With leave, Sir, I'd like to table The Ninth Annual Report of The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba for the year ending March 31, 1981.

I would again like to table The Fifty-eighth Annual Report of The Manitoba Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981.

And finally, Sir, there are three more. One will be The Report of the Court of Appeal under The Controverted Election Act for the period ending December 31, 1981; one will be a similar document from the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the period in question; finally The Report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board for the year ended March 31, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS, Minister of Health (St. Boniface): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table The Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the period April 1, 1980 to March 31, 1981. I understand that these copies have been distributed from the Clerk's office on July 17, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. ALVIN H. MACKLING, Minister of Natural Resources (St. James): I'd like to table a report commissioned by The Manitoba Water Commission entitled "A Review of Ground Water Management in Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because of my absence from the House on Friday where I was unavailable to answer questions — also I understand that there's been an agreement between the Government and the Official Opposition to waive the question period at this time — I felt that I should make a statement of some importance at this time.

Mr. Speaker in the past the Manitoba Medical Association and the Manitoba Health Services Commission have negotiated fee-for-service payments to physicians. This year this process began on January 30, 1982 with the tabling by the MMA of their proposal. The next meeting has been scheduled for February 25, 1982. On February 22, following a meeting between the M.M.A. Executive, my Deputy Minister and myself, the MMA made public the President's letter dated February 22, 1982 that was sent to the Association's membership on the same date. This letter which must be have been in the possession of the Executive when we met was not discussed at our meeting. The letter said that the President had advised me that "in order to achieve a settlement on one track a settlement must also be reached on the other track. For example, should the MMA, negotiating team and MHSC come to mutual fee agreement this offer will not be presented to the membership unless satisfactory progress has been made to bring about the new collective bargaining formula. I most certainly have never been advised of that. The MMA had previously said that they were expecting progress on proposed changes in legislation regarding compulsory binding arbitration and compulsory payment of MMA dues to practice medicine in Manitoba. I have assured them that we would give serious consideration to their proposals, the merits of which I had never at anytime refused to discuss. Of course, neither I nor the Government could allow the Manitoba Health Services Commission to negotiate fees under the threat that even if agreement was reached it would not be presented to the MMA membership unless the Government agreed to their request for compulsory binding arbitration and, at least in principle, agreed immediately. This kind of negotiation cannot be conducted in good faith and I know of no government that would accept negotiations under this form of duress. The matter of compulsory binding arbitration is a very complex question that has to be studied by government before it accepts or rejects it.

Some of the concerns are:

(1) Concerns of approximately 750 practising physicians in Manitoba who have either rejected the idea of binding arbitration or who have not, to date, made their views known;

(2) The general concept of binding arbitration on a fee schedule which has not been attempted anywhere else on this continent;

(3) The time that will be required for discussions with other provinces who could be affected by such a major change;

(4) Discussions with other provincial Ministers of health and the Federal Health Minister;

(5) Concerns expressed to me by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba which regard the compulsory membership in the MMA in order to practise medicine in Manitoba;

(6) Safeguards for the protection of Medicare in the public that might have to be incorporated;

(7) The position of the Canadian Medical Association on the elimination or restriction of opt-out provisions in Medicare;

(8) Legislative changes required in The Medical Act and The Health Services Insurance Act when the legislative program for this Session has already been set.

I have advised the associations, Sir, and I repeat it today that I'm anxious to see negotiations proceed to 1982 fees and that I'm prepared to instruct the Manitoba Health Services Commission negotiating team to resume negotiations as soon as I receive confirmation that the issues of fee negotiations and binding arbitration have been separated and agreement on one issue is not dependent upon the other. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the Honourable Minister of Health for his statement, also for his acknowledgment of the fact that a number of questions naturally occurred to many of us on Friday, but it was not possible at that time to put those questions and the Minister has certainly taken that into account. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I find no criticism of the basic position that the Minister of Health has taken in these circumstances with one exception, that being the fact that a contract does exist between the Manitoba Medical Association and the government — the Manitoba Health Services Commission calling for meaningful negotiations within a 30-day time frame. Since the MMA had initiated the bargaining process on the fee schedule on February 1, tomorrow, March 2, is the 30th day and I would hope that the Minister and the Commission will find it possible to enter into meaningful negotiations within that time frame so as not to prejudice or jeopardize the relations existing between the two sides. If he can't meet the 30-day deadline, I would hope that he would meet a deadline that isn't extended unreasonably beyond that point.

On the subject of binding arbitration, let me say that the Minister will find no particular criticism from this side of the House as he seeks a solution; we will make some positive suggestions, I trust. I know a number of spokesmen and media outlets have had much to say over the past year and praise the concept of binding arbitration in medical fee disputes. I'm not one who thinks that is a panacea or an answer to the problems or that it is even a democratic solution to the problems. I believe that it's worthwhile and valuable to have discussions on the concept and see to what degree a consensus can be reached that is in concert with democratic principles of accountability to the taxpayers, to the people who pay the bills, and to the elected representatives who have to answer for those decisions in the House, but to think it can be done in a hothouse or in a laboratory or in a newspaper news room is entirely unrealistic, Mr. Speaker. There are profound complex aspects to the binding arbitration question as the Minister has pointed out.

From time to time references are made to the fact that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall proposed binding arbitration as a solution in his report on Medicare two years ago. I think the interesting thing that should be put on the record, Mr. Speaker, is that Justice Emmett Hall has backed away from that position and that in a

recent interview with the Medical Post admitted that he was wrong in proposing binding arbitration as a solution. There have to be solutions and we have to search for those solutions but I do not think that we should be stampeded into the abstract concept of binding arbitration. So I await the government's search for a solution with great interest as my colleagues do. We will attempt to make some positive suggestions that may be helpful and I hope that he can meet that 30-day negotiation clause simply to maintain the best climate possible between the two parties.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, I would direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are three groups.

First of all, the practical politics group of rural Manitobans, we have 32 visitors under the direction of Mr. Keith Smith.

Secondly, we have a group of 60 students from St. Norbert School, Grade 9, under the direction of Mr. Nash and Mrs. Brandon they are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

We have 15 Girl Guides, ages 9 to 12, under the direction of Mrs. Schwartz; they are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, we, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will be forgoing our right to question the government today in order that the House may proceed directly into debate on the Speech from the Throne.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas for an Address to Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to her speech at the opening of the Session.

The Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my comments this afternoon by offering you, Sir, my best wishes and the best wishes of all members of the Opposition. Your position, Sir, in this Chamber is an extremely important one. The role that you have been called upon to fill is a demanding role and for our part, we will assist you in every way that we can within the bounds of all that is reasonable within the history and the traditions of this House.

To honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, to his colleagues on the Treasury Benches, I offer my congratulations. They, too, bear heavy responsibilities. The jobs that they have been called upon to do are difficult jobs and these are diffi-

cult times in which to attempt to carry them out. It is true that from time to time, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I will feel obliged to add somewhat to the burdens of honourable members opposite and to the difficulties that the First Minister and his friends will have.

I believe it was one of the great Lord Justices of England in 19th Century who described the parliamentary system once when attempting to explain it to a foreigner. He said the government is something like a brain surgeon doing a very intricate and careful operation; and the job of the Opposition is to jostle his elbow while he's doing that. That may be a bit of an exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, and we won't try to jostle their elbow too much, but we will from time to time apply a good, well-known, Red River nose twitch when we feel that they are going too far.

We, Mr. Speaker, offer them our genuine good wishes as they attempt to serve the public interest according to their lights during their term of office. I pause, Mr. Speaker, to say that in a general sense I think all of us in this House would subscribe to the proposition that each of us is here, whether on the Government or the Opposition side, as a temporary trustee of the public interest. Governments come, governments go; members come, member go and in the brief period that is allotted to us while we serve in the particular position on the Treasury Bench, I feel it is incumbent upon all who achieve that honour to remember that this is a trustee capacity and to remember that we should not attempt, in that period of time, while we are temporarily in office, to do things that will be irreversible to the fundamental system under which we operate, will make irreversible changes to that system unless those changes are clearly called for by the public will.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of new faces among us, four new faces that I am happy to welcome to our caucus in the Progressive Conservative party. I am sure that each of them, two of them significantly women members, will add a dimension to the quality of the Opposition which can be offered from this side of the House. I am delighted to welcome each of them to this House and to our party and am doing so in the assurance that they will make that kind of a contribution that will be worthy and respectable to the public interest.

As I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you and other members will understand, from my point of view, it is regrettable that so many of the new faces are on the other side of the House but that is a quantitative comment rather than a qualitative one and I say, very sincerely, Sir, that as one of the senior members of this Legislature I welcome them most sincerely to the Legislature of Manitoba.

I would like, in particular, Mr. Speaker, to compliment the Member for The Pas and the Member for Burrows who moved and seconded the Motion responding to the Speech from the Throne. Although, Sir, I am unable to share their enthusiasm for what is, in my view, a singularly uninspired and uninspiring overall statement of the government's intentions, I was, Sir, nonetheless impressed by the contributions that these two members made in their initial debate in this House.

I should like to take a moment as well, Sir, to make

comment about the public service of Manitoba, to say to my honourable friends opposite that they inherit a good public service, one that is administratively sound, one that is capable of carrying on the public affairs of this province in an efficient and in a good way. There have been some excisions from the public service since the new government came into office, not all of which we agree with, and there will be time later in the debate I daresay to speak about some of these matters, but I wish, Sir, to call to the attention of the House, in particular the service of one man, one senior civil servant, the former Clerk of the Executive Council, Eric Bedson, who has served the people of Manitoba extremely well, extremely faithfully and in a high manner since 1958. I wish, Sir, to extend to him, on behalf of all Members of the Opposition, I daresay, on behalf of all members of the House — Godspeed in his new vocation when he chooses it and the knowledge that he carries with him the respect and, may I say, Sir, the good feeling and the goodwill, not only of the Members of this Legislature, but indeed of governments from one end of this country to the other and the national government itself, for the outstanding record of public service which he has contributed to this country and to this province since 1958.

There are others, Mr. Speaker, who have left the ranks of the government service: the Assistant Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines; the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower; the Director of Northern Affairs; the Deputy Minister of Education, who is on a six-month sabbatical over to the Council of Education Ministers; plus some transfers of senior staff extending right down to secretaries. We wish them all well in whatever new vocations they choose to enter. As well, Mr. Speaker, those who have changed positions as a result of the change in government — I refer to the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs; the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower. We wish them well as they carry on in other capacities in the service of the people of Manitoba.

Sir, this first Session of a new Legislature, especially this first major debate, as we consider the overall statement of the government's intentions made in the Throne Speech, both of these things are extremely important. In the Throne Speech and in the comments that both parties will make throughout this debate we go a long way toward defining the themes and the subject matter that will mark the life of this Legislature throughout whatever term it may last. Throughout this first debate, Mr. Speaker, we begin the process of articulating the main issues and the main questions that the people of Manitoba will consider as they evaluate the job that government is doing. So, in my remarks today, I would like to talk about some of those main issues and main questions, about some of the differences between the approach of the government which it appears determined to take and that which we, as the Opposition of this Legislature, will be urging upon them.

The Throne Speech begins, Mr. Speaker, with what I would describe as the application of a goodly portion of self-serving, left-wing revisionism to Manitoba's recent economic history. My honourable friends being disciples, some of them at least of Marx, will know what I am talking about. According to the Throne Speech the last four years have been years of deterior-

ration for the Manitoba economy. Not surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, that alleged deterioration is blamed on the policies of the government of this province over that four-year period and I have no doubt that we will be hearing those claims repeatedly as this government attempts, as I know it will attempt, to shift responsibility for its own reverses and its own inadequacies.

But let's look at the facts, Mr. Speaker, which will be one of the tasks which this Opposition will constantly try to bring to the attention of the House, the facts — not socialist rhetoric — the facts. The fact is that there are more people employed in Manitoba today than at any time in our history as a province; the fact is that during the four years of our Progressive Conservative government, that ended with the last election, employment grew about three times as quickly as it did during the last three years of the NDP government led by former Premier Schreyer.

Let's look at what really has been happening in our economy, Mr. Speaker, not just over the past four years but over the past decade. The early years, the early '70s, Mr. Speaker — you were here as a member at that time — remember those halcyon days? It didn't matter how bad a government was, and we had one of the worst in the history of our province, it was like shooting fish in a barrel. You couldn't do anything wrong, no matter how wrongheaded the policies were. Buoyed by the strength in resource industries, by good crops, by generally strong economic growth across the country and all of North America, annual growth rates of 4 and 5 and 6 percent were achieved with relative ease in many parts of Canada, more or less, as I've said, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the policies of particular governments. Manitoba too, benefited from those days of easy growth as did all parts of our country.

But those days ended, Mr. Speaker. The last year in which the kind of more or less effortless growth was achieved in Manitoba was '74-75, and I don't have to remind the First Minister and some of his holdover colleagues from that old discredited administration that this is true. He and a number of his Ministers were part of that Government of Manitoba. I don't have to remind them of the frustrations and the problems that they faced in 1975, in 1976, 1977 as it became increasingly clear that easy growth was over and as the economic policies of that earlier NDP government began to collapse in shambles around them. One after another, Mr. Speaker, the NDP state-owned enterprises failed. We don't have the former Member for Inkster here to remind us of the 40-million boondoggle of Saunders Aircraft that he caused to be put into bankruptcy — at some political cost to his then-government — because he could see pragmatically that there was no point in wasting further money on that kind of a massive boondoggle. Well, Mr. Speaker, not only was it Saunders Aircraft, but many others, many other state-owned enterprises; public-ownership enterprises, such as we hear talk about now, failed taking with them tens of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Combined with that we had NDP policies of high taxation, of succession duties on family businesses and on farms, of uncompetitive royalty rates on mining and oil production and, at one stage, the highest

taxation regime of any province in Canada. All of this contributed to a withering of private investment in this province and I think there was a genuine sense within that early NDP government, Mr. Speaker, that something had gone wrong, the sense of anxiety as their old dogmatic nostrums of government spending and government ownership proved inadequate for a period of slower growth and greater general economic difficulties in our country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 — surrounded by the wreckage of ill-fated government enterprises, that earlier NDP government began a retreat from its previous policies. The clearest sign of that retreat was the decision taken by the NDP in 1977 and I repeat that again for the record, Mr. Speaker, because there seems to be a little bit of revisionist history going on all the time, a little slippage of memory, a cog slips here and there in the dates when honourable friends opposite, starting with the First Minister, try to recall what happened in '77 about who shut down Limestone. Well, we know who shut down Limestone; it was the NDP who shut down Limestone, Mr. Speaker, and it was in the Minutes of Hydro at the time, that was a fait accompli when we came into office. But, as I say, there seems to be a slippage of cogs in memory every once in a while and every once in a while we have that particular statement made that it was the Conservative government that shut down Limestone construction in 1977. Mr. Speaker, that's merely one of the facts that we have to repeat from time to time in order that the record be straight, in order that the record for the people of Manitoba to understand will be clear. That was one of the great retreats of the earlier NDP government. They suspended construction activity on the Limestone Generating Plant despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this construction would represent a massive blow to the construction industry that had become increasingly dependent on forced public spending. You can't take \$200 million to \$250 million a year of public-sector spending out of the economy and expect that the economy or the private sector is going to make up all of that. We admitted that from Day One. My honourable friends really never exhibited the candour to say to the people of Manitoba that was really what had been happening, that they had been force-feeding something like a French goose. They have been force-feeding the economy in Manitoba, but what they got was certainly not good pate. What they got was disaster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 the people of Manitoba elected a new government, a government that faced not the easy growth days of early 1970's, but the deepening economy difficulties that attacked the entire Canadian economy through the last part of that decade. If anything, these difficulties were multiplied in Manitoba because of the collapse of the economic policies of that earlier NDP government. By no measure, Mr. Speaker, can the years '77 through '81 be said to have been years of easy or spectacular growth for Manitoba — or for most other parts of Canada for that matter — but throughout those four years in the face of droughts and the floods, of record interest rates, in the face of worsening national economic conditions, in the face of the chaos that we inherited which they were pleased to call the Government of Manitoba, our economy grew. The progress was less

than we all would have wished, God knows, but it was hard won progress and it was real progress. It wasn't progress at the expense of tax-supported dollars; it was progress by private initiative. Throughout those difficult years Manitobans, compared to many others in Canada, fared relatively well.

During those years, Mr. Speaker, through the conscious policies of the Government of Manitoba, the foundations were laid for a period of more rapid growth based on the opportunities for new industries such as potash; aluminum smelting; for a resumption of soundly based hydro expansion built upon a Western Canadian Power Grid or Power Inter-Tie; for an expansion of the ManFor complex, to make it a viable and competitive forest products operation for years into the future with more job opportunities, with an up-to-date and contemporary mill so that we could confer greater economic benefit upon the people of that great northern region of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, those opportunities still exist. Even after three months of the NDP being in office, they still exist. Whatever else we may disagree about here in this House, our recollections of recent economic history and however those recollections of economic history may vary, I would hope that all of us in this Legislature, each member in this Legislature, will work to see that these once in a lifetime opportunities are not lost or frittered away. God knows much hard work went into the attraction of industries to Manitoba to negotiate with the Province of Manitoba into the search to determine that we had a mineable potash mine in Manitoba and possibly another one on which the Amax Company is working, if my honourable friend, the First Minister, hasn't scared them off with his friendly chitchats with the Premier of Saskatchewan.

There may be other things, Mr. Speaker, if we are only willing to take advantage of the opportunities that exist by having a competitive tax base and a government that is not constantly at war with the private sector as indeed the predecessor government of the NDP was, not only by reputation, by perception but in fact. But as I say, Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if this socialist revisionist economic history of Manitoba does not become a recurrent theme in this Legislature, regardless of the fact that it is in no way in accordance with the facts. We will from time to time feel called upon to correct our friends opposite and to ensure that the truth is also on the record. For the most part, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we will not spend our time here arguing about the past, simply because we can't afford to. The people of Manitoba won't let us. We can't afford to argue too much about the past; we've got to get on with grasping the opportunities of the future. But I hope we will carry out and discharge our real responsibility which is to consider the present and the future challenges facing Manitoba and our people and to discuss and to scrutinize the intentions, the policies, the actions and the competence of the government now and throughout its term in office.

Here I believe the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is revealing, both for what it says and for what it does not say. You know, Mr. Speaker, we could divide virtually everything in the Throne Speech into three columns, three general themes that are really the sum and the

total of what the government is telling us, in this, its first general statement of its intentions to the people of Manitoba. What are those three themes? Well, first of all, there's increased government spending — that's No. 1, without any question. No. 2, increasingly centralized government control — that without any question. No. 3, greater government ownership and intrusion within the economy — that without any question.

Let's talk first, Mr. Speaker, about spending and about what the Throne Speech has to say about that important topic because, as many of the honourable members across the way will know, Supply is the main function of parliament. The voting of Supply is the main function of parliament and Supply means how are you going to spend your money. That's the prime function, the prime reason, that we are brought here in this traditional kind of a parliamentary democratic setup, to act as trustees for the public's money and to spend that money in a way that they wish the money to be spent, not in accordance with any doctrine, dogmatic, haired-off idea that we may have or that the government may have, but rather to respond to the needs of the people of Manitoba as they express those needs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the speech at least pays lip service to the fact that there isn't much money available. That's true and that's true right across Canada. If one could listen carefully and without too much smirking to the present Minister of Finance in Ottawa, one would find out that revelation has come home even to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa. True, in our time, there was extra government spending in recent years attributable to some new programs, good social programs, and caused as well by some natural disaster such as flood and drought over which no government has any control. In addition to that, inflation has forced up the cost of essential services to the people in Manitoba. Meanwhile, in the face of nationwide economic difficulties, government revenues here and elsewhere have grown more slowly than in the past, with the result that government today has very little fiscal elbow room. Mr. Speaker, that should not be regarded I suggest at any time when you have an NDP party temporarily in office; that should not be regarded necessarily as a sin. I think that's a good cruise control to have on a government of the particular left-wing tradition and of the particular habits of many of the members of this government; that they have that kind of a cruise control on them, of fiscal restraint, because it's not in their nature to apply it otherwise.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we add to that, the Federal Government's intention of abandoning some of its responsibility for the provision of services to people, I think it becomes clear that if this government is to avoid massive tax increases or massive new borrowings, government is going to have to make some very hard choices about spending. We are going to be giving advice to our honourable friends opposite because God knows, Mr. Speaker, they're going to need it because their natural tendency is not directed toward the conservation of the tax payer's dollar, yet their theme generally has been spend, spend, spend, and hopefully the chickens will come home to roost when we're out of office.

Well, Mr. Speaker, some of the chickens are coming

home to roost right now and they're back in office and some of those inopportune and wildly erratic debt borrowings that they made back in the '60s and the '70s, back in the '70s, I should say, are going to have to be met by the current crop of New Democrats who borrowed this money in exotic currencies around the world at a time when they thought they knew more about money speculation than the advisors who should be advising government. We're going to see some of these chickens come home to roost and see how well my honourable friends can provide a perch for some of their own chickens which will be coming to their chicken coop.

Well, Mr. Speaker, do we see any sign in this Throne Speech that the NDP understand and are prepared to make these hard choices? To be fair, in some areas the government's proposals seem prudent enough. In Health, for example, with the exception of two additions to Pharmacare, the government is really announcing nothing more than this year's portion of the physical side of the long-term health development plan initiated by our government over the past four years; and that's a good program, Mr. Speaker, and a prudent one in a physical sense, but it appears to lack any innovative grasp of the real emerging problems in health care and any follow-through on the ideas for adjustment of the system that were developed particularly in the last two years. But once we move beyond the health care field, Mr. Speaker, there is somewhat less cause for confidence that this government's spending decisions are at least being made sensibly. There is no clear statement of spending priorities, but there are some oddities, some serious causes for concern.

Mr. Speaker, the government's vaunted interest relief program, for example, has been cut in half since it was announced with such fanfare during the election. It will now run for two years instead of one with no more money being added and the immediate relief — and I believe those were the words that were used by the First Minister when he first announced this program — the immediate relief, Mr. Speaker, that he promised to the people of Manitoba who were in dire straits because of — and that's Mr. Trudeau's term — because of mortgage renewals and so on, has proven a long, long way from immediate.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many Manitobans have felt that they have had no alternative but to give up their homes in the months between the time the NDP program was announced and the benefits actually became available. We made it clear, Mr. Speaker, when we announced a program after the Federal Budget as to what the timing, the eligibility and so on would be. Our honourable friends are still fussing about and still haven't got forms ready; the application form ready for the three categories of people that they say they're going to help under their program, the benefits for which have been cut in half.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't want to make a premature judgment, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to raise a lot of expectations; they have already done that, and they're going to dash the expectations of an awful lot of people to the ground when they see how totally inadequate this program, this immediate program, that they promised during the election, is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that there has to be some such kind of a program in times of interest rates which are usurious and interest rates which are not the fault of the individual citizens of Canada or of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we believe that such a program has to be brought in, but we think it should be a sensible program, not one which was hammered and tacked and papered together by a party when it was in Opposition seeking votes, but one that is soundly based on the public interest for the people of Manitoba, and before that program leaves this House, we guarantee we'll make enough changes in it to make a silk purse out of that, as yet, sow's ear that we have seen from across the way in terms of the program that they promised during the election.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, while the NDP have been unable to find the funds to do more than half keep their promise to provide interest relief to Manitobans, to small businessmen, to farmers, and to those renewing mortgages, remember there are three categories that they promised to relieve against, remember we said that if you're going to do mortgage interest relief alone, you would need about \$20 million and their officials will tell them, as they told us, that you need about \$60 million if you're going to do a half decent job at all for farmers, for small business and for the renewals of mortgage on homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, they know, they're privy to the facts and they should remember that programs that they tacked together in desperation during the election campaign should not necessarily be followed when they get into office because now they have the responsibility of carrying out programs, not just the responsibility of misleading the electorate and getting votes through misleading the electorate; now they've got a responsibility to carry out a sound program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, while they've been unable to find funds to do more than half keep their promise to provide interest rate relief to Manitobans, they are able to fire dozens of private security guards and replace them with staff guards at about double the cost to the taxpayer of Manitoba. We heard the Minister the other day make some vague suggestion as to how the public interest was to be served by this, but he didn't make any convincing case at all. The only case he has made is that they're going to spend more money for a service for which they could easily and clearly spend less money. They're able as well, Mr. Speaker, to find \$20 million to set up a government-owned oil company at a time when private oil exploration is already at record levels at no cost to the taxpayer in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Manitoba are going to find it strange that this government can only find \$20 million for interest relief for farmers, for businessmen, for those renewing mortgages and so on, but at the same time it can find an equal amount, an equal amount for a government-owned oil company to keep their promise in that regard, while they can't keep their promise to the people of Manitoba with respect to interest rate relief.

They can find money, Mr. Speaker, to support their ideological dogma; they can't find money to help the people of Manitoba when they need money.

Mr. Speaker, what are the spending priorities of this government? What we've seen thus far is not very heartening. What things are most important to this

government? Well, it's pretty clear that the list of things that are most important to this socialist government contains very few of the social concerns, the real social concerns, that used to be so important to the NDP, but they're saying to the people of Manitoba today it's more important for the government now to own oil companies. What kind of a party have we got here? What kind of a sheep in wolf's clothing or a sheep in sheep's clothing have we got here, Mr. Speaker? What are the social reforms promised, Mr. Speaker, what are the social reforms promised in this Throne Speech? A freeze on the price of bus tickets. Oh, brave new world) We're going to freeze the price of bus tickets in Manitoba. This NDP Government is going to make sure that university tuition fees do not go up this year, Mr. Speaker. And they applaud, despite the fact that tuition fees in Manitoba are already among the lowest in Canada, despite that fact, Mr. Speaker, and despite the fact that tuition fees already provide less than 14 percent of the cost of university education. In other words, the taxpayer is already subsidizing every man, woman and child in university to the extent of about 87 percent of the cost of that university education and, despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of those attending universities come from homes with incomes well above the provincial average in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic party government intends to tax the worker on the factory floor so that my daughter's tuition fees don't go up. I say that's not good public policy, I say that's bad public policy and they are going to have to pay the retribution for that first sign of bad public policy when they go about the Province of Manitoba and try to sell that particular one to the people of this province. It's bad policy based upon a bad fundamental misunderstanding. Remember what the Throne Speech said, Mr. Speaker, it said: some people, I think that was the term, are concerned that the costs of tuition fees in Manitoba are getting out of line. Who are these "some people? They are not any people who have made realistic studies of tuition fees here or in the United States; who are these some people? Do they reside in the caucus in the New Democratic Party; do they come from some of their friends in Academia across the way — God knows they don't have as many friends now as they used to have in Academia, Mr. Speaker? Who are these "some people who are concerned? And if you really want to do something about opening up university education for young people, which everyone in this House wants to do regardless of their financial means, you don't freeze tuition fees you provide better bursaries, you provide better student loans, you provide other programs that are keyed in to meet that need.

It's typical Mr. Speaker, of the New Democrats to go into shotgun measures of this sort and miss the whole point which is, if they really believe this to be the case, that people are being kept out of university. Why then don't they beef up the programs for educational bursaries, educational support to help those who really need it; but not cause the labourer working on the floor in Manitoba, or the members of my honourable friend from Rupertsland's Band at Red Sucker Lake, to pay taxes to support Winnipeg kids in university down here. That's what your government, Mr. Member,

is doing and I'll be interested to see your vote when you're called upon to vote the money to support above average income people in Manitoba in university because of a misguided idea of your party. I'll be watching you, Honourable Member for Rupertsland, to see if you carry out the mandate that I know you have from your people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's nice to have low-priced bus tickets, it's nice to have low tuition fees at the universities but are these things worth tax increases, large tax increases. Is it justifiable for the government to undertake large new borrowings, to freeze the price of bus tickets? Is there nothing more important that this government can think to do with its scarce resources? And we're going to ask the government, Mr. Speaker, just where is the money going to come from because there is, frankly, no evidence in this Throne Speech that the government has thought about that question at all, and without careful thought and management large tax increases or large new borrowings, or both, are going to be necessary. That's why I've said that this speech, having heard it, we are all aware that this speech really is directionless and uninspiring and uninspired and the Budget Speech is really going to tell the real story of this Session. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister and his party have, in the past, shown no aversion to high taxes and to excessive government borrowings and really to financial incontinence generally.

It is also true that the mandate that they received in last November's election was a mandate to try to achieve faster economic growth in Manitoba, and not a mandate to burden our economy with additional taxes and additional unneeded government spending. If my honourable friends think their mandate extends beyond that they'll soon find out because I know the people of Manitoba, I know them just as well as the First Minister of this province, in fact, perhaps even better. I can tell my honourable friend the First Minister that he received no mandate to increase taxes because he didn't go around the province saying I want to do all of these things and if you will just let me do them on your behalf I'm going to increase your taxes. Did you hear him say that, Mr. Speaker? Not once. So he's got no mandate to increase taxes or to increase the borrowings of this province at all, not a mandate for that at all or to carry out the rather peculiar and curious ideological mainsprings of life that hark from my honourable friend's 19th Century bankrupt beliefs, no mandate for that at all. The people of Manitoba, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, don't like socialists and they don't like their policy. These people across the way, Mr. Speaker, have a mandate to carry out good government, period, paragraph; not to indulge in any of their particular ideology which has been proven in most parts of the world to be totally bankrupt. It is a great idea; it just does not work.

But I said, Mr. Speaker, that the second theme that emerged from the Throne Speech was a theme of increasingly centralized government control and that is an ominous sign for a new government. Look carefully at the speech, Mr. Speaker, it speaks happily of the government's decision to do away with the system of block grants to the City of Winnipeg which our government inaugurated. Under the block grant system the largest possible range of decisions about

what the citizens of the City of Winnipeg wanted from their municipal government, the largest block of those decisions was to be made by the elected Mayor and Council of the City and that's as it should be. There will be very few members here, the Member for St. Boniface, who perhaps will recall — he was a Liberal in those days so he may not recall it — who will recall when the late Morris Gray used to sit on this side of the House when the NDP were in their Halgion years, they were the third party at that time, and Morris Gray used to stand up in every Session of the Legislature, one of the great CCF-NDP members, and say we've got to give home rule to the City of Winnipeg. I wonder what Morris Gray would be saying about this collection of his colleagues today if he could see what they have done to the block grant funding system in the City of Winnipeg.

Home rule for the City of Winnipeg is going to change: instead the NDP across the way are moving control of the City's finances away from the elected Mayor and Council and into the hands of provincial bureaucrats. People who have not been elected by anyone although, Mr. Speaker, to give him his due, the recently promoted Deputy Minister of the Department of Urban Affairs certainly tried to be elected and got a different reward for failing. The elected Mayor and Council of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, for example, no longer decide which roads to repair or improve; that's going to be decided by some bureaucrat over here. Those Capital budgets are now going to be controlled at the provincial level instead of having the elected City Council, the people that the voters can get at, decide what measures should receive priority in the City's budget. The Provincial Government over here, a bunch of faceless nameless bureaucrats that my honourable friends are going to hire in countless numbers because they are going to running the transit system from over here; they're going to be running the roads system from over here; they're going to tell the parks system; they're going to tell the City of Winnipeg how it should run its own business and, of course, they're going to have to hire a whole legion of social and other kinds of engineers in order to run the City of Winnipeg out of the vest pocket of the new Minister.

That's not what this Provincial Government was elected to do, Mr. Speaker. This Provincial Government was elected, along with all others, to work in co-operation with the duly elected representatives of the City of Winnipeg. If you don't like the setup — and God knows the NDP did enough in the history of this province to confound and to make worse local government in this province by passing The Unicity Act — but if you don't like that why not abolish it? If you think you can run it better out of the vest pocket of the Minister and the Deputy over here, why not abolish it instead of going through this charade of saying, "Yes, city, you can have a mayor, you can have a council, but we're going to have all the authority as to what money they spend?" That's centralized government that is bad government, Mr. Speaker. It's a bad omen for any new government to start on its path, its trusteeship path, with the people of Manitoba, saying that they know better than the elected representatives in our municipal system.

Mr. Speaker, instead of having the elected city

council decide what measures should receive priority in the city's budget the provincial government dictates the funds be used; not on housing, not on special programs to upgrade older neighbourhoods or to help Native people, but to freeze the price of bus tickets. I'm not opposed to low-cost bus tickets. I don't know anybody in Canada who's opposed to low-cost bus tickets, but I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that those councillors and those officials that the City of Winnipeg charged with the responsibility of running the Transit System know very much more about what is an equitable bus fare for the citizens of Winnipeg than anybody on this side of the House, or anybody they can hire, and they should get out of that business right away before they do great structural harm to the government setup in the City of Winnipeg. I'm opposed to decisions being made by appointed provincial officials that the great bus ticket price freeze is the most important use the city can possibly make of its funds. That's an arrogance that goes beyond understanding; that's a perverse kind of arrogance, to say, "we know better, even though you were elected to do that very job." I'm opposed to this kind of control being taken out of the hands of the elected Mayor and the Council of Winnipeg and I daresay that the lack of wisdom of this approach will be borne home to honourable members before too many more weeks go by.

We can see that same pattern, Mr. Speaker, in the government's dealing with the universities. The NDP Government has decided that tuition fees must be frozen, as we said before. Is the government prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make up the money the universities could have earned from increases in tuition fees, and if so, from where? They're not told. Is such a tuition freeze really the best use that could be made of that money? Is that a decision that should be made over here by the new Minister of Education, promising Minister of Education? Did she have this bad policy forced on her? I rather think so, because she's a woman of common sense. I don't think she would have initiated this program on her own, Mr. Speaker. No, this is one of those old shibboleths that's drawn up from the fever swamps every once in a while to say that, you know, we've got to prove that we're New Democrats, we've got to prove we're socialists so we'll get down into the fever swamps and pull up some of this stuff, this mire and muck that we're been trying to parade around since 1842 or 1838, whenever it was, and try to convince ourselves, if nobody else, that we're still good socialists. Well, that isn't good government, Mr. Speaker. It may be good socialism, but good socialism is seldom good government.

I merely say to my honourable friends opposite, get off the ideological, shibbolethic kick and get back to running the universities of Manitoba with a maximum of self-rule on the part of the universities. You will rue the day, Madam Minister, when you start to try to run the university from your office, because you can't do it and you will rue the day when those in the academic world come to you — I'm not referring to the Attorney-General, I'm not referring to the Member for Burrows — but when the others, who are running the university, come to you and say, "Madam Minister, you can't do that with our universities; you're interfering; your government's interfering too much with our freedom." If you haven't got freedom to determine what courses,

to determine the emphasis that will be given at the universities, then truly the kind of academic freedom that is our inheritance in this country is lost and the step that this government has taken in the Throne Speech is a move against academic freedom because it is intruding upon the right of the university and the Board of Governors of that university to make their decision according to their lights as to what is the best way to apply the scarce public dollars that are available for that education today.

Might it not have been more useful, Mr. Speaker, to have made those funds available to expand the kinds of programs that our government began, programs that provided special access to Native people so that they could have a more truly equal chance to get a university education? I ask the Member for Rupertsland about that; was that not a good program? Might not the money be more usefully employed expanding the microelectronics centres to ensure that Manitobans can receive this kind of high technology training; or in expanding the university's capacities to provide needed retraining for people of all ages? Are these not perhaps the priorities that government, federal, provincial and the universities could agree upon without one segment, the provincial government, running off in the wrong direction and saying, "we're going to freeze tuition fees," without any philosophical or fundamental or priority base to support that kind of a decision.

Those questions and others like them, Mr. Speaker, are not being carefully and openly and reasonably considered by those responsible for the operations of the universities. Instead, it's been decided here, by this government, in three months, that here on Broadway Avenue they're going to control tuition fees and they're going to freeze them and that's going to be the end of it. Are there other, more urgent needs within the universities? Do they care? Have they asked? They haven't had time. Can the government or the universities really afford this tuition freeze? These are the questions that the university community are asking already and only the Budget will answer that question. Those questions are neither asked nor answered in the Throne Speech. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the NDP take more and more control from the universities and lodge it with the Provincial Government.

That same predilection toward greater and greater centralized government control can be seen in the approach to day care that is set forth in this Throne Speech. You know, Mr. Speaker, our government more than tripled the amount of money being made available to ensure that there were enough day care services established to meet the very real need that exists in Manitoba, and heaven knows, there was room for more money to be spent in that field. But we did ensure that Manitoba had one of the best funded day care operations in Canada and that's the heritage that this government has taken over. Our overall approach, Mr. Speaker, was to encourage and support the broadest possible range of care alternatives so that parents themselves, the important people in the family makeup, parents themselves could decide what kind of care they wanted for their children. As an aside, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the First Minister and his then colleagues voted against the increased funding for day care at the same time as they voted

against our programs of rent subsidies for the elderly and for low-income families, and our programs of extra financial support to those same two groups. But despite their opposition, Mr. Speaker, we did make the extra funds available and the number of day care places was dramatically increased in Manitoba. That was our approach to day care; we expanded it. What is the NDP approach as we listened to the Throne Speech? Well, they intend to regulate it Mr. Speaker; they are going to pass a new act and they are going to make sure that decisions about what kind of care children receive are made, not by the parents of Manitoba, no, but by the Provincial Government, by some of the social engineers that they will have to hire in order to expand their bureaucracy to make decisions for parents, that parents want to make for their own children.

Mr. Speaker, we're not living in some kind of an Iron Curtain country are we? Do I detect, or am I supersensitive, some more . . . overtures to this kind of business of saying we're going to pass an act and that's better than providing more daycare places for the youngsters in Manitoba—we'll pass an act we will regulate; we will set the standards; we will do all of these regulatory and good social engineering things that won't help too much in increasing the number of daycare places and will take decisions away from parents that are truly parents decisions. I support and I undergird and I congratulate the member of this House, the Member for The Pas, who said the other day that the most important unit within our society is the family unit. Of course, it is. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Member for The Pas, how is he going to vote for this bill on daycare which takes away decision-making power from the mothers and the fathers of the one-parent families and causes that power to be transferred over to a bunch of nameless bureaucrats? Is that in support of his concept of the family? I think not, Mr. Speaker, I think not and I judge that the Member for The Pas, like all members on the other side, are intelligent men and women and I expect that they are going to, in their caucus, make their intelligence known to this bunch of retreads who are trying to bring back a revisionist Schreyer Government. I want these new members to make their ideas known because they are good ideas. Support of the family is a good idea and I am going to watch how the Honourable Member for The Pas votes when this particular bill comes up which takes away power from the family in Manitoba; I am going to watch how he votes and how many others on that side of the House vote, if indeed, Mr. Speaker, that bill now ever reaches this Legislative Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of this how much centralized control is really needed in daycare, in our universities, in our municipal government, and so on? How much is desirable, isn't that rather the question we should be asking? How much should the Provincial Government dictate to the elected city government of the City of Winnipeg; to the university communities, here and in the City of Brandon; to parents throughout Manitoba? How much can they dictate before they begin to erode the personal freedoms that we have grown to take so much for granted in this country, because we all know, Mr. Speaker, that you can have cradle-to-grave security, you can have bureaucrats in government making decisions for all aspects of your

life, but there is a price you pay for that, and the price you pay is in individual freedom. Given the choice between comfort and freedom my honourable friends should be under no misapprehension even though they are motivated by out-of-date doctrines that cause them to do silly things from time to time, as to what the people of Canada would choose. They would choose freedom. If that choice is given to them clearly, they will choose freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that expanded government control is necessary or desirable. Frankly, we do not believe that most members of the government have really thought this one through. I'm sure they have not, and so we are going to be returning to this theme as well throughout our deliberations here.

Mr. Speaker, there is a third theme that emerges from a reading of this Throne Speech that also concerns all of us in this province. That is the theme of government ownership throughout the economy. We are going to have, as we have said before, a \$20 million oil company. We are even going to have a new Department of Crown Investments. Mr. Speaker, that particular idea, I judge, was garnered from Saskatchewan. I wasn't under the impression prior to the 30th of November that Manitoba had become a branch office of that delightful little province to the west, but it appears that whatever happens in Saskatchewan, now is good enough for Manitoba. Well, it 'taint so, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friends across the way have got a pretty important lesson to learn about Manitobans if they think that merely aping or following policies from dear old Saskatchewan, that province that we are happy to have as a neighbour but from whom we can learn very little in terms of governmental operation, in terms of whom we can learn very little about the entrepreneurial spirit, in terms of looking at it we can learn very little really about resource management or, Mr. Speaker, anything else. We love to have them as neighbours, we respect them as neighbours but Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, are of a different cut and we do not have to take too many ideas from Saskatchewan because frankly we have not seen too many over the last forty years that have been too worthy of emulation. We are going to have a Crown Investments Act only because Saskatchewan is having one, that's the only reason I can understand, because Saskatchewan has one, and it provides a convenient way to hire some more bureaucrats.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. This whole theme of government ownership and expansion of Crown corporations and so on really is an ominous theme that runs through this whole speech and The Crown Corporation Investments Act, which has never really been properly explained by the First Minister, is just one example of that. As I say, the Saskatchewan explanation is not good enough.

In his press release announcing the Crown Investments Corporation he said this was a recommendation of the task force in 1977-78; not so. What the task force in 1977-78 said, Mr. Speaker, was that there should be a department of government with a minister responsible to answer for all Crown corporations and in our wisdom we found that that was not a recommendation that was practically applicable to government because there were some ministers who were

more adept and more experienced in answering for one corporation so why try to put them all into one basket. My honourable friends should not be mistaken as to the basis for Crown investments not recommended by our Task Force, recommended maybe by Premier Blakeney and his left wing friends to the west, but certainly not inspired by anything that came out of our government or any task force that we had on government operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are in basic disagreement about the overall desirability of large scale government ownership. I think it is important that we discuss these matters and see if we can plumb what is the genesis of this kind of thinking on behalf of my honourable friends because we can have fun as we always do caricaturizing each others positions and I'm as good at that as anybody, but that can very often generate more heat than light and I want, Mr. Speaker, genuinely to find out why the government operations in Manitoba have to have a new Department of Crown Investments I have not yet heard an intellectually responsible reason for that, but I don't say that it's not possible. Merely to say, however, that it has worked in Saskatchewan is no answer for Manitoba.

Let me first of all make it clear that I can't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister and most of his colleagues here in this Legislature wish government to be the sole owner or the sole investor, or the sole risk taker in our economy, Regina manifestos notwithstanding. I don't believe anybody in his right mind believes that. No one who has read history, no one who knows about the experience of these odd machinations of the human mind as they have been applied since the 19th Century would ever say that control of the means of production and the means of distribution works; it doesn't work. It will work if you give the government of the day the power to imprison or execute people; it will work in those circumstances. God knows it worked well behind the Iron Curtain where governments were given that authority; it worked well in Mao's China where they executed about 30 million people; it works pretty well there. But no one in his right mind, Mr. Speaker would suggest that with our parliamentary tradition in the western civilization that total control of the means of production and the means of distribution has any intellectually responsible position that can be either claimed upon or held by any sound-thinking person in this country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that being the case, and I give my honourable friends credit for not advocating that, it is clear, unfortunately from the kinds of discussions that sometimes take place when all the members of the NDP get together and have their funny little resolutions and so on when they gather in convention, there are some, Mr. Speaker, of the loonier fringes of their party who do in fact believe that to be desirable. I take it for granted that none of that loonier fringe is in this House. If so I hope they will speak up and be identified fairly soon because that is looniness at its best in the 20th Century.

But, Mr. Speaker, I take the First Minister at his word when he says, on behalf of his colleagues, that they are sincere when they talk of the desirability of joint ventures and of co-operation with the private sector. The private sector is what fuels the economy in this country. We all know that; we don't have to be taught

that. We live in a mixed economy. We all know that; we don't have to be taught that. Co-operation with the private sector is pure pragmatic common sense; we all know that. Well then let's get on with it. My honourable friend the First Minister says that's what they intend to do. Well let's see now some concrete examples of how they intend to do it. You see we have this gnawing doubt; we must have it on this side of the House because we have seen, as recently as 1977, how they fell into bad ways from time to time on purely ideological grounds because they do tend to believe, some of them, Mr. Speaker, that government-owned enterprises are somehow morally superior to privately owned. I know that's a strange thought for you, Mr. Speaker and it has never crossed your mind that that would be the case. I believe that curious and dated ideological attitude can influence their behaviour in a way which is not in the public interest. We have to be constantly vigilant and on guard to ensure that that does not happen in the administration of public affairs in this province.

What do we believe on this side of the House about public ownership? Well, to begin with, we know that we live in a mixed economy; we know in fact Conservative predecessors have been the ones who have nationalized, may I use that word, to make it ofay with something my honourable friends would understand. Conservative governments have nationalized different enterprises, utility enterprises, in the history of this country. We're not totally opposed to government investment in the economy at all. We're prepared to use public investment as a stimulus to develop and as a means of ensuring adequate returns to the people of Manitoba. The development of our potash resources is only one example. But we are concerned that the government wishes to use government ownership somewhat more widely and that's a concern that arises out of the Throne speech; it's a concern that arises out of their tendency, based on their record when they were in office. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that a goodly number of my honourable friend, the First Minister's Cabinet come from that discredited period and were parts of that discredited administration. We're not entirely certain that they have given up all of their bad ways and so we have some of these doubts and we're counting in large measure on that infusion of new thinking and new members from across the way, who obviously would not be so fuzzy minded as some of the old hands, to bring that kind of clear contemporary thinking to the administration that my honourable friend has the honour to lead.

Why, Mr. Speaker, just as another case in point and I have referred to it before, why are we having a \$20 million oil company at the present time. Let me say if there was no oil exploration taking place in Manitoba today, if it were not possible to attract private investment without committing public funds in this way, then it might well be sensible to risk—and that's what it is—to risk the taxpayers money setting up an oil exploration company to get the industry started in Manitoba. But that's not the situation in Manitoba today, Mr. Speaker. We already have record levels of oil exploration brought back in the last four years from the degradation into which they fell from '69 to '77. The government is already earning record revenues from oil and gas leases and from royalties from oil and

gas production in Manitoba. We are doing this, Mr. Speaker, without risking one cent of the taxpayer's dollar.

Now I appeal to my honourable friend, not on ideological grounds at all but rather on pragmatic, commonsense grounds. If the system is operating well then don't try to fix it. My honourable friends are using the need for a \$20 million oil company in a way that tends to suggest to, I think, otherwise fair and reasonable observers who wish them well in the tasks that they have, but these people are starting on the wrong foot, they're starting off as ideological captives. They want to prove that they're good socialists before they prove that they're good and worthy governors of the people of Manitoba. Well, that's not good enough Mr. Speaker. We can't see a situation that calls for this kind of an oil company in Manitoba today. Were we able to achieve this kind of situation where we have record exploration going on and indeed record finds going on, despite the fact that four years ago such economic activity had virtually ceased in our province, remember that, virtually ceased four years ago. We have been able to do this simply by ensuring that our taxes and royalties were competitive with those in the rest of Canada and that our people are getting a fair return from the resource. That being true, Mr. Speaker, there is simply no need that we can see for a \$20 million government-owned oil company in Manitoba. But the NDP are going to go ahead with their \$20 million oil play and it should not be forgotten that we are talking about \$20 million only to start with. We don't know what the final cost will be and they're going to do so for apparently purely ideological reasons. I ask honourable members, on the other side of the House, just think of the other things that could be done with that \$20 million. Some of us here can remember when the previous NDP Government, peopled by some of the ones who sit on the front bench right now, started off with a \$2 million loan, I think it was, to Saunders Aircraft and the 2 became 4 and the 4 became 8 and the 8 became 16, 16 became 32 and eventually, before Sid Green closed it down, and what turned it into bankruptcy. That's how that innocent little example of socialist ideology grew into the kind of disaster that it was. That's not the only one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there can be occasions where public investment can be one useful element among others in an overall effort to stimulate development, but public investment for its own sake is something else, and I'm afraid that that's what we hear being discussed in the Throne Speech. In this first of this generation of government-owned enterprises, this \$20 million oil company, I believe that's exactly what we're seeing. I think that there's a danger here, a danger that I hope the First Minister and his friends will be extremely sensitive to. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I believe the First Minister when he says that he prefers joint ventures with the private sector and that he has no wish to drive out private investment, but the danger does exist that, perhaps even inadvertently, they may do precisely that. That is certainly what has happened in the past and I issue this warning to him in as friendly and in as non-partisan a way as I can because, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend may think that he knows the private sector but I really don't think he does; I say to him that

even with the best of intentions he can, because of the tendencies of that government, because of the tendencies of the party to which he belongs, he can drive out, scare away private entrepreneurs from this province who will not take the risk here because they just feel it isn't worth it, it isn't worth it and that they don't have the kind of support from government that is necessary in many of these ventures to make them successful.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the First Minister and his friends that during the mid-70s the combination of uncompetitive taxation, the threat of enforced partnerships with government, in the mineral field particularly, resulted in a collapse of private investment in both the mineral and oil exploration in Manitoba. The only money that was being spent was taxpayers' money matched up to some money from the private sector. International Nickel, one of the biggest operations in Manitoba, shut down, all exploration in Manitoba in 1974, except immediately around their mine. They didn't resume it again until 1978, until the royalty taxes in Manitoba became competitive, and their short answer, very pragmatic, very commonsensical, was this: why should we spend money in Manitoba when we can spend it in a more competitive tax regime in Ontario and British Columbia, in any other country of the world, or even in Saskatchewan?

Well, Mr. Speaker, that company started a \$20 million, five-year exploration program again in 1978 because of the very pragmatic reason we abolished and ameliorated the taxation system that my friends wrong-headedly had imposed upon the mineral and the oil industry in Manitoba thinking that this was going to really cause great additions to the treasury. It dried up the flow into the treasury, it cut off exploration in Manitoba and we had to resuscitate it and bring it back so that it has reached the levels that it has in the last few years.

So, I warn my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, I warn my honourable friend that the danger does exist that he can fritter away what has been built up in terms of resource development in the past few years unless he is extremely careful. I would remind them of the trap that they found themselves in the last time they attempted to use force-government construction to buoy up an otherwise sagging economy. God knows, Mr. Speaker, we all know that one and we're going to be paying, as Manitobans, the price for that kind of irresponsible maladministration of Manitoba Hydro for generations yet to come. That was their plan in the mid-70s, they wanted to buoy up the economy. They would use the construction of government buildings, and above all of hydro expansion, to prop up the economy. But such efforts, Mr. Speaker, are no real or long-term substitute for healthy economic growth. Throughout the mid-70s, as excessive taxation attacked the private sector as succession duties drove family businesses to invest elsewhere, to move assets to Alberta, to move out of the province entirely, how many scores of millions of dollars moved out of this province under the threat of their puny little succession duty tax so that they could all get a flutter in their socialist hearts and say we're taxing the rich and, at the same time, driving out a hundredfold of the investment money from this province, after even dear old Saskatchewan had said: We can't do this any-

more, it doesn't make any sense to try to take \$4 million or \$5 million in taxes every year and to drive out \$100 million in doing it.

My honourable friends can maybe tell us in the course of this debate whether they intend to reimpose succession duty in Manitoba because, God knows, they clung to it to the last minute and it was one of the first taxes that we had to repeal when we came into office in order to stop the flight of capital from Manitoba which was begging this province, begging small business, begging the farmers of this province so that they would take their assets and move elsewhere rather than pay their duty, their blood money as they used to say to Schreyer, they weren't going to do it and they didn't.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the results are well-known. Our economy in those years, because of succession duties, the high taxes on resource industries, suspended investment from the private sector. Our economy became more and more dependent on uninterrupted hydro construction; that's what happened. This party became a government capable of singing only one tune, uninterrupted hydro construction; that's all that kept their head above water and the result is well known. By 1977, when even that government had no option but to suspend hydro construction, we were left in this province with a vast overcapacity and a huge debt whose impact was multiplied by ill-advised, speculative borrowings in foreign currencies which the new Minister of Finance is going to have to deal with as the maturities come forward in '82, '83, '84, '85, many of them. And we were left, Mr. Speaker, with an overall economy which was not capable of replacing the jobs and the investment loss with the suspension of hydro construction and in effect because public ownership and government spending were the sole development strategy. Remember this new members, this isn't news to us but it may be to you, public ownership and government spending became the sole development strategy of that earlier NDP government. Does it sound familiar after reading your Throne Speech? They were trapped into continuing to spend on hydro, continuing to pour money into failed government-owned enterprises, King Choyism or whatever you want to call it, long after it had stopped making any economic sense whatsoever to be involved in. There are some, Mr. Speaker, in the First Minister's party who are so blinded by their ideology that they cannot see the clear lessons of that earlier NDP government and its excessive reliance on government ownership and government spending and you see, Mr. Speaker, why we're so concerned about these two twins that show up in this Throne Speech, government ownership and government spending? These gargoyles are appearing again and we wonder how much damage will be inflicted upon the public of Manitoba before they come to their senses again this time. But if we are to judge, Mr. Speaker, by the First Minister's statements during the recent election campaign, he is not among the looney fringe, he says so openly. He never quite admits he has a looney fringe but he says he's not among them, on good evidence. Throughout that campaign, Mr. Speaker, he spoke of co-operation with the private sector and we, and the people of Manitoba, are going to hold him to that promise and that's what the

government has received a mandate to work toward, nothing else. Period) Paragraph) And achieving that will call for prudence in the use of government ownership. So we will ask throughout the life of this government, as it undertakes investments with the taxpayers' money, "Are the investments the government proposes to make prudent and sensible efforts to stimulate development and more jobs for Manitobans?" That's the test. Or are they only wasteful and unnecessary reflections of the government's ideological preference for government ownership over private ownership? Is government spending, Mr. Speaker, being taken to complement and support real growth in the economy, or is it being undertaken in such a way as to drive out real growth and private investment, creating the kind of economy that is increasingly dependent on even higher levels of taxing and spending and control from the government?

Mr. Speaker, these three themes: increased government spending, increased government control, increased government ownership and intrusion in the economy, all emerge clearly from what was said in the Throne Speech and they are ominous. Each will be a major focus I assure you, Sir, of the deliberations that will take place in this Legislature throughout the life of the government.

Perhaps more striking than what is in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is what is not there. We have the old NDP themes, of course, spending control and ownership by government and they're frightening enough, but there is no breath of innovation in the Speech, not a whisper of innovation in the Speech at all. Not one sign that this government has any new ideas, any flexible ability to deal with the changing realities of the challenges that face us in Manitoba today: We live in a changing society; one shouldn't have to say that to socialists, but I guess we do to this particular lot, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite used to claim to be the party of social reform and innovation, and it offers increases in welfare payments this year — that's its big social reform — just as they have been increased each year for the past four and for dozens before that.

It offers, Mr. Speaker, a review of the minimum wage, just as the minimum wage has been reviewed regularly for the past four years and for dozens of years before that. Unless you count the freezing the price of bus tickets, Mr. Speaker, there is not a single significant social element in this entire Speech.

What's happened to this party? What's happened to this party that used to believe in social reform? Well, Mr. Speaker, they're caught up in socialism, not social reform, and the only economic idea presented here is government ownership; government ownership not advanced as one part of an overall effort to stimulate growth and increase in prosperity — no, not at all, but as the sole answer that this government has been able to come up with, never mind the fact that it's a Nineteenth Century idea that has simply never worked anywhere it's been tried anywhere on the face of the earth.

Where are the broad initiatives and the energy that we might have expected from a new government? Where are the strategies to expand income so that things like welfare payments are less and less needed in Manitoba? Where are the answers to the doubts and

the concerns that surely the First Minister and his friends know are out there among Manitobans? Where, for example, is a clear statement of commitment to the maintenance of the merit principle in the Civil Service, a principle which our government had to restore, Mr. Speaker, to the Civil Service in 1977 and the years following and a principle totally disregarded by the last NDP government in this province?

Mr. Speaker, I've already made it known and I say here to the First Minister and to his colleagues that I congratulate them on the appointment of Mr. Ted Poyser as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. This, Sir, is a reassuring appointment and one that backed up always by performance — that's the test, backed by performance — will go a long way toward calming and dispelling the serious doubts that you, Sir, must know and the Leader of the House must know exist among public servants in Manitoba that there may be a return to the unrestrained, naked patronage and hiring manipulations of the Schreyer years in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of playing around with public employment and public hiring in Manitoba will no longer be tolerated again. That kind of act will not be permitted again. My honourable friends are on notice — I put them on notice from Day One — that any fiddling around with the merit principle with the Civil Service or with the party cards to get a job for this, that or the other thing, or for contract hiring to avoid Civil Service examinations isn't going to wash anymore, because the MGEA won't let it wash, and we won't let it wash, and the people of Manitoba won't let it wash anymore. So be on notice, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends across the way better be on notice that they won't be able to get away with those naked patronage practices in this time around in the temporary trusteeship that they carry out on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been much better if a clear statement affirming the government's intention to abide by the merit principle in the public service would surely have been a worthwhile addition to this Throne Speech.

Where, Mr. Speaker, are the reassurances to farmers in Manitoba that this government will not abandon the sensible program of selling Crown lands to long-term leaseholders — selling Crown land? Where are the guarantees, Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech, that there will be no return of the state farm program in Manitoba — no return of the state farm program? We do not want to have tenants of a socialist government on our farms in Manitoba and let them be on notice now that program will not be permitted to start again. It may be good socialism; it's bad public policy and it won't be permitted again.

What is the government's position with respect, Mr. Speaker, to the major development projects that could mean so much to the future of this province. The major projects: the potash mine; the Western Power Grid or Inter-Tie; the proposed aluminum smelter and ManFor are handled almost dismissively in the Throne Speech in a single paragraph. The government talks about calculating the cost associated with these projects. Well, Mr. Speaker, we want to be concerned, well and good, with the costs of the projects, but what about the benefits that these projects can bring to all Manitobans. What measures will the government take

to ensure that Manitoba companies benefit from the massive orders involved in these projects and that Manitobans have full and fair access to the thousands of jobs that the projects will create? Have they given any thought to that, while they are worrying about advertising and worrying about some of the other trivial issues that are involved in these programs? It doesn't appear to be the case.

Do we have an assurance, for example, that this government will continue the policy of the previous government, of insisting that the greatest possible Manitoba, Western Canadian and Canadian content in these and all other development projects in our province. That would have been a resounding statement of confidence for the private sector in Manitoba to know that this government believes what it says, that it wants to work in partnership for the private sector and it is willing to engage in those policies that will see Buy Manitoba, Buy Western Canada, Buy Canada integrated as part of the foundation of the ongoing program of this government. It is very important.

Will they continue the industrial benefit strategy that has been designed to maximize the benefits of these and other projects to Manitobans? Or will they do, Mr. Speaker, regrettably as they did in the past when they chose to buy turbines for the Jenpeg generating station from Russia, and when they made no effort to maximize Manitoban or other Canadian content in Manitoba industry?

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Community Services is not here, because I wanted to point out to him that having been the Member of Brandon when Shell Resources announced that they were not building a \$25 million dollar plant in that city where we had worked with them to try to get it done — the Honourable Member for Brandon West is here, so we can pass the message along, although I'm not trying to hang any of these albatrosses around his neck. I think he's a man who comes here with a real desire to work with the private sector. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, that's the third big industry that the Member for Brandon East has lost for Brandon. Do you remember Kraft Foods? He lost that one in good style. Remember the General Electric Plant that we could have had in Brandon if this government, when it was in office before, had been prepared to consider a buy-in-Canada policy? Well, we could have had a plant in Brandon, but the Member for Brandon East lost that one too. I'd say three strikes and out, because he's lost Shell now, and he might as well get out because he hasn't done a first-rate job of any sort at all in industrial development for the second largest city in our province. It's a shame! His record of industrial development for the City of Brandon is a shame, and I call attention to it only because Shell resources announced they were folding their tents and sneaking off as well, shortly after the Honourable Member became a Member of this Cabinet across the way. Where then, Mr. Speaker, are these hopeful signs that the private sector will believe that the government and the First Minister are sincere when they say that they want to work in co-operation with the private sector.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these questions are even more urgent now because of the complete confusion that exists around the government's intentions with respect

to the major projects. During the election, the First Minister promised, not once but several times, that there would be an immediate resumption of construction on the Limestone Generating Station. He didn't know what he was talking about, but he announced it anyway. We announced it because we knew that we had had the recommendation of three provinces to their governments to proceed with the Western Inter-Tie. Now, they're reviewing it all, Mr. Speaker.

Well, the First Minister, during the election campaign, said there would be an immediate resumption of construction on the Limestone Generating Station. Maybe he means something different by "immediate" than the rest of us do; but if for whatever reason he feels compelled to break that promise, then let him say so, and say so clearly, because if fortunes had been reversed and our government had been returned to office, that project would have been under construction next year based upon markets that we have been working to achieve for the last three-and-a-half years, based upon real industrial development in this province.

Meanwhile, we have a Deputy Minister, for example, and I think earning the chagrin as he properly should from the first Minister, breaking off talks with Alcan because he objects to the company's advertising. Mr. Speaker, did somebody in Manitoba, did anybody in Manitoba elect that itinerant Deputy Minister to make those kinds of decisions? I rather think not. We've had enough of this trivializing of major events and major projects for the province because some particular socialist, who is brought in on a transient basis to do a temporary job, doesn't like a particular brand of advertising that's carried on, then he can put in jeopardy a whole project that will see a thousand direct jobs come to Manitoba, one of the largest investments in the history of our province, the biggest hydro customer that this province has ever had, and we are placing in jeopardy projects of that size and that magnitude and of that benefit to the people of Manitoba, because some Johnny-come-lately comes into this province from the office of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa and says he doesn't like their advertising.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough for Manitoba and my honourable friend, the Leader of the House, had better get a hold of his act in Manitoba, better get a hold of some of these funny deputies, get a hold of some of these ideologues that he's bringing in and tell them that what has to be served here first and foremost is the public interest, not the particular ideology which makes his little heart flutter, but the public interest and the people of this province. I don't know that you can get that kind of understanding or loyalty from the kind of people — these itinerants who seem to flock about and join the Saskatchewan Government or the B.C. Government or the Manitoba Government whenever there's a socialist government in office, because they don't seem to be prepared intellectually to be able to work for any other government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was said in an article recently — and it doesn't need to be said — it's been said in every text on political science that has ever been written about our parliamentary system here or in Britain or elsewhere in the Commonwealth, that the founda-

tion of the system, because politicians do come and politicians do go, but the foundation of the system is to have good neutral people working in key positions in governments so that the public interest can be carried on, and that they can carry out the wishes, whether the government is Socialist or whether it's Conservative or whether it's Social Credit or Liberal or whatever the case may be. As I see itinerant ideologists being shoved into temporary positions where the public interest of Manitoba is suffering because of that, then, Mr. Speaker, I become very very worried about the direction in which my honourable friends are going. It's all well and good to say that you want to have people who are compatible with you.

I remember the former Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Schreyer, on the occasion when he hired someone from his family to work in his office, and his excuse was, "I wanted to have somebody who was ideologically compatible with me. At that time, Mr. Kosygin was visiting Ottawa, and someone was heard to say if he wants somebody ideologically compatible, why didn't he ask Kosygin for one of his staff. He would have been equally at home.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of nonsense, you see, that sometimes animates my honourable friends opposite, and the public interest suffers. What are the other economic and development initiatives that were under way when this government was elected — are they to be retained? For example, for months, Manitoba has been negotiating with the other provinces to persuade them to co-operate in a nation-wide program designed to make sure that more of the money governments spend is spent on Canadian-made goods. We had agreement, in principle, of most of the provincial governments including as well the Federal Government in Ottawa on that initiative. That's an important initiative for Manitoba. It's an important reassurance for the confidence of business people in this province, that the government should say something, and say something fairly soon about whether they're continuing with that initiative. There is nothing ideological about it at all, nothing that my honourable friends have to worry about there at all. It's good for the country; it's good for the province; it's good for the public interest. I'd like to hear what they have to say about it because that negotiation was almost completed, and it is something that would benefit all Manitobans. What's happened to it? Is it going to continue or will it be abandoned as well in favour of more government ownership and more government intrusion?

Who, Mr. Speaker, is speaking for the government on financial matters in this province? Let me cite one little example. At the recent First Ministers' Conference, we have the First Minister of this province going to Ottawa and calling for a 75-cent Canadian dollar or perhaps even lower, God knows; and the next week, we have —(Interjection)— well, if Peter Loughheed advocated it, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with it anymore coming from his lips than I do from the untrained ones of my honourable friend opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister goes to Ottawa and he calls for a 75-cent Canadian dollar, and the next week we have his Minister of Finance, that brilliant addition to the money firmament of Canada. We have this great addition to the financial firmament of the

country rolling over a loan in Swiss francs in Switzerland.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish this party, which is temporarily a government, would make sure that the left foot knows what the left hand is doing, because if the First Minister, by any trick of fate, were to get his 75 cent dollar can you imagine what that would do to all of the exotic foreign borrowings that my honourable friend is going to have to pay off, the maturities on those ill-gotten loans that were made by his predecessors 5-10 years ago, in exotic currencies, in Swiss francs, in Japanese yen, in Euro dollars, in Hong Kong dollars and so on and so on, and Deutsche marks. You name it, we've got it in our portfolio and they're coming due. And if my honourable friend, the First Minister, gets his way and gets the 75 cent dollar it's going to result in an even greater load on the shoulders of Manitobans and on the shoulders of their sons and their grandchildren and their great-grandchildren because of the kind of incontinent and the kind of — I hesitate to use the word — kind of ill-thought out, ill-conceived and generally stupid investment policy that was carried on by the Schreyer Government and which now appears, Mr. Speaker, it now appears to be being resumed by the current government after being in office for only a few months. At the same time they're borrowing Swiss francs, or I should say rolling over Swiss francs, they're not paying them off, the loan initially was 100 million Swiss francs which cost \$43.7 million in 1977 and it cost us \$63.7 million in 1982 to roll over the same amount. That's a great kind of financing but my honourable friend prefers to talk only about the rate of interest which was 5.25 percent.

So, in accordance with his terms, if you're part of the unwashed out there you can get away with that kind of thing because he would like everybody to believe that he made a great deal at 5 percent or 5.7 percent. Well he didn't, because he didn't tell the people of Manitoba what the dollar conversion is on that loan and how much the initial loan has already cost the taxpayers of Manitoba and why he's going back into that same currency at the present time when his First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is advocating a 75 cent dollar in this country.

Now I suggest, with the greatest of respect, that they get their act together because the only ones who suffer from this kind of confusion, wrongheadedness, are the people of Manitoba, not necessarily now, but in 5-10-15 years to come because the maturities are coming due. Isn't it ironic, Mr. Speaker, the maturities are going to be coming due, with another NDP Government in office, on those ill-gotten loans that they made back in the '70s. And we're going to watch how they squirm and twist on the hook as they try to tell the people of Manitoba that this was a good investment initially, and it's going to cost us a bundle, Mr. Speaker.

All you have to do, I say to the honourable members across the way who are new to the House, look at the last year's budget statement, Expenditures and Revenues, read last year's Budget, see the tables at the end of the book and you'll see the maturities on the loans that were contracted by the previous NDP Government that fall due 1982-83-84-85, some 200 and some odd million dollars, I believe, that are going to have to be refinanced. I think 250 million in Swiss

francs alone. And ask yourselves the question: If that was bad policy then why are these people in the front row doing it again? Why are they doing it again? That's a good exercise, I think, Mr. Speaker, for all new members in the House.

I was surprised, frankly, Mr. Speaker, that in the Throne Speech there was no mention, or just mention en passant, of federal-provincial relations at a time when those federal-provincial relations, even by the admission of the new Minister of Finance, are in one of the worst states that they've been in the history of this country.

I find it strange in passing, Mr. Speaker, that there was not mention of that, no mention of how this government intends to persuade the Federal Government to maintain its co-operative federalism stance with respect to this and other provinces in Canada.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister, in the course of his partisan discussions with the Premier of Saskatchewan, has had an opportunity to be filled in yet, to be filled in on just the degree to which this present national government in Ottawa has determined that it is going to beggar the provinces and that it is going to abandon its national responsibility in areas of health care, in areas of senior education, into which it calls initiatives to be made and calls provinces to move into programs that otherwise, left to their own devices, they might have moved at a different pace.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend has really had the opportunity yet, and I don't blame him if he hasn't, I don't blame him for a moment because you can't learn everything overnight, but I say this to him, and I said it on another public occasion and it's not directed in any personal sense to him, but the Premier of Manitoba can neither a doormat nor a church mouse be in negotiations in this day and age with the present Prime Minister and with the present government of this country and if you think otherwise you'll learn to your regret.

Manitoba doesn't have to bow and scrape, pull its forelock, kiss anybody's hem or do anything like that at all, with respect to its valid positions in principle, founded in principle, with respect to the nature of this country, with respect to federal-provincial relations. If you've got a case to make, make it. If the Prime Minister of the day happens to take a dislike to you, or to your government, that's too bad, but make your case because the people of Manitoba expect it to be made, to be made forthrightly, to be made with candor and to be made firmly and not with the idea that you're a Uriah Heep going down there wringing your hands and saying: somehow or other if I become a doormat to the Prime Minister all is going to be well; that stance won't work. I say to my honourable friend I'm not suggesting, for a moment, that he has taken such a stance but I suggest to him, in the strongest terms that I can, that he be his own man and be his own government with respect to federal-provincial relations, and not worry too much about his image with the press or his image with the particular ministers or anything of that sort at all because that kind of cream puffery won't last him very long.

The test of the relationship of this government with the government in Ottawa is going to be how well they emerge from the federal-provincial negotiations on cost-shared programs, on the great other cost-shared

programs that we have that are up for renewal and which, at the present time, appear to be underfunded by the Federal Government moving unilaterally as was in the wind that it was going to do some time ago.

Well, I would like to hear a forthright statement from the First Minister of this province, Mr. Speaker, about federal-provincial relations, about what approach this government intends to take with respect to these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I also found it somewhat unusual that no mention was made in the Throne Speech, as my honourable friend has been loquacious on the topic before, of the Constitution and of the Constitution which will be coming home to Canada of the role which this government intends to play in the renewed Constitutional Conference, which will be taking place I daresay, within the next year or so.

It is certainly no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba, when I had the honour to be the Premier of this Province, had a well-know position with respect to the Constitution of Canada; a position, Mr. Speaker, that was shared by seven other provinces in this country, and that the compromise that was arrived at finally with respect, first of all, to the amending formula, was the amending formula in large measure as devised by the seven provinces who were forced to take the Government of Canada to court, and that the Bill of Rights, that he ultimately emerged from this compromise discussion, is a Bill of Rights subject to the override of Parliament and the override of the Provincial Legislatures so as to preserve the concept of the supremacy of Parliament, which underlies the whole political and judicial system of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we could not stand by and see one Prime Minister, no matter how long, no matter how intellectually clever he was, try to destroy the foundations of this country as indeed his package would have done. Mr. Speaker, I said at the time when the compromise was arrived at it was a victory for all Canadians. I believe that, and I merely say to my friend, the Attorney-General, that he had best be very careful before he goes about the province making pronouncements to the effect that Manitoba will never use the override with respect to the Bill of Rights. Many of us can conjure situations where that override will have to be used in the public interest because of decisions that may well be taken by the judiciary which are not in accordance with public opinion and the public interest in this province or in this country. So my honourable friend, before he says it will never be used in Manitoba, should remember that overrides will be used by the Legislature of this province, not by any one Minister and not by the Treasury Bench, but by the Legislature, and I suggest to him that he consider that position very carefully before he goes to groups which I am sure would love to hear such talk, misleading as it may be, such as the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, and make statements that really, I suggest without any ability to foretell the future, will not hold water in the future because the override is there for a purpose. It acts as a Damocles sword against the judiciary who may want to start legislating in this country, and God knows we will not have in this country judicial legislation of the kind that they have in the United States. We can be the greatest

admirers, as many of us are, of the system in the United States and of the particular kind of Republican Democracy that is practised there, but Mr. Speaker, it is not our system. It is not in accordance with our tradition, it is not part of the parliamentary system, and thank God we prevented it from being foisted on this country by one man.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, a reading of the Throne Speech leaves no doubt that this government is committed to increased government spending, although it tells us nothing about the spending priorities that will guide the government in its decisions. It leaves no doubt that the government is committed to extending centralized control over everything from municipal government to daycare, although it provides no evidence that such extended government control is in the public interest. It leaves no doubt that the government is committed to government ownership, although on what basis and to what purpose is far from clear, beyond that they like the idea of government ownership.

I remind my honourable friends of some of the old axioms, you know, that are still true, in this society, in this province, in this country, indeed in our Western World. The greatest enemy of poverty is an expanding free economy. It's a pretty good thing to remember every morning when you get up and buckle on your boots and come to work as a legislator in Manitoba and are proud to do so, remember that is what history has shown us. If you like something that comes from another source that I'm sure causes some titillation among my honourable friends opposite, it President John Kennedy who said, "A rising tide lifts all boats," and that's why an expanding economy is needed for this province; that's why we need the Alcan development or an Aluminum Smelter, we need one or two or three; that's why we need a potash mine or two of them in this province; that's we need the Western Inter-Tie to develop that great resource of hydro that we have and to provide a market for that resource so that we can get on with the building of it. That will give the expansion to this economy so that on all sides of the House we can then begin to offer those expanded social programs that are possible if you've got an expanding economy with a tax system that remains competitive, not the highest in the country as we used to have.

That is really all that is in this Speech, Mr. Speaker, talking about government ownership and more spending and more government control, and I can't help but think that it must be at the very least a disappointment to many of the new members opposite to see how very little this new government has to offer.

Where is the energy that you expected to see in this government? Where are the new ideas that you were confident were here? That's why you joined the party, that's why you ran for them. Once they've changed the colour of the license plates, Mr. Speaker, and decided once again to bet that the Swiss franc is going to go down against the Canadian dollar, what do they propose to do? That's the question you've got to ask yourselves. What are they really doing, what is their vision for Manitoba? Surely they want more than a government owned resource industry on each corner, and a one-year bus ticket price freeze, or is that all the NDP stands for in Manitoba today? There's not much

here to inspire enthusiasm or competence, Mr. Speaker. There's not much here to fire the imaginations of the people of Manitoba. Instead we have government spending, government control, and government ownership — those three tired centerpieces of tired 19th Century socialism.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is fortunate in having a number of new members behind him. Let him put some of them in his Cabinet, God knows it needs an infusion of something. Let him benefit from their imaginations and from their energy, because they've shown no imagination or energy thus far.

This Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, could have been written by that same tired bunch that wrote the last Throne Speech of the Schreyer Government in 1977, and remember what happened to them; they were turfed out. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what could have happened. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, unlike my honourable friend opposite, I believe the Member from Kildonan, who's yelping from his seat, I don't think it's any disgrace for a politician or a political party to be defeated. It's only socialists who think that way, and most of them don't understand our parliamentary system to well. I don't think it's any disgrace at all. I'm willing to abide, and our party are willing to abide by the judgment of the people. Would that you're party could be so humble in the assumption of office, that's what I say to the Member for Kildonan.

Mr. Speaker, the other members of the Opposition will have a number of other comments to make about this Throne Speech. We welcome the governments explanation today as to their position with respect to negotiation with Manitoba's doctors. We will have something more to say of the revisionist history that marks this Speech in days that are ahead.

Primarily, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be asking for more from this government; more information, clearer statements of it's intentions. What are the governments spending priorities? Where will the money come from, Mr. Speaker. On what basis will they choose to extend government control over the lives of Manitobans? On what basis are government investment decisions going to be made? What measures does the government propose to ensure that the benefits of economic growth are widely shared among Manitobans and are maximized in this province? Or are we going to be fed another great feeding of the "cold porridge of envy" as we try to divide a smaller and smaller economic pot among the people of Manitoba. The choice is clear, Mr. Speaker. Let's get on with the development of our province. That is the heritage that was left to my honourable friends, to get on with development. What have they done about it in the first three months? They are looking at the cost to Manitobans and they are blinded to the benefits.

These are the kind of broad and strategic questions that one would normally expect the first Throne Speech of a new government to answer, but the answers are not here, Mr. Speaker, and so it is impossible at this stage for the people of Manitoba to evaluate this government's intentions.

Instead we have a disjointed little list of things that bear no relationship to the main challenges and the opportunities that face Manitobans. We have three themes of increased spending, increased government control and increased government ownership and we

have less innovation, fewer new ideas, less energy and direction and leadership than I have ever seen in the first Throne Speech of a new government in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that the Motion be amended by adding to it the following words: "but that this House regrets that the government, by its lack of leadership, lack of imagination and lack of an overall economic strategy, its failure to move ahead with major project negotiations to generate jobs for our people, its disturbing tendencies to centralize authority and its preoccupation with doubtful expenditures of taxpayers dollars to secure public ownership, has thereby lost the confidence of the citizens of Manitoba."

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the few things that I agreed with in the Speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition was when he said it is not a disgrace to be defeated. That reminds me of the person who is about to be hanged and said that if it wasn't for the honour he would just as soon have declined.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin to examine the remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition, I wanted to say that this House is, of course, different from many others in previous years. It is the first time that there have only been two political parties represented in the history of Manitoba. It is also a special Legislature in that it has a largest number of women in Manitoba's history.

We also had the privilege of having a House opened by the first woman Lieutenant Governor, the Honourable Pearl McGonigal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech, the Honourable Member for The Pas, and the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Member from The Pas said that members often want to brag about the fact that the lakes in their ridings are the best and the waters is the purest, and the cleanest; I want to tell him that I have never said that. I want to tell him, however, that if Elmwood did have a lake, it probably would have the cleanest and clearest water of all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say to some of the newer members of the House, as one who has been in the Assembly some sixteen years at this point, back in the days when the Honourable Duff Roblin was Premier, that I do believe that this is, in fact, where the action is and that great writers and thinkers in the past like Plato and Aristotle were right when they said that politics is in fact the noblest profession or the highest calling, and I say that in particular because of the fact that everybody seems to think that politicians are fair game and that as a part of the profession one takes a great deal of abuse from the media and the public and so on. Because of the fact, I suppose that the world is full of armchair politicians, and I speak from the broad range of people who feel that they can comment at

anytime, in any place on any subject and criticize people who are in the political process whether they be the Ted Stupidly or the Coconut Willies or whoever they may be, I simply say that by definition people who are outside of the political process can do no wrong, because they never make any political decisions and they never take positions of major public importance.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition and as usual he makes his remarks and then leaves. He has been doing this ever since he came into this House. I remember having an opportunity three years ago to follow him in the Budget, and in typical fashion he spent two hours attacking the New Democratic Party, particularly the Federal Leader, and when he was finished, and when it was an opportunity for somebody on our side to reply he, of course, took off as he is always inclined to do. He likes to hammer the opposition but he doesn't like to hear back what the . . .

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's highly improper for a member to make comment about the absence or presence of any member in this Chamber. I would hope that you bring it to the attention of the present speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the total effect of what the First Minister said I thought of the song by Peggy Lee who once sang, "Is that all there is?" I mean, what did we hear? He had all these big points about bus ticket freezes and tuition fees and so on. He was worried about government spending, that's his main concern, that's the main concern of everybody over there. Well, who has run up the biggest deficits in Manitoba's history? The Conservative party of Sterling Lyon, run up the biggest deficits in Manitoba history. And which government had a falloff in revenues because they were sitting back watching the economy going to rack and ruin and did nothing, stood idly by while the Manitoba economy went down the tube; and who stood back when there were record bankruptcies and record business failures while the people of Manitoba watched the performance of the government for four years. And what did they see? Poor managers, poor economists and poor politicians, I suppose the ultimate cut. And the people of Manitoba decided to change from a government that simply took an inactive position, simply sat idly by, and voted for a positive activist government.

Mr. Speaker, if the proof of the pudding is in the eating then Manitobans have demonstrated that they've either had indigestion or food poisoning under the Tories.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister, the former First Minister, the Leader of the Official Opposition — well, you know, I've been calling him that for four years so I have to make the adjustment. Mr. Speaker, he says that he's learned something. He told

us for four years that he's for laissez faire economics and now, all of a sudden, he says he recognizes the fact that we live in a mixed economy. Well, you know, when did he learn this, when did he —(Interjection)— November 17th is apparently the time he learned about economics, contemporary economic theory, because before then he was a monitorist, before then he was an Adam Smith economist and that takes us back a considerable distance. We listened to the vocabulary of the Leader of the Official Opposition, you know, no change. What did I hear today? I heard references to socialism, to dogma, to rhetoric, 19th Century machinations of the human mind, rhetoric, social engineering, iron curtain — I love that story about Kosygin — and ideological state enterprises, nostrums, revisionism. Mr. Speaker, the man hasn't learned a thing. His thinking and his vocabulary is frozen in the 19th Century; his economic thinking is frozen in the 18th Century —(Interjection)— Yes, absolutely, 1776 is where he takes his references from. I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that those who do not learn from their mistakes are bound to repeat them and, as Bertrand Russell once said, "we learn from history that men never learn anything from history," and the Leader of the Official Opposition, he is going to pour it on in the same way in the same fashion. And he now has the distinction that no one else in this House I think could claim, he has the dubious distinction of being the first First Minister, a double first, to have been defeated after one term in office and I don't know whether or not he realizes the basis of that decision on the part of the public.

I read with interest his remarks on the Throne Speech, and what did he say, he attacked a knee-jerk plan, that's how he described the Throne Speech, a knee-jerk plan.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of knee-jerk thinking and speaking of jerks and speaking of silly references, who has the knee-jerk reaction in this House? Who has the same type of philosophy unchanging over a period of time? Is it the government on this side? Is it our First Minister who's had the experience of being in a previous Cabinet, is he acting in exactly the same manner as his predecessor or is he changing based on certain experiences, or is it this gentleman on this side, is he the one who is changing? Is he the one who is making the change or is he the one who is persisting?

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Cabinet I want to point out that I'm only four or five feet away but the gentlemen and the ladies on that side are eight to ten years minimum away.

Mr. Speaker, I always think it's interesting to hear from a defeated Tory First Minister as to why he lost. It's interesting to hear from anybody, of course, as to how they analyze the events that put them out of office, and I remember very clearly in 1969 Walter Weir and Don Craik getting together, analyzing their results on the front page of the newspapers and they said, as my colleague recalls only so well, "The people of Manitoba made a mistake." They couldn't have really meant, they didn't really intend to vote us out of office, they must have made a mistake.

Now, what did Sid Spivak say, what did Sid Spivak say when he was leader? I liked what he said, it was terrific. He was a Red Tory remember, a Progressive

Tory. He said, and so help me God this is truth, he said, "We won the election," because it was a peculiar result. You might recall in '73 the New Democratic Party went up one seat. The Conservative Opposition went up one seat and I think maybe even the Liberal party went up one seat, it was a peculiar result for a while because we had some Independents in the House and we had a Sacred and the results were, therefore, each party tended to gain. But the Tories, their leader at least, I don't know about the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, but I know that the Tory line, the official line coming from the leader was, "we actually won." And I say, if that's what winning is, keep it up, keep it up. And now we come to this year's result and the new Leader of the Official Opposition, here's what he said and I quote from the Free Press, February 10, 1982, "I'm convinced" — and he was speaking to 1100 Tories at the International Inn. I'm glad you give Sid some business once in a while. Mr. Speaker, they gave him the business when he was leader and now they're at least giving him a little business in the post period. But 1150 Tories, \$125 a crack, having dinner and he's worried about freezing bus fares. You know, the reason he finds that bizarre and peculiar is he's never ridden a bus and neither have any of these people who are shelling out \$125, \$250 bucks a couple. —(Interjection)— Not bad. Well, they saved their bus fare for a whole year and then they were able to buy a ticket to the Tory dinner. I knew there was a connection. Mr. Speaker, what did the Honourable Sterling Lyon say? He said, "I'm convinced that we allowed perceptions of a lack of compassion" — people didn't know they were compassionate — "and disinterest" — he should have said uninterest or lack of interest but he said people had the wrong impression — "a disinterest e problems in thof the ordinary citizen to become entrenched in the public mind, even though such perceptions were wildly inaccurate." Well, I mean shucks, somebody thinking the Tories don't have compassion and somebody thinking that they're not interested in the problems of ordinary citizens. I mean, Sterling's telling this to people who are sitting there at \$250 a couple, saying we have a concern for the ordinary person. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why they lost.

MR. JOHNSON: Your price is wrong

MR. DOERN: Oh, how much was it? Two for \$249.50. Well, I'm quoting the Free Press. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to weather forecasting I always look at the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek. I look at his face because if his face is pink it means we're not scoring very well; if it's red it shows that we're getting to him; if it's blue it means that we're really pouring it on; and if it's black we've hit the 10 out of 10 on the scale. Now, if he's not there, either look outside and you'll find him in the halls or you'll find him on the floor which is where he frequently is when he hears the New Democratic party speaking. —(Interjection)— Well he's just pink, I'll keep trying. Mr. Speaker, why did the Tories lose? You heard what their leader said. I'll give you some reasons why they lost. Headlines like "Housing starts in Winnipeg fall to a 20 year low." That's a reason why you lost and results like this — I now go back to the '80-81 Session, results like that — Bus fares went up from 25 cents to 60 cents, that

was a Tory contribution to the people of Winnipeg. Tuition fees up 40 percent, that was a contribution. The First Minister doesn't appreciate what our government is attempting, the former First Minister. He allowed bus fares to rise; he allowed tuition fees to rise; Pharmacare deductible up 50 percent; Autopac deductible up 100 percent; Provincial tax on gasoline up 40 percent; nursing home fees up 44 percent; and a free hand to landlords to raise rent. Those were the kind of things that were done; that's the kind of record, Mr. Speaker, that this government left, compassion for the common man.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the economic indicators that went on in their term in office and attempt to compare it to the two terms that we had in office you can see on every count, on every single count, the New Democratic party surpassed the accomplishments of the Lyon administration. The Schreyer administration on every count surpassed the accomplishments of the Lyon administration. I will give you some examples, and this is data taken from the Statistics Canada, from the Conference Board and from Canada Mortgage and Housing —(Interjection)— And, yes, it was put together by our resident economist, the Honourable Leonard Evans, but his sources are clear. I don't know where your sources came from but I know where his came from and they're all there in black and white. If you take the six economic indicators — real growth average only .2 percent during Conservative years compared with 4.6 and 2.8 percent during the New Democratic years; if you take investments the increase in total spending was only 18 percent in 1977-81 compared with 26.9 in '69-78, through the whole term, or if you take our last four years, it was 66 percent — Mr. Speaker, that's over 300 percent higher than the Conservative party in office; employment, job creation, was only 2.7 percent during the Conservative years, 3.4 and 3 percent, respectively, during our terms in office; if you take unemployment, unemployment averaged 5.8 percent of the labour force during their term in office and 5.2 percent from '69-73 and 4.7 percent from '73-77, Mr. Speaker; housing starts fell during their term in office; and one of the ones that bothers me the most is population, Manitoba's population fell, only increased — let's put it in those terms — only increased .2 percent under the Conservatives, one-fifth of 1 percent increase during the Conservative term in office. Mr. Speaker, while Sterling Lyon was Premier of Manitoba, Manitoba suffered a net loss of over 40,000 people. That's why there was a change in government a few months ago. Mr. Speaker, we had mega promises. —(Interjection)— Well, higher taxes the old Finance Minister says. Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll see about that. The Conservative party came out with these mega promises and that's all that they were. There was talk of development and the people of Manitoba weren't going to be conned. The Conservatives thought they would trumpet this sort of information and then they would sell it through a series of high cost expensive ad campaigns paid for by the taxpayers. That was their strategy, and you remember what kinds of ads they had. I have a list that I put together that totals a half-a-million dollars. And what about the timing? You know the timing was always interesting. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, will recall during the by-election the SAFER

ads that came out. Eighty thousand dollars worth of SAFER ads came out just at that time. —(Interjection)— No, they didn't like his. It was the former Attorney-General, he didn't like that advertising.

Before the election, \$40,000 of taxpayers money to put together that blue pamphlet on the Constitution. Remember that? What a waste of money) That crumbly little pamphlet about Manitoba's position on the Constitution, and that was distributed to everybody.

The "Stay In Manitoba" T.V. expenditures that the former Minister of Economic Development had going in two phases — 65,000 a crack, \$130,000 for that.

The White Paper promotion, Mr. Speaker, \$100,000, \$100,000 there, and then the worst and the greatest sin of all — the Industrial Benefits Campaign that went on just days and weeks before the Provincial Election Campaign. I mean, full page ads, television ads, radio spots talking about the mega projects. "You are sitting on a gold mine." What a silly slogan) I don't know who thought that up, and I don't know who thought up that particular campaign, but let me tell you it didn't go over at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, that sort of stuff, that sort of an expenditure, and that sort of approach was rejected by the people of Manitoba. The whole thing should have been billed to the Keystone Club. Remember that Keystone Club that they formed just before the election; that is where the bills should have gone or else on Kennedy Street; that is where the bills should have gone. But they took this money and they spent all this money and they never thought that there was anything wrong with it at all.

The Member for Turtle Mountain, he couldn't see anything wrong with sending letters out to the civil servants with their cheques explaining his position, explaining how he thought that the Opposition had done something that was wrong. He couldn't see how this was a political thing. He had a hard time distinguishing, had a hard time. —(Interjection)— Well, beware of the month of March. You know, I say to your Leader, beware of the Ides of March, beware of the Ides of March. If he was here I would speak to him on that particular account.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Conservative failure, and I will move on to the election from the election campaign into the direction that I think the government is heading. I think that the failure can be summed up in three words, acute protracted restraint. That is what did in the Tory Party, and that is why the Conservatives are sitting over on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans voted for an activist approach to government, that is why there was a change. The people of Manitoba didn't buy the approach of the former government, and what was that approach? It was laissez faire; sit back, don't get involved, government is dirty. I don't even know how these people can stand for election, Mr. Speaker. They don't believe in government, they don't believe that government should play a role. I really find it a contradiction, I honestly do, as to how a Conservative can seek election, serve in the Legislature when he doesn't believe in the role as an MLA or believe in the role of government in society. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, while my colleague says anarchist and that is probably true, that my in fact be. The Honourable

Member for Concordia, he thinks that you are probably, if you dig deep down you'll find an anarchist.

Mr. Speaker, I think the most difficult thing that we will attempt and that we were elected for is to turn the economy around and that is the one, and that is where this government will stand or fall, and that is where your government fell. That is the challenge that we meet, that we are glad to take on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am a construction man, so I can tell you right now that one of the things I believe in — you can characterize me in this fashion as a Keynesian or a Galbraithian — I believe that the government should build a lot of its requirements, like hospitals, certain educational facilities, certain facilities that it requires, maybe even some roads and highways and in that fashion keep the economy going. That is one of the things that I would do and one of the things that I will argue for inside this government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make mention of an opportunity that I had a few weeks ago, because I made a very very interesting trip to Eastern Canada. I attended a Conference in Washington because of the fact that I am now a member of the Manitoba Telephone System Board, and I also made a trip to Toronto and saw some things in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I found in the field of communications, which has been an interest of mine for a long time, at least going back to '69, '70 when I was a member of the Manitoba Telephone System Board, I found it extremely interesting to see some of the new developments in the field of communications. It is like having a preview of the future and then coming back and trying to explain it to some of the people. Seeing things like satellite communication systems which are now with us.

In the old days, it was pick up a telephone, and the voice went down the wire and somebody at the other end, a couple of thousand miles away, picked up the telephone. Now we are going into a situation where your calls go via satellite and there is no particular wired city connection; electronic mail, whereby people are sending documents, for example, through machines that are then reprinted at the other end or, of course, data is transmitted by satellite or could be by telephone line, etc.; tele-conferencing where people are going to in the future, as they are already, sitting in front of a television screen and communicating thousands of miles away with people, say, from their board of directors; weather forecasting, new developments like hand-held telephones by which a person — we didn't see this, but we heard of this, one of the gentlemen that we saw on the trip said he was given a small receiver by which he can dial a number anywhere in the world and so on. So it's only a matter of time before we'll be into wristwatch radios and T.V. sets and telephones. —(Interjection)— Maybe the honourable president of Success/Angus has one in his office, but I've never seen one, but I assume that there are such things. He probably belonged to Dick Tracy's Crimes-toppers as well back in the old days.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think in communications I saw some of the future, but I also think that I was privileged to attend the first morning of the First Ministers' Conference on the economy in Ottawa; and also saw the future of Manitoba and the provinces in relation to the Federal Government. We have watched your Leader bite and attack and kick and rough up the First Minis-

ter of this country. He thought he was doing just dandy. He was going to call the election. Well, there's the former First Minister. I'm glad he's back. But we watched him — I watched him on T.V. time and time and time again attack Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada, always every now and then saying "Sir," always kicking him and scratching and biting and then saying "Sir" and "It's with the deepest respect" that I then do this and then do that and then do that. You know, I think the people of Manitoba, maybe they liked that the first time they saw it. They like their Premiers to stand up for their provincial position, they like their people to stand up and put the position of Manitoba strongly into the Federal arena; but I think after a while they were just sick and tired of watching the performance of the First Minister in that regard. He certainly wasn't putting forward the historic position of Manitoba. Manitoba is normally in the middle. Manitoba normally wouldn't ally itself with a province like Alberta, which is resource rich, or a province like Quebec, which is interested in separatism, but yet you had the First Minister of Manitoba allied to the former First Minister, allied with Levesque and Lougheed at these conferences.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people said, "We want a new approach, we want at least an attempt." Now, if the First Minister of Manitoba fails to reason with these people to make them see the merit of our position over a period of time, then I suspect that our position will become stronger if that occurs; but at least we should make an attempt. At least, there should be a period of time in which we attempt to co-operate with the Federal Government. —(Interjection)— Well, how long did you wait? You never waited one minute. You gave four years of heavy artillery to the Liberal Government, and I suppose, the Clark Government as well. Mr. Speaker, I also saw in Toronto another interesting phenomenon.

So I say, we have made a beginning to put Manitoba's position in the middle of the road, in the middle of the country where it historically has been in the best interests of the people of Manitoba — a new beginning to co-operative federalism.

Mr. Speaker, while I was in Toronto as well, I also attended for a couple of days the New Democratic Party of Ontario's Leadership Convention where they chose Bob Reay, and that was very fascinating — the next Premier of Ontario. Two thousand delegates, over a thousand visitors; the media, I mean I never saw such media coverage in my entire life.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Reay is a — I don't want to make a comparison between Lewis and Reay — but I'll tell you this, Reay is brilliant and Reay has an excellent personality and he has the drive and the determination to take that party from third party status to kill off the Liberals, which we did in this province and to go all the way to the Government of Ontario.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, you're going to witness in the next year a New Democratic Party Government in British Columbia, in the next six months to a year. Bennett's fortunes are down and Barrett's fortunes are up. Now, we're seeing the Bennett Government trying to set up a situation to call an election, and that's interesting to watch.

Mr. Speaker, right wing governments are passé. They've had it. They've had their day. And what hap-

pened here in this particular government is going to happen to two more major governments in the world, the Thatcher Government of Great Britain which is so unpopular that if they called an election today I don't know whether they'd win any seats, and the Reagan Government in the United States. Sure, Reagan's riding high, President of the United States. Check his polls, check his results, check his popularity at an all-time low. I talked to a few people in the United States, one Congressman in particular, who is a Liberal Republican, and he thinks they are going to get really hammered in the next elections which I guess are in November of this year. He was worried about what is going to happen throughout the United States to the Republican party in the off-season elections.

Mr. Speaker, change is in the air. Some of us, I guess, who are less familiar with the Roman Catholic Church than others tend to regard, as I have tended to regard, the Roman Catholic Church as a Conservative force, but the church has changed with the times; and I was struck in September, 1981, with the encyclical of Pope John Paul II when he said as follows, and I'll read you the first two paragraphs of this Associated Press story:

"Pope John Paul in his most comprehensive statement on social issues yesterday strongly backed labour unions, urged worker participation in management, and proposed a just family wage and subsidies that would free mothers from the necessity of taking jobs. The papal encyclical condemned both rigid capitalism and the collectivist system that would eliminate all private ownership of the means of production. It suggested a socialist middle ground as a model for economic development."

Mr. Speaker, I think my time is running out. I simply want to say to the members opposite — do I have five minutes, Mr. Speaker, or one minute? One minute, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that the swing throughout the Western World is to moderate socialist governments, and I think that the party opposite has had the distinction of leading the way and showing people the future. I simply say to them, as well, that they are going to now witness, they sat back for four years and watched the economy grind down. I say they can now sit back and watch a positive activist government take over.

MR. SPEAKER, D. James Walding (St. Vital): The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would be moving or begging to move an adjournment of the debate at this particular time, but certainly not wishing to prevent anyone from speaking.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. PENNER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday)