

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 27 February 1980

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a short Ministerial Statement to make. Copies are provided herewith.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement that will provide information to members of the House. Some of you will have noticed a satellite ground receiver dish that has been moved on to the Legislative grounds on the east side of this building. For your information, I would like to explain that the dish is to be used during the next ten days to demonstrate this new advanced telecommunications technology. The demonstration will illustrate to us some of the expertise that has been developed by Canadians in the satellite field.

The dish is owned by Telestat Canada, a federal government agency, which is carrying out this demonstration in co-operation with the Manitoba Telephone System. Signals received from the dish will be distributed over the internal wiring system of the Legislative Building.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this demonstration is particularly significant at this time when the CRTC is about to hold hearings in the need for expanded television services in northern and remote communities. This matter is of prime concern to my government, and will, I'm sure, be of great interest to members of the Legislature.

It is most appropriate that this demonstration, which will take signals off a Canadian Anik satellite, should take place during the sitting of the Legislature. Several television sets throughout the building will be hooked up to receive the signals off the satellite, including the party caucus rooms.

The 15 foot dish will remain at its present location on the Legislative grounds this week and next. The equipment is being installed now and the demonstration will be under way later this week.

I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that an official of Telestat Canada will be available next week to give members a demonstration of this system, and to answer any questions that they may have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also have for distribution a further technical book with respect to the equipment that is on the Legislative grounds.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, we listened with considerable interest to the Honourable Minister explaining what that rather strange shape was on the east side of the building today, and we will look forward to watching the quality of the signals from the points that the satellite can pick up. It's rather interesting to see that the government is showing some signs of interest in the future and is bringing its thinking out of the 19th century into the 20th century.

I would just ask the Minister whether he has in fact been in contact with the CRTC as regarding the legality of picking up signals from a satellite? I understand there have been some considerable concerns of the pirating of signals from satellites, and I would ask him or perhaps the Attorney-General whether they have confirmed that Manitoba is in a legal position in doing this?

I would also ask, on a perhaps less serious note, Mr. Speaker, whether the system is reversible and whether it's the intention of the government to send signals of our Question Period out to the satellite and hence to the rest of the world?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House an error in Hansard which I think is most important and should be corrected. It's in the third line on page 93 of my speech last night, in which I referred to the impartial fashion, Sir, in which you serve as Speaker of this House. It appears in Hansard as "partial".

MR. SPEAKER: May I say to the Honourable Minister that the printing of Hansard comes under my jurisdiction. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to table some information regarding the explosion of some gas facilities in Alberta and provide some information on their possible effects on the utilities within Manitoba.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will pass these around. It will give more detailed information in the statement than what I will read, but in overall terms there is not cause for concern to the general public with regards to any heating requirements within the province. The information I gained a matter of a few minutes before coming into the House is also not included on the statement, but apparently they feel that they can put in bypass facilities by midnight tonight and if they are successful, that all the flows should be back to normal within about 24 to 36 hours.

Mr. Speaker, there is an outline here of all of the effects on all of the utilities. All of the interruptible supplies in the province at this point have been cut off. The main line pressure has reduced, but there is no threat in terms of the firm energy supply requirements to regular and other heating customers at the present time.

So, Mr. Speaker, this information is passed on at this time. It appears that things are rectifying themselves satisfactorily. It was a very serious explosion and has caused a very vast area of damage in Alberta but the flows will be brought back with the peak-shaving abilities that are contained along the line between here and the supply, and it is expected that with the temporary rectifications that they are hopeful to have in by midnight, that it will be back within 24 to 36 hours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister responsible for Energy for his statement. Many Manitobans were indeed very concerned as members on this side were this morning when they heard the news of this particular explosion. We are perhaps too dependent on natural gas in this particular province of ours, where I know a very high percentage of the households and businesses are dependent on natural gas as a source of heat and power. I would only suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister that he and his department may wish to consider some time the possibility of developing a natural storage space for natural gas that I believe to be available in the Virden area of this province. This is an area, a geological formation, I believe that could enable the gas utilities in Manitoba to store natural gas in some large amounts. This is something worthy of consideration, particularly in terms of security of supply to Manitobans who are dependent on this source of fuel. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 11, an Act to incorporate The Brandon General Hospital Foundation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney-General provide the house with a status report pertaining to the criminal prosecutions against one Kasser, in Austria?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that matter is still before the courts in Austria.

MR. PAWLEY: As a supplementary, would the Attorney-General also advise the Chamber as to the status of the proceedings involving ones, Zingre and Reiser, in Switzerland?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is also still before the courts in Switzerland.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Attorney-General advise the Chamber as to whether he can assure the House that the civil proceedings that were settled a short time ago, that that settlement will not prejudice the outcome of the criminal proceedings as against either Reiser, Zingre, Kasser, or any of the other individuals that are involved in the Churchill Forest Industry episode?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it was made very clear in the settlement agreement and in the announcements that were made and in the negotiations between counsel, that the settlement was only a civil settlement.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Attorney-General advise whether or not the legal counsel acting on behalf of the Province of Manitoba in Austria has provided assurance to the Attorney-General, and to his staff, that such a provision within the agreement is sufficient in order to ensure that criminal proceedings will not be prejudiced by the completion of the earlier civil settlement?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, counsel for the civil actions reviewed this matter with counsel involved in the criminal proceedings, both here in Winnipeg with the special prosecutor previously retained by the former government, and with criminal counsel in Austria, prior to any decision being made to enter into a civil agreement.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Attorney-General provide the Chamber with information as to when the court proceedings are likely to take place and to be completed, on the basis of the information which he has received from his professional advisers?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the status of the criminal matter is that there was an appeal from the indictment by Mr. Kasser in Austria and that matter is still, as I understand it from counsel, still before the Court of Appeal in Austria.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister for Urban Affairs, who yesterday advised me to look at an answer he gave on Page 22 of Hansard of last Friday, dealing with the grants to the city of Winnipeg, and invited me to find the answer to my question there.

Not having found the answer to my question there, I would now ask the Minister directly whether he will agree that the \$58 million figure given last Friday and the 12 percent increase referred to last Friday in the grants to Winnipeg, included the statutory amount which is payable to the city and to all municipalities under the Income Tax Act, the Provincial Income Tax Act, and the Provincial Municipal Tax Sharing Act? Would he confirm that in the figures he gave, were these statutory payments, which were not moneys paid by the province but indeed were moneys for which the province only acted as a conduit, in payment to the municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for St. Johns will be aware, the Provincial Municipal Tax Sharing Act allows for a fund to be created by the imposition of 2.1 points of personal income tax and one of corporate tax. That fund is then distributed to municipalities. The manner in which that fund is distributed amongst municipalities is decided upon by the provincial government. This year we revised the formula for distribution of those funds in order to allow urban centres - approximately 35 urban centres outside the city of Winnipeg - and the city of Winnipeg to receive a greater share of the increase in order

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

to allow for increased per capita costs that urban centres have with an increased level of services being required in most urban centres.

The amount of the municipal tax sharing payments to the city of Winnipeg was included in the figure I gave to the Member for St. Johns, but I point out to him that the increase is a result of a revised formula for distribution that was arrived at by the provincial government in order to accommodate the demands of urban centres.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable Minister for having agreed that this amount which is a statutory payment was included in the grants which he alleged were given by the province to the municipality and I appreciate his confirming that. Will he also confirm that the government has under the provincial municipal tax sharing act the need to provide the manner in which there shall be the allocation and distribution, but the government has no right whatsoever to withhold any portion of the moneys collected from the personal and corporate income tax? Will he confirm that?

MR. MERCIER: I would confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thanks, Mr. Speaker, this is not a supplementary but I think it need not be more than the one question. Will the Honourable Minister inform the House whether formally or informally the City of Winnipeg has requested the government of Manitoba to accede to its right to impose taxation under the Provincial Municipal Tax Sharing Act on persons in the municipality who purchase or consume motel and hotel accommodation or meals at a restaurant or dining room or liquor or on the transfer of land, and if they have requested this formally or informally could he inform us as to the response by this government?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion of this subject matter going back to when the former government was in office when they did not accede to any of those requests for revenue sharing. As I understand the matter as it now stands, the council or a committee of council is reviewing the various aspects or options for revenue sharing and will be making a specific request to our government at some time in the future.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Just for clarification, did the honourable Minister answer as to whether or not this government has acceded to such a request, because he says that all that's being done now is an in-the-House search by the municipality?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated there has been a general discussion for a number of years going back to the time of the former government with respect to this matter and again as I understand it a committee of council are reviewing the various options and will be pursuing the matter again in the very near future with our government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Co-operative Development and ask the Minister a question related to an answer he gave to the House yesterday wherein he stated Bohmer Box Limited of Ontario was among the five companies that bid on McKenzie Seeds and among those that were subsequently rejected. My question is, Mr. Speaker, if the government saw fit to reject the bid of Bohmer Box Limited last fall, on what basis would the government have to enter into further discussions and negotiations with Bohmer Box Limited having had their bid rejected at one time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned on previous occasions, one of the prime concerns is that that operation maintain the employment levels at Brandon and that that company stays at Brandon. In negotiations with people who are interested in purchasing that company, that is of paramount importance to this government, so any negotiations with any company that can strengthen that particular

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

aspect of any agreement, any partnership agreement or equity agreement, that is what we are concerned about.

MR. EVANS: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Honourable Minister advise whether Bohmer Box Limited initiated the discussions or proposals, or did the government, the Minister and his staff, go to Bohmer Box Limited?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate what I said several weeks ago when I was questioned by the media with regards to this particular matter, I have no hesitation in disclosing all the facts if and when a proposal is accepted by the government and by the board of directors, but I don't think it serves a useful purpose for us to deal with this particular matter in the public forum. It won't help the employees, it won't help the company and it won't definitely be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, among the bids was a bid proposed by the employees of the company. Could the Minister advise the House why the government would not be prepared the employees of McKenzie Seeds an opportunity to put forth a deal or a proposal at this time, having been among the five that were rejected last fall, along with Bohmer Box?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would care to read what the Chairman of the Board has said, what I have said continuously, and what other members on this side have reiterated, that we are open and looking at different proposals that people have put forward. To date, that particular group has not made any effort to come forward with any proposal. So all I can say is that if you have any further specific questions with regards to the company, the Chairman of the Board will be appearing before Economic Development Committee, at which time the member knows he is has full privilege to ask any questions he wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In October of 1977, our government terminated the State Farm Program and developed policy for the sale of agricultural leased Crown lands. Could the Minister indicate the number of applicants that have been received to date for purchase of these lands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Emerson, I don't have those specific numbers right with me now. I will mention them, however, later in my Throne Speech so that all the members of the House will know. But it has been a significant number of people who have requested to buy that land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Corrections. In view of reports to the effect "That eleven robberies in Winnipeg might have been prevented or avoided if special help recommended by the Crown for a juvenile offender had been forthcoming, and if the offender had been placed in one of the centres recommended at that time, and in view of the report that the Deputy Minister delayed replying to the last of the requests until too late" - and I am quoting - will the Minister assure the House that he will conduct an investigation into the manner in which the department deals with such recommendations and special requests for help?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I can assure you that we are always reviewing our department with regards to how it handles probation cases and hoping to improve them. For the information of the honourable member, the individual in question was suspended from that

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

particular charge and was under the probation officer for a previous case. And I can assure the honourable member that during the five months that the individual was under probation care, he did not commit any more crimes. So the question of whether or not a probation service of that nature is better or not better than being in a group home has yet to be proved.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Community Services whether he can clarify for members of the House, the government's position with respect to support for those day nurseries that have been denied provincial aid over the last few years, whether they are now in a position to expect funding? I'm talking specifically, Mr. Speaker, about those that had been excluded from the program, or application denied in the last two years.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, as you have probably read in the statement that I presented to the House, we are reinforcing the existing day care centres that are presently providing this service to our communities in Manitoba. We have offered them an increase of approximately 10 percent if they physically feel that it's going to be efficient for them. Any of those spaces that are not taken up will be offered to new facilities that have not been included in the program to date.

In addition to that, there will be approximately, I think it's in the order of 50 spaces which will be related to family day care centres that will be brand new spaces and will be offered to those that wish to come forward and apply.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to follow up with the question of how the Minister is going to decide on the priorities? That is, which institutions or which proposals are going to receive the attention on the basis of the Minister's consideration, on the basis of date of application, or are there a set of guidelines that will determine, or help the Minister determine, the eligibility of applicants? Because obviously, Mr. Speaker, if funds are limited, then it seems to me that to be fair, one has to have some systematic means of approving applications that have been outstanding for some period of time.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, I can assure you that when the spaces are made available and the extra ones that we have proposed, that one of the main criteria will be that of need, that where it appears that it can be need and proportionately, hopefully spread through the province where this need is presently situated.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would confirm that the least that can be considered is that we have a regional allocation so that all regions of Manitoba will receive their fair share of any increases in the program, as opposed to the possibility in having all of the increases centered in one or two areas of the province?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, for his information the present distribution of spaces in the province, there are approximately 50 percent in the city of Winnipeg, and approximately 50 percent outside the city of Winnipeg, and are pretty well evenly proportioned at the present time, and we would presume that this would follow with these new increased spaces.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet directed a question regarding drivers' licences returns in the first three-quarters of 1979/80 fiscal year, and questioned as to whether there was, in fact, a reduction in the income, or in the number of drivers' licences involved. I took the question as notice, Mr. Speaker, and the answer to it is that the apparent difference results from the changes in The Financial Administration Act that were introduced last year, whereby the refunds were attributed and brought in during the given year in which they occurred, and as a result there is \$886,000 of refunds that were included in this current fiscal year that would not normally have been included. So that, on a strictly comparable basis, the returns from the drivers' licences would have been higher by that amount, and at roughly 4.6 percent above the same period in the year before, for a total of \$6,012,000.00.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Government Services. Since the Minister actually mentioned remote communities in his statement today, I wonder if he could indicate whether the provincial government is going to get involved in assisting to provide these kind of satellite or ground receivers for the remote communities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if there are any particular policy decisions to be announced having to do with that matter, they will be announced in due course. I can indicate to the honourable member, as a northern member, that this government is very concerned and very interested in providing as many of the amenities to the northern citizens in this province that we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas with a supplementary.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'll wait for the Minister to demonstrate the latter part of his statement. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there are any other measures besides the ground receiving station that this government is willing to take to assist communities that received their first channel and some that received their second channel under the previous administration, whether there are any other measures that they are willing to take to assist some of the remote communities to get second TV channels up north?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be still part of the administration that, back in 1966, brought the first such amenities to northern Manitoba, and I am pleased to be now a member of a government that will expand that service in due course. The question of how and the type of technology to be used is a very complicated one. The member, if he has studied the matter, will be aware of that. There are jurisdictional questions that have to be answered with respect to the responsibilities of the federal authorities in this matter, those pertaining to provincial authorities, and I expect to have a great deal to do with these matters over the next period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Would the Minister confirm that there has been successful petroleum crude oil discoveries and production along and just south of the 49th Parallel in North Dakota? Can the Minister confirm that at least one American-owned oil company has capped wells which should be producing to help our balance of payments and cut imports in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm perhaps not clear on the question. I think the member referred to wells that had been drilled south of the 49th Parallel?

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, my question was to find out if the Energy and Mines Minister knew of the successful petroleum and crude oil finds in North Dakota, just south and along the 49th Parallel, and then the suggestion to me that in Manitoba, one American-owned petroleum company has oil wells that are capped which could be producing to help our balance of payments.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there have been so called deep wells south of the 49th parallel in the United States that have brought some new hope for added oil discoveries at greater depths in that area of the country. There have been to this date no discoveries at those depths or in that formation in Manitoba or to my knowledge in Saskatchewan either. So there is nothing in Manitoba at this point in time that is of the same significance to the discovery, I think, by Shell Oil some time ago about 30 miles away from the southwest corner of the province in the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley with a supplementary.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

MR. WILSON: I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could assure the House he will investigate and report back that he is satisfied that our support of the petroleum industry and orderly sale of oil leases is taking place in an orderly fashion, and I wonder if he could supply the House with the number of exproducing wells that are now capped in Manitoba.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would refer the member to the examination of the Estimates for the department for any further information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Community Services: I wonder whether the Minister could advise whether the \$1.00 extra charge which will apply to the day care centres, whether they will also apply to the family day care operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, yes they will.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister shares my concern or whether he is not concerned of the possibility that because of the additional moneys which can be made by operators of day care operations by charging that extra over and above the per diem, the recognized established per diem, that they may indeed be pushing and squeezing out people who need the day care facility but are of moderate or low income.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, no I don't believe the charge will do that and that is the reason why we did not increase the maintenance grant for that very reason that we wanted to make sure that where the increase of the subsidy fee would be most attractive to those people who need it, that is those people with the low income, and if the honourable member recalls he was a Minister at the time, I believe, that the initial reasons for setting up the day care centres were to assist mothers who wished to go out and make a living rather than stay on family allowance, and that is one of the primary objectives of the day care centre facilities is to provide this service for the single parent who wants to go out and earn an income rather than stay on welfare.

So that we feel in most cases that the day care centres will not charge that extra dollar because they probably will lose a lot of their clients and if they lose their clients they will lose their subsidized space as well.

MR. MILLER: Since I don't have unlimited time for questions, I can't explore with the Minister the statement he made with regard to maintenance fees of the \$500 paid to the day care operations. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the Minister realize that the amount that the government would pay for maintenance is totally unrelated to the per diem charge, and if they had increased that there'd be no need to increase any per diem charge?

But apart from that isn't the Minister concerned that an operator of a day care, family day care or group day care, faced with the choice of having children whose parents can afford that extra \$1.00 per day and therefore it could be \$300 a year, would rather have children whose parents will pay more than children whose parents would pay less, and isn't that an inducement to cater to people who have the ability to pay rather than who need this service desperately but who are over that minimum welfare level which would qualify them for full support.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, that is a possibility but we don't believe that that will happen because 50 percent of the spaces are subsidized to some degree and the rule is that you just can't charge the non subsidized spaces \$1.00 more either. They have to be a uniform rate that they charge to both people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Attorney-General, the opprobrium of my caucus, Mr. Speaker. My question relates to public concerns that became evident as a result of the tragic death of Lyle Dean Enns last August

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

30. Has the Attorney-General anything to report with respect to enabling amendments to the Fatality Inquiries Act, particularly will the government be presenting legislation this Session that would require a mandatory inquest into the circumstances of all police related deaths?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, if as the honourable Minister has previously been quoted in the media, the Minister feels that The Fatality Inquiries Act is too restrictive and precludes inquests being held while related criminal charges exist will he then move to amend the Act so that in appropriate cases an inquest could take place prior to the completion of the hearing of a criminal charge in the courts?

MR. MERCIER: I indicated in my previous answer, Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the present provisions of The Fatalities Inquiries Act as they apply to these situations and that review has not yet been completed.

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

MR. CORRIN: It's not a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, but it's to the Attorney-General. Has the government decided whether to implement the Manitoba Police Commission Report tabled after the Frampton inquiry calling for an independent investigation unit attached to and under the authority of the Winnipeg Police Commission?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is also under consideration and we are in discussion with police organizations throughout the province, with the Winnipeg Police Commission, the Manitoba Police Commission and a number of other organizations, and I expect that review to be completed very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister for Community Services, did I understand him correctly? Did he say he is not concerned or doesn't feel that there will be a squeezing out of children out of day care centres or placements because the extra charge which is allowed over and above the standard per diem rate, that that extra charge would have to be charged to all the children in the facility? Is that what he said?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: I would be concerned if that happened but I don't believe it will happen. I can assure the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks that we will be monitoring the situation very close and if anything like he suggested was happening that we would correct the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't quite answer my question because I believe he did suggest that he wasn't concerned because the extra charge would have to be universal, that is apply to everyone in the day care centre. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the extra charge cannot be, will not be shared by government. It is a charge on the individual child over and above the established rate and so if that is what the Minister is depending on, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether in fact he shouldn't check with his department and could convey to the House whether in fact that the department will be very careful to monitor the impact of this new levy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General concerning the inquest into the death of Tara Ackland, a six-month-old girl who was killed in a natural gas explosion. I would like to know whether he is satisfied with

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

the inquest, in view of the fact that the major issue of what caused the gas connector to leak was never determined and also there was no answer as to why the flexible connectors were condemned in 1961 and why they remained in service until 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with that particular case because for some reason the lawyer for the family and the family itself did not receive a notice of the inquest itself. At the present time the Director of Prosecutions is reviewing the inquest proceedings and the evidence at the inquest with the lawyer for the family and until that review is completed I can give no further response to the question and the probable result of that review. But I am awaiting a report from the Director of Prosecutions as a result of his review of this case with the lawyer for the family and I hope to receive that very shortly.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Attorney-General if it isn't a sufficient condition, the mere fact that the parents were not notified about the inquest nor called as witnesses, isn't either one a sufficient condition to authorize a second inquest?

MR. MERCIER: Well, that is precisely the matter that is being reviewed with the lawyer for the family, who has suggested that further evidence could have been brought before the inquest, and the Director of Prosecutions is reviewing with him the exact evidence that was produced before the inquest in order to determine whether his suggestion is correct. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if it is shown that all of the evidence that was available was not before the inquest I expect that will be a very significant reason for possibly reopening the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Yes, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that the recent court trip to Hong Kong met with mixed success, that is, that the court party had a fine holiday at public expense, and that because of the failure of the Crown to subpoena certain witnesses justice may not have been done and the charges were stayed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that the court party enjoyed a holiday in Hong Kong. The facts of the matter are that certain evidence was brought forward to our department, to the Crown attorneys involved, which justified, in their opinion, the laying of certain charges. The department had two alternatives in pursuing this particular matter, one was to bring a substantial number of witnesses from Hong Kong to this province for examination; or secondly, for the Crown attorney and defence counsel involved, and court reporters, to go to Hong Kong to caretake Commission evidence.

The second alternative was at least 50 percent of the cost of bringing the witnesses from Hong Kong to Manitoba, and because it was a much cheaper alternative was the one which the department chose to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is before the courts. I expect that this matter will be brought forward before the courts probably very early next week and a full explanation of the matter will be provided by the Crown attorney to the court and to the counsel involved and to the accused involved, which is the proper manner and place for it to be brought forward.

MR. SCHROEDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that that charge or that those charges had been stayed?

MR. MERCIER: No, I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because this matter has not been brought back to court in the city as I said. I expect that it will be brought before the courts very early next week and a full explanation of the matter will be made by the crown attorneys involved to the court and the accused and everyone involved.

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

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, can the Attorney-General confirm that the witnesses who should have been subpoenaed in Hong Kong were not all subpoenaed and that that was one of the reasons for the problems?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that. I can only say again to the Member for Rossmere that the Crown attorneys involved will be providing the court with a full explanation of this matter very early next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questions having expired, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the Adjourned Debate on the Motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights and the Amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition - the Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. ED MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this is my first opportunity in the Fourth Session of the 31st Legislature, I join with my colleagues and others in the House who have already expressed their pleasure at your return to preside over proceedings in this Chamber. I know that those duties are onerous from time to time and I trust that the actions of my colleagues on this side of the House, and indeed those on the other side will not be such as to add to the burdens of your office. In this respect I am encouraged by listening to the annual undertaking of my colleague, the Minister of Government Services, who has again undertaken not to transgress the rules of this House, and, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Government Services can make that undertaking I am encouraged to do the same thing.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, add my words of commendation to those already expressed to the Mover and the Seconder of the Proposed Motion for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. The Seconder, the Honourable Member for Emerson, is not new to this House and so his talents are well known to the members and the message which he brought and his contribution to this debate was well received. The Mover, of course, is new. He represents the Constituency of River Heights, and he has, as my colleagues have already noted, indicated in his early remarks in this House that he has the skills that we have come to associate with the members who have represented that constituency in the past.

I would also like to express my words of welcome to the other new members of the House. I was interested in the remarks of the Member for Elmwood, who was describing in glowing terms the qualifications of the new Member for Rossmere. I noted that he stopped, Mr. Speaker, just short of predicting that the new Member for Rossmere would be the next Governor-General of Canada, and I'm sure that in his reservation at that point, the Member for Rossmere was much relieved. Nevertheless, I do expect, and this House expects that the member will make a contribution to the affairs and the business of this House during his term and his taking his seat in the Chamber.

To the new Member for Fort Rouge, I'm sure she is busy in her own mind preparing a suitable response to her predecessor in that seat, who, in rather colorful language has expressed his conception of the very ineffective role played by minority memberships in an elected Assembly. Mr. Speaker, it's rather surprising to me that the former Member for Fort Rouge should have forgotten so soon, and if he was indeed reflecting his own frustration, his lonely position in this House as the one member of the Liberal Party, and adopting the kind of metaphorical description of his inadequacy that he did in Vancouver a short time ago.

But in spite of that, and leaving to the new Member the response which would be appropriate to Mr. Axworthy, we do welcome her to the House and we know that she will, in spite of what Mr. Axworthy says, be more effective than perhaps he was.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is attending to more urgent business at this time and is unable to be in his seat, but I did want to comment on his response to the Speech from the Throne and the amendment which he had proposed to the original motion. I think in the earlier remarks made in this debate by the Minister of Government Services and others, and the Minister of Mines, there is now some question as to the reliability of statistical evidence that the Leader of the Opposition has used to support perhaps the first part of his amendment with respect to the numbers of businessmen and others who have migrated out of the province of Manitoba. I think it was most important to

the understanding of this House and to the reputation of previous charges made by members opposite that the numbers involved in outmigration from the province of Manitoba during the past two years are very much in line with those which have been average for the years of the last ten or twelve. Mr. Speaker, actually, as the Minister points out, they have been fewer in the last two years than the average for the last ten or twelve years.

The Leader of the Opposition, too, Mr. Speaker, has avoided any real comment on those very many positive thrusts that have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and has contented himself with attempting to create a prophecy of declining prosperity for our province, and one in which he and other members opposite seem to be determined to predict and to provide proof that cannot be disputed that such a prophecy will indeed take place.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, in the time which I am permitted during the consideration of the Speech from the Throne and the amendment thereto, to deal with some of the positive thrusts that are contained therein, and particularly as they relate to the western part of the province and the WestMan area. I think there's no need to inform members of this House that the city that I represent is the economic centre and the hub of western Manitoba.

The prime industry is, of course, agriculture. I hope my colleague and the Minister of Agriculture will not feel that I am encroaching on his turf if I do make some remarks relative to the importance of that primary industry and the way in which this government is recognizing its motive force and is determined to give the encouragement that is so necessary.

According to the preliminary estimates which we now have, Manitoba farmers are expected to receive a record total of \$1.4 million in farm cash receipts in 1980, and regrettably, Mr. Speaker, rising costs will affect the realized net income, but the projected 1980 figure of \$328 million will still be above the 1978 and the 1977 figures.

The Speech from the Throne stressed our government's support for Manitoba's primary industry, and it outlined a number of our commitments. It outlined commitments such as our undertaking to press for improvements in the grain handling system, to make improvements to accommodate freight transfer from rail to highway, to help ensure that the agriculture sector is not hurt by rail abandonment. In addition to accommodating an estimated three percent increase in the overall traffic growth, the province will aid in offsetting impact on any branch line abandonments, which of course, Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will understand are those abandonments which are due to the federal government decisions.

Our government is prepared to fund enhanced programs to expand markets and marketing activity for Manitoba's livestock industry, and Mr. Speaker, I would remind the members that the livestock industry provides more than 20 percent of the total farm income, and is second only to that portion of the total revenue from agriculture that is provided by wheat.

This government will continue with research into crops to provide additional value to the Manitoba Processing Industry, and it continues to provide and make provision for water for livestock and crop production under the Federal-Provincial Agri Water Program.

In connection with agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this week, Manitoba members of the Canadian Seed Growers Association will meet in Brandon for their annual look at developments in the seed growing industry. Highlights this year include the report on Seed Can and crop losses. Seed Can, of course, is of vital importance to the seed growers, as in some cases it is the only agency for certain seed varieties.

Mr. Speaker, let me make just a few further comments on grain handling. As the members are aware there was extensive discussion on the topic of the problems of Western Canadian agriculture at the First Ministers' Conference on the Economy in November of 1978. The result of this meeting was an agreement on the Manitoba proposal that a meeting would be held at the earliest practical date to discuss urgent problems plaguing the grain transportation and the handling system. Our Premier took the initiative and hosted such a meeting in Winnipeg in January of last year. This was the beginning of a series of meetings between the First Ministers of the four western provinces and the Federal Minister responsible for grain handling and transportation.

Let's review some of the accomplishments of those meetings. Out of them, Mr. Speaker, came a firm commitment that a second west coast grain shipping outlet would be undertaken with the establishment of terminal facilities at Prince Rupert. This is a move considered as the key to unlocking the present congestion. There was agreement on the expanded use of the Port of Churchill, made possible by new switching trackage. Optimistically this could increase the present annual 25 million bushels handled to more than 50 million bushels a year.

Out of these meetings, Mr. Speaker, came the establishment of a national grain coordinator located in Winnipeg - Winnipeg, the centre of Canadian grain trade, and the coordinator has the authority and the responsibility to achieve more efficient and reliable grain movement to export markets.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

The meetings by agreement with the Federal Minister will review the Federal Government's policies regarding the transfer of ownership of abandoned rights-of-way. And the Federal Government through these meetings undertook to make money available to lease and rehabilitate more than 2,000 grain hopper cars.

Mr. Speaker, in the response by the Leader of the Opposition there was mention of McKenzie Seeds in Brandon. All members of the House are aware of my personal and of our government's commitment to keeping McKenzie Seeds in Brandon. To pretend that McKenzie Seeds does not face serious financial problems is not to face the facts. McKenzie Seeds is in need of refinancing. The company is under-capitalized and is presently carrying debt obligations in excess of \$8 million. The 1978 Financial Report of McKenzie Seeds indicated a working capital deficit of nearly \$2 million. We will shortly have the 1979 Annual Report as soon as it is presented to the Standing Committee on Economic Development and we will then be informed on the results of the most recent years' operations.

While the decisions made by the present government concerning McKenzie Seeds have not been easy, they have also been unavoidable. The company without government backing, Mr. Speaker, would be bankrupt. The government was faced with three alternatives. First, to keep the company as a government Crown-owned corporation and continue to run it with increasing large subsidies eventually paid by the taxpayers of Manitoba. Or secondly, to seek private investment and recoup some of the millions of taxpayers' dollars now involved. Or thirdly, to let the company simply fold. The government, of course, committed itself to keeping the company going and to keeping it in Brandon.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind the members briefly of some of the facts surrounding the government's actions in this connection. I believe it is important to set the record straight and to ensure that our debate on this topic is based on facts.

In June of 1979, the government put out a call for tenders to see whether the under-capitalized plant could be refinanced without additional injections of taxpayers' money. At that time the Premier of Manitoba stressed the jobs at McKenzie Seeds Limited must be retained in Brandon no matter who owns the company.

Three conditions were included in the invitation to tender for the firm. The three conditions were that each bidder must first, submit a three-year marketing plan; second, give an undertaking to maintain the company's present level of employment at Brandon; and thirdly, to outline future expansion plans. Those conditions, Mr. Speaker, were imposed in order that the jobs would be maintained and that the company and the plant would remain in Brandon. The future growth and expansion of the plant and an increase in job opportunities for the citizens of Brandon were of paramount importance to this government.

At the end of November 1979, the Manitoba government announced that all tenders to purchase the company had been rejected. None of the proposals was judged to be in the best interests of the province. The government, as a single shareholder, will continue to seek a partner or affiliation as a means of ensuring the plant's continued operations, and the opportunities for expansion in Brandon.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, where the community of Brandon and the whole WestMan area has a most important interest and a continuing one is that of the educational field. And again the Leader of the Opposition overlooked what was an important positive policy commitment by this government in respect to the improvement of post-secondary educations in the WestMan area. Certainly the people of that area were pleased with the announcement in the Throne Speech that Brandon's Assiniboine Community College would be expanded to provide additional post-secondary vocational educational opportunities. This announcement is in keeping with our government's commitment to maintaining and improving the sound educational base of the province. We recognize that our children and our grandchildren must be equipped with the skills and the abilities to compete and succeed in an ever-changing and demanding world.

MR. ENNS: And it is ever changing.

MR. MCGILL: And demanding. As a resident of Brandon I am pleased to say that the Assiniboine Community College has contributed to the quality of life in Brandon. The success of the Assiniboine Community College in meeting the demands of the public is witnessed in the fact that enrolment at Assiniboine Community College was up in September 1979, a contrast to the overall decline in enrolment for Manitoba's three community colleges. As of September of last year, Assiniboine College had 875 students enrolled in 33 full-time or apprenticeship courses, compared with 789 in 32 courses in the same time in 1978. The

two-year business administration course showed the greatest enrolment increase - to 125 this year from 87 the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I recall during the remarks and the contribution of the Minister of Mines that the Member for Burrows said, "Well what about jobs for all of these graduates of the colleges?" He was not aware, of course, that there has been a recent provincial government survey which indicates that nine out of every ten graduates from Manitoba's three community colleges are finding good paying jobs here in Manitoba. And that ratio, Mr. Speaker, has not changed for several years.

It is apparent that the economy is sufficiently strong and buoyant to provide careers and bright futures for Manitoba's young men and women. The career successes of the study show that for many people, community colleges are a valid alternative to universities. The survey found that 90 percent of the two-year diploma graduates, and 82 percent of the one-year certificate graduates have a training-related job, and that an equally large proportion of all graduates were using their skills in their jobs. About two-thirds of all employed graduates found jobs in the same city or town as their community college training.

The fact that such a large proportion of employed graduates are able to find jobs in their own region and the region in which they took their training attests to the basic inherent strengths of our provincial economy. I have no doubt that with sound policies to guide our educational system, we will be able to equip our young people to take their place in the working world.

Also of primary interest and importance in the economy of the WestMan area, Mr. Speaker, is the oil industry. The years '78 and '79 witnessed new activity in Manitoba's oil-producing areas. There were stepped up sales and explorations on Crown land. The petroleum industry activity in Manitoba during '79 is expected to result in exploration expenditures of some \$10 million. This exceeds the 9.2 million reported for '78, which was the highest since the initial oil boom of the early 1950s. Twenty-five new wells had been drilled by mid-December, and that surpassed the yearly totals for the past ten years. It's expected that 14 of the wells will be successful oil producers.

The resurgence of the oil industry in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is partly in response to increasing demand and diminishing supply within our country. But it is equally due, if not more importantly, Mr. Speaker, to the policies of this government towards the industry, and I firmly believe that without the changes in royalties and Crown land leasing arrangements brought about under this government, that we would not be witnessing the resurgence of the oil industry in western Manitoba.

In December, 1978, our government passed regulatory amendments to provide for the reintroduction of Crown lease sales in Manitoba. A record \$977,000 was received from two sales held in 1979 for leases covering less than 40,000 acres. This compares 1.67 million collected from 69 sales held in Manitoba in the 17-year period between 1954 and 1971. The previous record year was 1955, when \$585,000 was collected from more than 10,000 acres. Three additional sales of leases and reservations of Crown-owned oil and natural gas rights are scheduled to be held in 1980. The first is to be held March 5, in which 56,000 acres have been posted for bids by sealed tender. All parcels, Mr. Speaker, are located south and west of Brandon.

The policies governing oil exploration in Manitoba are resulting in not a single cent of taxpayers' money being expended in exploration. And the government is still receiving revenue from the sale of leases; and in those instances where producing wells are found, the government will continue to benefit through the recovery of royalties on the oil produced.

And, Mr. Speaker, those revenues to the province are significant. It's estimated that Manitoba's oil production for 1979 from about 700 producing wells will be approximately 3.65 million barrels valued at more than \$48 million. The province will collect about \$11 million in revenue through Crown royalties and mineral taxes, while private mineral owners will receive approximately 3.7 million in net royalties.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government's action in providing security of tender has resulted in renewed interest in oil exploration in Manitoba, and has created a competitive bidding situation which has benefited both the industry and the province.

Another area of interest is in that of corrections in the WestMan area. We had, Mr. Speaker, the official opening of the new Brandon Correctional Institution in November, 1979 by Health and Community Services Minister and then Community Services Minister, the Honourable Bud Sherman. A permanent staff of 48 will operate the 6.9 million dollar institution. The new institution will replace the present outmoded stone jail building which, when erected in 1883 - that was the year after the incorporation of the City of Brandon,

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

which members may not know became an instant city in 1882. I suppose it's a comment on the times that the first building of any really substantial nature was a jail, a year after the incorporation of the City of Brandon. The old institution is in the southeast part of the City of Brandon, and the new institution is in the northeast part, not many kilometers from the original site of the first settlement of Grand Valley which was across the river from the present City of Brandon.

The new institution has a capacity for 140 inmates. Mr. Speaker, our society has come a long way since the first jail was erected in the last century in Brandon, and enlightened attitudes have led to the new approaches which will be taken in relations between correctional officers and the inmates. It's intended that selected staff members will work with groups of inmates through the period of sentence, from escorting inmates to meals, to counselling and helping inmates to adjust to life within the institution.

A group of ten experienced correctional officers who will be called "living unit officers" have been specially trained for this work. Besides counselling, programs available to inmates will include lifeskill programs, academic instruction - which will be arranged, incidentally, through Assiniboine Community College - and recreation and sport programs. There will also be pre-release programs, under which inmates will be able to work or study in the community under supervision.

It's with some pride, Mr. Speaker, that I note that the Minister of Health has indicated that Brandon has always been receptive as a community to these types of programs.

The institution also contains a gymnasium, and in keeping with policies to maximize the efficient use of these facilities, it is hoped that the gymnasium will be available to residents of the Brandon Mental Health Centre and to community organizations for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, that we are not doing much to assist small businesses, I should remind him again of the Enterprise Development Centre which has been provided in the City of Brandon - and this, in keeping with Brandon's role as the economic hub of western Manitoba. The new centre will be built in Brandon to serve small businesses throughout western Manitoba. A total of \$1.7 million has been allocated for the operation of this centre.

Our government, as the previous governments for the last eight years did not, recognizes the importance of small business to the economic livelihood of this province. We are concerned that businessmen benefit from the government that they helped finance. The concept behind the program, that is the Enterprise Development Program, is to create a complete assistance centre for the small businessman, providing a full range of business services, including the advanced factory space and co-ordinating access to support services available through selected federal agencies. And the centre will be guided by a board of nine directors made up of West Man businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on some of the primary industries and the natural advantages that are part of the western areas of our province. I think, in concluding, I would like to commend and salute the vibrant spirit of the people of western Manitoba. And this was so typified, Mr. Speaker, by the enthusiasm and the dedication that helped make the Canada Winter Games in Brandon last February such a tremendous success. The hard work and the community spirit behind the organization of the 1979 Winter Games typified the energy and drive behind the people of western Manitoba. Our entire nation witnessed the proud accomplishments of the games. Brandon is now a place on the map that most Canadians recognize as the home of the highly successful 1979 Jeux Canada Winter Games.

Recognition of a job well done and a fine sports complex are the legacy left to the people of western Manitoba for their contribution to the success of these games. It is this true community spirit, Mr. Speaker, and the will to achieve and succeed that will ensure western Manitobans a place in Manitoba's and in Canada's future.

So, Mr. Speaker, the motion and amendment to the motion for an address to His Honour by the Leader of the Opposition has ignored most, if not all the positive aspects of the message which has been given to this Assembly. While the Golden Boy on the top of our Legislature continues to look towards the north - and indeed, there will be great developments in that part of our province - but I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that he might cast an occasional glance towards the western horizon where are the new developing strengths of our province, some known and some, as yet, unknown. And we know, Mr. Speaker, that with this natural advantage, and with the spirit and zeal that has been demonstrated as recently as last year and the renewable resource of our people, the future of this province, and particularly of western Manitoba, is assured.

Thank you.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to be back here and participate in the Throne Speech debate, something that perhaps is somewhat dull in the first couple of years for new members of the opposition, after a change of government, but something that regenerates itself with the longevity of the government in power. And so I think, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in what I would consider to be a most opportune position in the political process, given the fact that we have had a couple of years of Tory administration under the premiership of Sterling Lyon.

In looking at the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, one would have to assume that things are relatively good and well for Manitobans. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it really stretches the imagination to come to that conclusion, given all of the information that has been thrown at Manitobans and Canadians about our economic problems. Canada has economic problems, but certainly it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba's economic problems far overshadow those of the national ones. And this is something that the present government is trying to sort of skim over in their Throne Speech with a lot of wording and not too much substance, Mr. Speaker.

I think that if you examine the record of the last two years, you will quickly conclude that what we've got is more rhetoric and very little activity to do something about the economic malaise that we are in. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't have to come from members of this side of the House. We are not the ones that have to point it out, because it has been pointed out to members opposite by what I would consider to be very neutral organizations such as the Conference Board of Canada, and other people that have studied the, yes, the Toronto-Dominion Bank and so on, that have studied the problems of Manitoba's economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reading the Throne Speech, one finds that the government is continuing its attempt to indeed mislead the people of Manitoba into believing that things are on track and that just a little longer and we will turn the right corner and we will be doing relatively well. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't, as the newspaper headline indicated the other day, I don't agree with the headline that the Premier has decided, his government has decided to relax and to try to stimulate the Manitoba economy.

I believe that that particular impression is left with the media and with the people of Manitoba very intentionally, calculated, Mr. Speaker, to buy one more year for the Conservative Party. It is really designed to camouflage the real problem that they find themselves in. They want to detract from the problems that they face on a day-to-day basis because they know, Mr. Speaker, that they have short-changed every other body of government in Manitoba in the last two years, and are continuing to short-change them this year, as is indicative, Mr. Speaker, if you follow through the statements contained in this Throne Speech, and indeed, in the actions of the government to date.

All of the government dollars that have been attached in terms of financial support services to programs within government, and to school boards and to municipalities throughout the province, are dollars that are not keeping up with the inflation factor from year to year, Mr. Speaker. So to the extent that that happens, there has to be nothing else but a net reduction of services and a net increase passed on, an increase in taxes passed on to municipal taxpayers and local governments throughout the province.

The Minister of Health is probably the most capable one in that group, Mr. Speaker, in trying to leave the impression that the government is indeed concerned with problems of the communities, of the school boards, the municipalities, the hospital districts, the people that are promoting the nursing homes and so on; trying to leave the impression that indeed, the Government of Manitoba is concerned with nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than headlines. And I want to just give you a short example of that because, Mr. Speaker, I know one can dwell on it throughout a 40 minute time period, which is allocated for members in the House.

But I would like to point out that a year ago - just as an example of what I am trying to point out to the members, the style of this government - a year ago the Minister of Health, under heavy questioning from this side, indicated that there would be certain nursing homes built in Manitoba, that permits had been issued for the construction of additional bed space, and so on - hospitals and nursing homes, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we find that a year has passed and we have more headlines, that these are still yet to come, that the private entrepreneurs who were so ready and willing and who were given the permit to proceed a year ago, have decided that they will not proceed because the costs of money are such that it's not economic for them to build at the present time. And so we have another 12 month period during which time not a thing has been accomplished with

respect to those needs in those specific communities which have been on the waiting list and approved two or three years ago, Mr. Speaker.

So that is the style of the government in this Throne Speech. They are going to continue to try to leave the impression that they are going to do things. But, Mr. Speaker, I will believe those statements when I see the printed Estimates and the dollars that are attached to each of the programs that are mentioned in the Throne Speech.

The Throne Speech went on to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government had achieved two important things, and that is to get government out of fields of activity that the government had no business being in; and of course, the second being that they are managing the activities that they are in more prudently and more efficiently. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look at what has taken place over the last year alone, we find that there is nothing in terms of management that one can be proud of, because we have today an economic situation in Manitoba which is much worse than it was a year ago. If you look at all of the indicators produced by Stats Canada, and produced by the Conference Board of Canada, you find that Manitoba is at the bottom rung of economic activity in every field, as compared to all the other provinces in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the statistics on Manitoba's economy, you will find - and this is as late as January of this year - that in terms of percentage increase in real domestic product, in 1971 constant dollars you will find that Manitoba is batting last amongst Canadian provinces. --(Interjection)-- Yes, right at the bottom, Mr. Speaker, at 0.8. If you look at private investment capital and repair by province, again you find the bottom of the rung, that's Manitoba, at 5.1 percent, a marginal increase which is below the inflation rate by far, Mr. Speaker. It is only half of the inflation factor.

Now the members opposite say that these figures are wrong - these are not my figures, Mr. Speaker. These are figures produced by Stats Canada and figures produced by the Conference Board of Canada.

If you look at 1979 over 1978 in terms of public investment, capital and repair by province, again you find Manitoba at the bottom of the list at a plus 1.7 percent, and so on.

If you look at percentage change in retail sales, Mr. Speaker, you find Manitoba is up by 9.2 in inflated dollar sales, which is another bottom of the list example of where we are in the economy.

If you look at percentage change in housing starts over last year, Mr. Speaker, you find that Manitoba's housing starts are down by 46.6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at percentage change in the labour force you find that we are again at the lowest level with a plus 1.2 percent.

And so it doesn't matter which industry you want to examine, Mr. Speaker, you find that our economic performance has never been worse in the last three decades as it has been in the last two years, Mr. Speaker. So I believe that the government of Manitoba is indeed in very serious economic difficulty. It is in that position because of its ideological hangup, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the public shall not play a very large role in the economic affairs of this province.

One of the things that I think should be pointed out however, Mr. Speaker, is notwithstanding the restraint philosophy, the lack of involvement philosophy, we find that this government was not restrained whatever when it came to the point of trying to embarrass previous governments through setting up of political commissions, and I am referring to the Hydro Inquiry Commission, and then to attempt to use the report of that Commission as a justification for statements that were made by the Conservative Party in leading up to the election of 1977.

Mr. Speaker, it was very amusing to me to witness the Minister of Finance in a television interview wherein he threw in some figures on the the question of what he considered to be waste and mismanagement on the part of Hydro in the development of the Nelson River-Lake Winnipeg Hydro facilities. He threw in figures of five to eight-hundred million dollars, Mr. Speaker, but in doing so he left the impression with the people of Manitoba that those figures were extracted from the Commission of Inquiry Report. Mr. Speaker, if you examine that report the exact opposite is what you will find. The Commissioner concludes that it is not possible to determine any figure with respect to wastage or mismanagement or whatever the allegations would be on the part of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, that one could not attribute amounts.

So we have the spectacle of a government that is embarrassed by its own position with respect to the election, with respect to the question of Hydro, with respect to the position of the Chairman of Hydro over the last several years, and in an attempt to improve their image

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

we witness the expenditure of two or three million dollars, an expenditure made not for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, but hopefully for the benefit of the Conservative Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was most amused at the time of the defeat of the Conservative Government in Ottawa because I think it is worth noting that the Premier of this province gave some real so-called sound advice to the incoming Prime Minister Joe Clark last May on what to do with respect to the Canadian economy, the examples that he was setting in Manitoba that should be followed nationally. And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province lost no time, no time in complimenting the Budget of the Clark government in December --(Interjection)-- Well, yes, that is fair comment, Mr. Speaker. The Member for St. Boniface suggests that the Premier of this province criticized the Clark government for not having been tougher with the Canadian people when it brought down its Budget in December, a Budget which resulted in the defeat of the Conservative Government in Canada.

It was interesting for me, Mr. Speaker, to note during the course of the election campaign that followed, that the Premier of Manitoba who was so willing to carry the Conservative flag into the ridings of Manitoba in order to re-elect and elect some new Conservative members to the House of Commons, we found that it was difficult to find our Premier. In my travels we found that it was even suggested that he wasn't wanted by local Conservatives because he was a liability to the particular area of the province. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I am sure that he did not cross my path in the election campaign, in that my campaign was largely in the areas where we picked up additional seats. And the Minister perhaps did not have an opportunity to have the pleasure of my contribution in the area that he was involved in during that campaign, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's examine one of the main reasons why the Conservative Party of Canada lost the election just a few days ago. The Conservative Party of Canada in taking its advice from this government felt that it had an opportunity to bring down a tough Budget on the Canadian people, felt that they were able to pass on huge price increases in energy onto the Canadian people. But, Mr. Speaker, while we recognize that that is inevitable, I believe it is fair to say that few Canadians truly believe that attack on energy was a reasonable proposal as a means of trying to either reduce the Federal deficit or of financing the Mortgage Deductibility Program for new homeowners. Most Canadians, I am sure, believe that that was the wrong approach in fiscal management in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of policy that this government supported and does continue to support. But let us examine what it truly is, Mr. Speaker, because that Budget as it related to energy was an elitist approach to the fiscal management of this country. Yes, it was an elitist approach because the effect of that Budget was to transfer dollars from ordinary middle-income people to the advantage of higher-income people. And if you just examine the 18¢ a gallon that was going to be paid by every driver of an automobile in Canada, you will find that not all automobile drivers own homes, and therefore to the extent that their 18¢ a gallon contributed towards the mortgage deductibility feature of that Budget, they found themselves, Mr. Speaker, subsidizing someone who happens to own a home, someone who could afford a home, with a huge mortgage. --(Interjection)-- Yes, with a huge mortgage, Mr. Speaker. The people that could not afford a down payment on a house were in a position of having to make a contribution to the Government of Canada in order that the Government of Canada could pass on that contribution to someone who already was in the position of home ownership. That was the absurdity of that one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there are tens of thousands, there are millions of people that have no wish to own a home nor should they pay for mine, Mr. Speaker, or for yours - we should pay for our own. There are many people who are not in a position to afford a home and perhaps never will be and who shouldn't be asked to contribute via the excise tax on gasoline for a deductibility on the mortgage interest rate. You see, that was the absurdity of that Budget. It was asking people that were not in a position to afford a home to help finance the home of a person who already was in a position to afford one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the best thing that could have been done for home ownership, the idea that everyone should have an opportunity to own their home, the best thing that could have been done is that the interest rate could have been subsidized so that people in all levels of our economy had an opportunity to purchase their home and to afford the payments on the mortgage. That is where the government's position should have been and that, Mr. Speaker, is something that would not be acceptable to members opposite, I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech deals very briefly with the question and the need for setting up some sort of energy authority, and of course, I think it is virtually - well it can be

said that that is really a motherhood position. I don't think that anyone would argue against setting up an energy authority in order to manage the energy resources of our country, and certainly the provinces have a role to play in relation to the Government of Canada in energy management.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that authority that is set up by this government is going to play a very meaningful role, but I don't believe it is going to happen, because again we have the problem of ideological hangup on the part of members opposite, that is, that for an energy authority to do its job one would have to have fairly substantial regulatory powers. One would have to interfere, Mr. Speaker, if one is to do an adequate job in this respect, one would have to interfere in the market economy to effect a kind of energy conservation that is deemed to be necessary.

Now I would like to illustrate as an example, Mr. Speaker, the fact that today, or even after this energy authority is established, that I don't believe that that authority will be strong enough to prevent any group of people from making an unilateral decision in the use of any form of energy in this country. And, Mr. Speaker, before I believe that there is an energy shortage, I would have to face a situation where I would be in a position of having to apply to some board or to some authority for the use of any form of energy. Unless we go that far, Mr. Speaker, it is not a convincing argument, the argument that we have energy shortage problems.

Let's take for instance a person who would want to invest ten or twenty million dollars in a hula hoop factory. Perhaps the Member for Morris might want to build a hula hoop factory in Morris, Manitoba, in order that he might make a few dollars on the sale of hula hoops, Mr. Speaker, and give some employment to the people of Morris.

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, we all know that hula hoops are made out of petrochemicals. Secondly we know that if the Minister without Portfolio - no, I'm sorry, the Member for Morris, he has a portfolio; Consumer Affairs, yes, the Minister of Consumer Affairs - if the Minister decided he wanted to build this factory and to heat it with gas, there is no authority to say to him that hula hoops aren't the most important thing in our economy, and therefore he couldn't use gas as a fuel to heat his factory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps he would want to use oil. But as I see it, there is nothing indicated in the Throne Speech that would say that anyone who wants to build a hula hoop factory cannot have oil in order to heat that factory. Yes, this is how ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, the whole concept of the energy shortage is, because in essence so far they have only demonstrated that there is a desire for more revenue from energy use on the part of the shareholders of the companies, on the part of the provinces that have the energy, and on the part of the Canadian government who desire extra tax revenue. But no one has come to grips with the question of what kind of energy should be used for what particular purpose.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if there is any sense to an energy authority, then we have to have an authority that would have enough power to deny to the Minister of Consumer Affairs the use of energy that is in short supply if he wants to build hula hoops in Manitoba. And that is the important aspect of energy conservation. Because unless we are in a position to decide, Mr. Speaker, that for certain purposes we will use hydro energy, for other purposes we will use coal energy - unless we catalogue all of the energy sources that we have and decide how it's going to be consumed, and who may consume the energy, and what agencies would not be given a permit for its consumption - unless we are prepared to do that, then there is no energy shortage, Mr. Speaker. It is merely a con-game aimed at convincing the Canadian people that they should pay more money for energy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can give you another example - and you know I don't fault anyone for wanting to do it - but let's assume the Minister of Consumer Affairs wanted to build a new home. And you know there are just two people in his family, the Minister and his wife, but for some unknown reason they sort of like a palatial atmosphere and they want to build a home that has 5,000 square feet or 10,000 or 20,000, and have a handful of maids and butlers and so on. Mr. Speaker, there is no authority that would say to the Minister of Consumer Affairs that no, we can't give you 10,000 or 10,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas next year to heat that monstrous mansion of yours. There is no one that would tell him that. He makes a unilateral decision that he's going to hook up to the gas pipeline and consume as much energy as he wishes to consume, as long as he can afford to do so. So what has that to do, Mr. Speaker, with energy conservation? It has absolutely nothing to do with energy conservation.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what follows from that is that if we are going to have an energy authority, then we ought to have a building code that takes cognizance of the need to conserve energy. A building code that the construction industry, in the building of

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

homes and the building of office structures and the building of factories, would have to recognize and would have to follow the rules and regulations in an effort to consume less energy than we have been consuming to date.

If you look at the skyline, Mr. Speaker, of any major city in Canada, it's very obvious that there are structures built that have no regard whatever for energy consumption. And certainly these are the kinds of areas where an energy authority could play a major role. But, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of that government would never tolerate that kind of intervention in the marketplace. And so it comes down to the larger question, Mr. Speaker - energy production, energy consumption. On the production end, unless we as Canadians, Mr. Speaker, are prepared to decide to control our own energy production, and unless we facilitate ourselves with the mechanism to do so, then we are not going to insulate ourselves from the fluctuations of world energy prices and the supply-demand situation that arises internationally in oil production and supply.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind pointing out that if it was I that had to make the decision, that I wouldn't need any more than one oil company in Canada, and that oil company should be owned by the Canadian people. I have no hesitation whatever, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to you that there should be only one oil company in Canada - and it should be owned by the people of this country - to provide a service in the energy field for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it's tragic that we, a country that has almost self-sufficiency in energy, would allow foreign intervention, decisions made by multi-national companies, decisions made to effect the supply of energy to this country, when we are in a position to do something about it. It is truly tragic to witness that kind of thing occurring in Canada, and yet you see the former ministers of the Clark government parading up and down Canada, comparing Canada's energy situation with which countries, Mr. Speaker? With Italy - they'll say look at the price they pay in Italy. Look at the price of energy in Japan. Yes, on the campaign trail, countries that are virtually 100 percent importing countries were used as comparisons with Canada in the energy pricing system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the Conservative Party of Canada, the Conservative Party of Manitoba, are not going to face up to the reality that Canadians would prefer - and they have given them this message just very recently, Mr. Speaker - would prefer an energy authority that was controlled by the people of Canada and that would work for the people of Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all embarrassed, nor do I qualify my suggestion that in Canada we only need one energy company, and that is a company owned by the people of Canada. There is no room for any more, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to campaign from one end of this province to the other on that issue. I have no hesitation whatever.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area that I find lacking in the Throne Speech - and I don't particularly fault this government, but I think I fault all governments of the past - an area that has to be addressed and we never seem to get to that stage, and that is the need to set up a proper human resources development department, or branch of a department or authority. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have in our society a situation where we are in fact, through the existing mechanisms, helping to destroy people, Mr. Speaker.

And I refer to people who are able-bodied but who are not employed, and who continue to exist only on the charity of society, Mr. Speaker. I refer to people who are the offspring of that group, who are born into that kind of situation, and where society doesn't seem to have a mechanism to pull them out of that environment and to give them an opportunity equal to that of other Manitobans and other Canadians. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what is needed here is an approach through a department of government that would have as its goal the restoration of whole groups in our community, Mr. Speaker, to the point where they would be full participants in our economy to the point where they would not be dependent on society for their existence.

And I suppose if one wants to look at statistics, one could introduce all sorts of figures for different periods of time. But my perception of it is, Mr. Speaker - and I believe it to be accurate - that each year we have a larger block of people who find themselves in that position and that the opportunities for those people become more and more limited, and we end up with a larger ghetto, if you like, of what I consider to be a sort of welfare syndrome where there is no escape from. And it seems to me if we have any sincerity in trying to deal with that problem, then we have to approach it on the basis that where we have employable people, then government has to play a role in becoming, at minimum, the employer of last resort, Mr. Speaker. Government has to become at minimum the employer of last resort, so

that we don't allow people to fall into that trap of having nothing to do with their time but to wait for welfare moneys to come into their homes via the postman, or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister suggests that the welfare rolls are down. Whether they are down or up is irrelevant as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that there are tens of thousands of people who are not participating in the economy as they should. There is the statistical group, and there is the non-statistical group, Mr. Speaker, those who are never mentioned in Stats Canada, and that's the chronically unemployed that never show up anywhere in terms of Stats Canada Reports or whatever.

And that problem is a growing one. It is concentrated in given areas of the province and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it's a time bomb. It's a time bomb that should not be ignored, that we must address ourselves to, Mr. Speaker, because we are dealing not only with our own selfish interest - and that being that we have to pay for the services that flow to those people - but we have to look upon it as a situation where we would want to bring those people into the fullest possible involvement in the social economic system for their benefit.

And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I would add the penal system as well. And this is something that I know has been worked on for a number of years, but it seems to me that we probably would be better off if we shut down most of our jails, Mr. Speaker. I truly believe that a penal system can be set up that would be much less costly for the taxpayers of Manitoba, and yet much more effective in terms of rehabilitating the people that fall into the system. It seems to me that one doesn't need to destroy a human being by means of setting up walls or bars or an overabundance of supervision. What one has to do is develop a system, Mr. Speaker, that allows for the individuals that fall into the penal system to participate in the economy, but that the penalty that they would pay, Mr. Speaker, would be that they would not have the same financial rewards for their participation, that the income that they would earn would go towards paying for the cost of handling the system.

These are the kinds of approaches that I would hope that our society would evolve towards, Mr. Speaker, in order that (a) we remove the burdens from the taxpayers that are growing every day and becoming much more difficult to deal with; and (b) that we truly do a job in rehabilitating people that need rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that members opposite would take those last two suggestions more seriously perhaps than they would take some of the other comments that I have made through the course of my speech, because indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is, I don't believe, a partisan issue. I believe it is a problem that all political parties recognize that is there, it's a question of how one tries to cope with it. It's a problem that must be dealt with.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure to follow and to listen to the former Minister of Agriculture, with his convoluted thinking, his far-out theories of economics, but more than that - every statement he makes is intended to drive the people of this country into one corner, and that is into a totalitarian state. That is the thinking that's behind everything he has said here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I'll say this for him - notwithstanding the failures of the system that he advocates, he continues to follow in that course, and I wonder what it is about a person of his kind that never seems to deviate, in spite of all of the evidence to the contrary, he has a pretty thick skin in order to continue to believe the things that he tried to practise when he was on this side of the House.

Sir, he made some reference to the First Minister, and the fact - or at least his assertion that he never appeared in this province during the course of the recent election campaign. Well, my honourable friend should be one to know something about that, because in the course of the 1977 election, that Minister was not in evidence in any constituency across this country, certainly not in the rural areas.

But Mr. Speaker, I sidetracked a little bit from the intent of my remarks because of the comments that were made by the former Minister of Agriculture, but I couldn't help but be struck by his statement with respect to home ownership, and they differ markedly. It comes as a surprise to learn that there is somebody on that side of the House that believes in home ownership. He should consult with his colleague, the Member for St. Johns --(Interjection)-- well, the Member for St. Johns obviously owns his own house, but he doesn't believe that other people should. He doesn't believe that other people should.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said in this House, and I'll quote him: "There is a great deal of lip service played in this province to our people on all sides of this House that

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

home ownership is desirable and should be encouraged." So I'd like to discuss that for a few minutes, because I am not sure that that is right.

MR. CHERNIACK: What does that mean to you?

MR. JORGENSON: Well, that means to me that my honourable friend has some serious doubts about whether or not home ownership is a good thing.

MR. ENNS: There is no doubt on this side.

MR. JORGENSON: And there is obviously no doubt in the mind of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who now has come out - in spite of all his other assertions, he now believes that there should be home ownership. I don't know how that particular statement got into his remarks, because it's contrary to everything else he said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not offering the usual comments at this stage of our proceedings. I do want to offer my congratulations to you, Sir, in assuming your office, this high office in this Chamber. None of us makes your task any easier, and we've just seen a very recent example of that. But I am satisfied, Sir, that your conduct of the affairs of this Chamber is exemplary and that the impartiality that you have shown - and I hope that is correctly recorded in Hansard - will demonstrate itself during the course of this session.

I want to offer, also, my congratulations to the Member for River Heights and the Member for Emerson, who carried out their tasks in a manner that - particularly the Member for River Heights, who is a new member in this Chamber, which indicates that much can be expected from his contributions in this Chamber. I only too well recall the first opportunity that I had in the House of Commons to perform that same task, and I have watched over the years the contributions of maiden speeches in this Chamber, and I think after a while, one can pretty well judge how well a member is going to do in this Chamber simply by listening to that maiden speech. You can pretty well predict his demise or his success in this Chamber by the way he conducts himself in that first effort. I say to the Member for River Heights, his will be an illustrious career in this Chamber.

I also want to offer my congratulations to the new members. I notice that the Member for Fort Rouge - and I want to congratulate her for the winning of the election, and her admission to this Chamber. But I can't help but notice that in her contribution the other day, it sounded a great deal like the regurgitations of the former Member for Fort Rouge, with one noticeable difference, Sir, and that is that she couldn't possibly get as much on the record in the same space of time as the former Member for Fort Rouge used to do.

I also notice that the speeches that she smuggles in during the Question Period are also reminiscent of another Member for Fort Rouge. Now that is not a criticism, I think that anytime that anybody can do that at this early stage in the life in the Legislative Chamber, shows some great promise at bending rules. --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition delivered of himself his contribution on Monday, and if there were to be any criticisms of the Speech from the Throne that it contained, as he suggested, cosmetic approaches and warmed-over promises of the past, then most certainly his speech can be characterized in that fashion, because it contained nothing new. It contained the same old clichés, the same old half-truths or mis-truths that they have been uttering in the last two years, nothing new. And I want to quote a few examples of the statements that he made. I shouldn't say I want to quote them, because they were quoted the other day by the Minister of Mines and Resources, and I think adequately dealt with by the Minister of Mines and Resources, I think adequately rebutted, so I won't repeat them.

But I do want to read into the record again, some of the policies that my honourable friends said that they were going to follow, in the unlikely event that they ever come back on this side of the House. "We shall concentrate on short-term, long-term planning to generate employment and to cease outmigration and depopulation." Mr. Speaker, I wonder what that means? I suspect that what it means is that the kind of long-term planning that he's talking about is the kind of planning that is being abandoned in countries that have attempted it.

I'd like to quote a couple of passages from a speech that was made by a Professor Walter Eltis. The remarks of Professor Eltis, who is a Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford and visiting Professor of Economics at the University of Toronto - I searched a long time before I found the remarks of a professor that I thought were suitable, because there was no point in me attempting to quote the remarks of a bank manager or a businessman. I would think that my honourable friends opposite would pay close attention to what a university professor says,

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

particularly the Member for Transcona. --(Interjection)-- Yes, there are, but this particular one deals with the very things that my honourable friends opposite are suggesting for this country, and he deals with them as they happened in other countries, the very same things that they're advocating.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet was advocating one oil company for Canada. That's an interesting suggestion, but Professor Eltis deals with the inefficiency of nationalized industries in Great Britain, and he says that this can be illustrated very vividly from what happened in Britain because it is, in fact, possible to estimate the surpluses of marketed output that British companies provided each year. From 1961 to 1977, British private sector companies provided a rate of surplus for the finance of social welfare which averaged 35.9 percent. The nationalized industries, or Crown corporations, provide a rate of surplus which averaged only 11.1 percent. This meant that if the whole British economy had been run like the private sector companies, Britain could have had a welfare state of around 35 percent, which is roughly what Britain, in fact, had. If the whole economy had been run like the nationalized industries, Britain could have had a welfare state purchasing only 11 percent of total output.

And my honourable friends on that side of the House continuously - well indeed, Sir, they never open their mouths on that side of the House unless it's at taxpayers' expense - continuously advocating greater spending on this side of the House. Greater spending, more money. But they never give a thought as to where that money is coming from. Oh, the Leader of the Opposition said, yes, we'll take it from the mining companies; we'll take it from the profits of other companies. Well, the British tried that, and Dennis Healey, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was forced to admit, at a Blackpool conference of the Labour Party one year - it was in 1974 - that if all of the incomes over \$12,000 in Great Britain were taxed 100 percent, it would pay for running the government for exactly 4 1/2 days. And then he added, "it would only happen once, because after that, the people would leave the country." --(Interjection)-- Professor Eltis said that if the whole economy had adopted the pricing and investment policies of the nationalized industries pensions, would have had to have been cut by two-thirds, and two-thirds of the doctors, teachers, soldiers and policeman would have had to be sacked because the nationalized industries are only capable of supporting an 11 percent welfare state.

Then he goes on to point out the case of Sweden. And this is what he said about Sweden. "As the real cost of labour rises, companies find it unprofitable to employ as many workers as before, so they cut employment, as it is widely agreed in Sweden that this is the government's duty to act as an employer of last resort." Those were precisely the words that were uttered by the Member for Lac du Bonnet. All the people who have become unemployed in industry are found kind of work in the public sector. This puts up taxation. The Swedes finance most of their public expenditure through taxation and not by printing money, and the higher taxes cause the workers to put up wages again. This further rise in wages, the Director of the Institute of International Economic Studies pointed out that with Sweden's marginal tax rates, it now takes three percent rise in wages to recover one percent of wages lost through higher taxes. It is still more workers sacked from private industry, and so it goes on. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of economy, that is the kind of a world, that my honourable friends are advocating here.

He also points out the example of New York; I won't go into that. I would invite my honourable friends to read the speech. But it won't make any difference to my honourable friends opposite, because they seem to have a death wish for this country. They seem to have a desire to destroy the economy. Talk about people who are dogmatic, who are oriented towards a philosophy that they can't shake themselves free of - my honourable friends are the classic example of that kind of a person. No matter how much evidence is presented to them, they continue to argue that the course of Socialism is the way to Utopia in this country.

Here is a recent article that came out of the Financial Post on February 16th of this year. On the one hand, as Jamaican - and this comes from Jamaica - as Jamaican academic Carl Stone said recently, "The charismatic, manly promises of a better life under a Socialist vision have become a nightmare of despair. With 30 percent unemployment, a 50 percent devaluation in the past three years, and inflation running 35 to 47 percent, and with many of the most skilled immigrating, Jamaica's outlook has gone from bad to worse. So far the manly government's commitment to Jamaicanize the economy through extended public ownership has brought few signs of economic improvement. The public sector has been plagued by wave of labour unrest, which, combined with inefficient and sometimes corrupt management, has taken a heavy toll in the central service and other state-run enterprises."

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

That is the Utopia. And, you know, it is an interesting thing, during the course - and I am not going to dwell very long on that election campaign, but one of the remarks that was made by the Member for Lac du Bonnet couldn't help but escape my attention, his continued suggestion that we need one oil company in this company.

During the course of the election campaign - as a matter of fact in the early part, on the 21st of December 1979 - when the Prime Minister had suggested that he would distribute shares of PetroCan to the people of this country it brought an outburst of outrage on the part of the Leader of the Socialist Party in Ottawa. "It is totally irresponsible", he cried. "It is nothing more than a clumsy device to save Joe Clark's political skin. Canadians are not fooled. They will see what Mr. Clark is trying to buy them with their own money."

But then, Sir, a little bit later - that was on December 21st, 1979 - on January 4, 1980, in Windsor, on the question of whether the government should bail out the ailing Chrysler Corporation, he said this: "If the government is going to provide financial assistance to Chrysler Corporation, then they" - meaning the government - "should provide shares of that corporation to the Canadian people so that they can become the real owners." Now you see, that, Sir, is the kind of dichotomy that you find from my honourable friends, but it is not that really, because there is a method and there is a purpose in their utterances. There is a purpose. Anything that is nationalized, they don't want anybody to have a look at it. If it is nationalized, then it is there. But they will nationalize private companies, they will gladly give away shares of somebody else's efforts, so that they will force them into a nationalized state as well.

Well, you know, that raises another interesting subject - bankrupt Chrysler, and why did Chrysler get that way. It just refutes the argument just made by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, when he said what we need is an energy authority, an energy authority that will tell everybody how much gas they are going to use. They are going to have some bureaucrats, some connoisseurs of energy running around allocating energy to every person in this country. They are sure going to cure the unemployment problem in this country if they do that, because everybody will be doing that. That will be the bureaucracy to end all bureaucracies.

And the reason that Chrysler is in difficulty is because they refused to accept the fact that people on this continent, because of rising energy prices, and because they knew that there were going to be problems, started to buy automobiles that consumed less gasoline. The import of automobiles from Japan and Germany grew from a trickle within a period of about five years, to a greater number than were being produced in this country. And for one reason - they were more economical to run. They saved on gasoline.

And the Member for Lac du Bonnet tries to tell us, or tries to tell this Chamber, that the people of this country haven't got sense enough to know that. They have demonstrated in every way possible that they are keenly conscious of the energy situation that we find ourselves in, and are prepared to do something about it. Homes that are being built today are being built with a view to energy conservation. Homes that are being repaired, not necessarily because there is a government grant or a government loan available - a good many people are doing it on their own, or in recognition of the serious problem this country is faced with insofar as energy is concerned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition quoted at length his oft-repeated claim that economic development in this country, or in this province, was not proceeding along in the way that he would like to see it continue. And he began to talk again about the myth that was, I think, very adequately destroyed by the Minister of Mines and Resources last night. But while the Minister of Mines and Resources was speaking, I couldn't help but look at my honourable friend, the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, who now sits in his seat - and I am happy to see him there, because when he was on this side of the House he had somewhat different views about how economic development should take place.

And you know, I like to see him in his seat, rejuvenated as he is, looking much younger than he did when he was on this side of the House, and it is a treatment, Sir, that perhaps more of us should enquire about. I don't know whether it's just because he is on that side of the House now and does not have the worries that he used to have, but we are happy to see him with his aggressive personality, and the defence of his indefensible economics which, Mr. Speaker, changes from time to time. The remarks that he made when he was on this side of the House were not nearly the same as he makes now.

I am going to quote some of the remarks that my honourable friend made when he was a Minister of the Crown on this side of the House, and he was following a speech that was made by the former member for River Heights, who had been attacking the government because there were population losses at that time, and because the performance of the economy was

not as good as the former member for River Heights thought it should be, and indeed they were quoting the same figures that are being quoted today, the situation is just reversed.

But here is what the Member for Brandon East had to say, and this is a statement that always precedes someone who is unprepared to speak and so speaks with conviction because it comes from his heart, and from his heart alone. There was no data, no figures, no backup; it came from the heart, Sir. This is what he said, "I was not prepared to speak at this time." That is a good opening line. "Although I was going to make a contribution to the Throne Speech Debate later this evening when I had the data with me. . ." - he doesn't have any data, I remind you again, Sir, - ". . . however I can't refrain from making a few comments in reply to the former Minister of Industry and Commerce in his castigation of this government and our policies."

He starts out well. "He asks what our policies are for development. I can assure him that they are being developed and they will be revealed very shortly." And they were, Mr. Speaker, because in the Guidelines for the Seventies they were outlined, and at that time the Premier's statement at a meeting in St. Vital that two to one, two and one-half times one formula, that was an economic development policy of the previous administration. "And they will be effective policies." They were effective, Sir, because they were effective enough to drive honourable gentlemen from this side of the House to that side of the House, and that is the best thing that could have happened to economic development in this country.

"They will not be" - and get this - "teddy boy philosophy." I don't know what my honourable friend meant by a teddy boy philosophy. He said, "A crude growth philosophy" --(Interjection)-- "growth at any cost, growth at the cost of pollution, growth no matter whether they are low wage jobs, it doesn't matter. These will be our policy, will reflect a policy of selective economic development which will raise the standard of living of the people of this province." A ringing declaration, Sir.

Now, he goes on to say this: "Now the definition of economic growth as espoused by my honourable friend from River Heights seems to me to be population increase. It is inevitable to me that the Honourable Member for River Heights, by economic growth he means population growth. And this obviously, as any economist or any first year student of economics will tell you, is not the definition of economic growth. The definition . . ." --(Interjection)-- He does do that. "The definition of economic growth is a rise in the standard of living of the people of an area surely. It is an increase in the average income of the people of the area, not an increase in the population," says my honourable friend. And it is very ironic in this day and age of over-population, of tensions caused by people being overly crowded in areas, that we are talking about bringing more and more people into a specific area. In those days he wanted people to leave. He was inviting them to leave, Sir. He goes on to say this, "This is not economic growth."

I'll tell you, Sir, if there is one thing that has helped this province, and particularly the youth of this province, is that his election to this Chamber has at least limited his ability to inflict his views on the students that he teaches. This is not economic growth, he says, as a matter of fact, economic growth can be achieved by having fewer people in some instances rather than more people. And then he makes this declaration, "and that's a lesson he should learn." That's from the Member for Brandon East, when he was on - don't forget - this side of the House.

But if he's interested in population growth, I can tell him that the population of the province did increase last year. Here's another one. He says, "but if he's interested in population growth, I can tell him that the population of the province did increase last year in spite of the bad wheat situation." Now the wheat drives him out.

The province of Saskatchewan did realize a net loss of people. The absolute level of population in Saskatchewan did decline last year. They did. And I think they declined by something like 25,000 people. Our population did increase. --(Interjection)-- Oh, that was the year 1969-70. That was the same year, Mr. Speaker, that was the same year, in 1970, that our population declined by 9,207. --(Interjection)-- Now he says, "I'm not holding that out as any indication of growth. That is not an indication of growth." But if he's interested in population, we can talk about that, too.

Metropolitan Winnipeg. The rate of increase of Metropolitan Winnipeg was high in 1969. It was 2.2 percent last year over the previous year. This is the highest rate of population increase that Metropolitan Winnipeg has experienced for many, many a year. But, he says, "again I say this is not an indication of economic growth." But if my honourable friend is interested in population statistics, he has it. Well, he says it's a good speech. I'll say this, it's an interesting one, because it certainly isn't what he's saying today.

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

I don't know what he has learned or unlearned in the meantime, but my honourable friend should remember his utterances of the past. And you know, Mr. Speaker, if there is any one suggestion I want to make to some of the new members in this Chamber, they could find it a very useful exercise to dig back over the past into some of the speeches that were made by former Ministers on this side of the House. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for River Heights that jobs at any cost - he refers to jobs, more jobs and more jobs, as though jobs are equivalent to motherhood and all the virtues of life - that jobs at any cost is not good enough. The most advanced industrial areas of the world today, the Atlantic Seaboard in the United States and Japan, Japan is one of the most industrialized nations of the world. Oh yes, he has an admonition for those in the Fourth Estate. Japan is one of the most industrialized nations of the world, and I'd like the press gallery to note this. And scarce as they are in the gallery, I want to pass on those pearls of wisdom by my honourable friend: "Japan is one of the most populated, polluted areas of the world; the most advanced industrialized, so-called industrialized nations of the world, are those that are suffering from the most pollution. It's their population that's suffering." And so he goes on.

Well, Sir, --(Interjection)-- well, now I am confounded. He said, "it was true then and it's true today." And yet my honourable friend swallowed himself. Does he not realize that? And he continues to do that. It's an interesting exercise that my honourable friend, this metamorphosis that he goes through, this changing, chameleon-like, from an advocate of no growth, to now, an advocate of super growth. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm not going to try to repeat the statements that were made here last night by the Minister of Mines and Resources. They won't get much attention, because statements that contain some truths very rarely get the kind of publicity that they should be getting, because they don't sell newspapers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the performance of my honourable friends has been interesting, to say the least. Not the least of which, however, is their reiteration of a statement that is plastered across the walls of this city time and time again, about "Make the rich pay." That seemed to be the message that was conveyed to us by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke on Monday, repeated again by the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet. That theory has been disproved by those who have tried it, by those who believe in the same philosophy that my honourable friends, the Labour Party of Great Britain. It's been demonstrated that it does not help an economy, it ruins it.

What my honourable friends have failed to recognize, Sir, is that it is necessary, and it's been said time and time again by the Minister of Government Services, that if you're going to improve services in this country, if you're going to provide greater social benefits to people of this country, you must first of all find the wealth. My honourable friends believe that by nationalizing the industries of this country, by nationalizing the resources of this country, they can create that wealth. It doesn't work that way, it never has, and it never will. The experience in Great Britain has proven it.

The nationalized industries produced zero income. What about the nationalized industries that we have here? I tell you one way that we have saved some money, we've saved about \$3.5 million by getting rid of those industries that you had nationalized in here, because the taxpayers don't have to pick up the deficits for them. They don't have to pick up the deficits for them. But we, Sir, are reaching a stage in our history and there is a - in my concluding remarks I would like to quote from a reference to the 200-year cycle of major civilizations. They go, first of all from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from great courage to freedom; from freedom to abundance; and from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependence; and from dependence into bondage. I'll leave it to my honourable friends to judge at what stage we are now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate you on your continued retention of your position. I would also like to congratulate your Deputy, for I think a performance well done over the last two years. And I congratulate his apparent successor, the Member for Virden, who I think has been a respected member of his caucus, and I'm glad is now going to be recognized by his caucus --(Interjection)-- oh, he will just be

Committee Chairman, sorry. I'm sorry. I was just corrected. The Member for Virden will not become the Deputy Speaker, he will in fact become the Assistant Deputy or the Chairman of the Committees. I'm glad that he is being recognized by his caucus because the people on this side of the House have respected him. He's been a long-serving member of his caucus, the most senior member of that caucus, and I'm glad that they have finally recognized his ability and in a sense have possibly taken him from purgatory after all these long years. --(Interjection)-- Possibly. I hear the Member for Wolseley saying, "me next" - who knows?

I would also like to welcome to the House the three new members. Undoubtedly the members, especially the Member for Fort Rouge, I hope that she didn't take the last speaker's speech too hard. I notice that she left in the middle of it sort of holding her stomach, but I hope that that is not a sign of things to come. I didn't know that the Member for Morris would have that effect on a new member. I think they have to be here for awhile and get toughened to that type of vitriolic - indeed, I've heard it for the third time. This is the third lecture from the Member for Morris on totalitarianism. He has undoubtedly spoken that speech many times before, but this is the third time I have heard it in the Throne Speech, and it follows a set pattern of implying that anything activist automatically implies a totalitarianism. It's their defence against any attack against their performance; their defence is automatically to rebait or to throw up the spectre of totalitarianism.

I can appreciate the members looking into some historical records for some documentation. He hasn't got too much in that respect, and he's now trying to dig through libraries to find any right-wing historian or intellectual historian or philosopher to try and back up his position. I would ask him, as an amateur historian, to look indeed at the performance of his own party with respect to the whole question of civil liberties in the history of Canada, because I think the performance of his party at times, with respect to the issue of civil liberties, has been atrocious.

I remind the member of the 1935 campaign where the two traditional parties attacked the founder of my party, J. S. Woodsworth, for promoting the vote for Japanese and Chinese people who were Canadians. They were attacked by Conservatives and Liberals at that time. Later on, his party..--(Interjection)-- I would have given him the right to vote. I, in fact, don't have - you're asking me, what would I have done? I ask you, what would you do today if they didn't have the vote, if you are asking me that type of question at this time. Obviously, universal suffrage is there. In 1935, the Member for Minnedosa is implying that he would not have given them the vote, by asking that type of question, what would we have done?

I'm saying, my party at that time took the position that those people should indeed have the right to vote. And it's on the record. Later on in the war, we had the internment of Canadians of Japanese ancestry. Again, which party was supporting that, and promoted that? In 1970, we had the application, or the imposition, by a supposed civil libertarian, of The War Measures Act, and the strongest supporters came from the Conservative Party. In fact, that has been the greatest infringement of civil liberties in the history of Canada that I know of. It was the most universal infringement of civil liberties, and where was the Conservative Party on that particular issue? And to give Robert Stanfield credit, when he retired from public life, he was quite candid when asked by an interviewer on television, recorded for all of us, when he was asked, is there anything you would do differently now that it's all over, now that your political career is over, is there anything you would do differently, is there anything you regret? And he said, "Yes, I regret voting in favour of The War Measures Act, and I have the greatest respect for David Lewis and Tommy Douglas, who voted against this imposition."

Those were words of remarkable candor by a retiring politician. Maybe politicians only get candid when they retire. But I was very impressed with his statement at that time, and that's why I'm not impressed when I hear these continuous harangues of a one-dimensional nature regarding totalitarianism. Because really what they do, they try and obfuscate what the real problems are. It's a diversionary tactic, and it's unfortunate that that is what has to be practised by the Conservative Party in order to try and slide these types of problems under their carpet.

Indeed, the Member for Morris raised a number of points regarding outmigration and tried to quote statements made by the Member for Brandon. And out of all the laughing and giggling, Mr. Speaker, he didn't say anything positive with respect to the problem that does exist in Manitoba, namely that there is a tremendous sense of pessimism in the province at this time, and that that sense of pessimism has been, in fact, encouraged by the failures of the platform of the government in office at present.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first Session of the 1980's, and I would have expected that we would have had a Throne Speech that would have been somewhat expansive, that would have tried to define some of the problems that face us as a country, as a province, over the course of the next decade. And having then tried to define some of those problems, I would have hoped that the Throne Speech would have then tried to set out this government's program as to how they might deal with these problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, this was not a Throne Speech of the 1980's. This was really a Throne Speech of the latter 40's and the 50's. It was a Throne Speech that assumed that everything was okay because in the latter 40's and the 50's, we in fact were being buttressed by a lot of American investment in Canada, and we were taking the short-term return, and we were enjoying ourselves, and we weren't realizing that we were digging ourselves deeper and deeper into a hole, that we were in fact losing control of our economy and that we were putting ourselves in a position that when world circumstances changed and when world terms of trade changed against us somewhat, we would not have sufficient control over our economy to respond to those types of changes in the best interests of Canadians and of Manitobans.

And, Mr. Speaker, the most solid indication of that sense of depression and frustration that exists in Manitoba in the 80's, as we go into the 80's, are the outmigration figures. And the reason why they are important, Mr. Speaker, is that we are losing a very vital element of our society - our most skilled, our most productive people - and that is the tragedy. When, in fact, you lose your best trades people who have to go elsewhere because there is no work in Manitoba when there could be work, that is the tragedy. And when you couple that type of loss with the fact that we have an aging population, that we may not have sufficient people in the labour force in the future to adequately support this aging population - which in 20 years is going to be double the present size - at that stage, Mr. Speaker, we have to get very concerned about Manitoba's future.

Mr. Speaker, we've lost that control of our economy, and we aren't facing up to any of the challenges facing our economy right now in this Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, to me the greatest loss that we've suffered over the last 30 years in Canada has been loss of control over our economy. And there was something established called the Foreign Investment Review Agency. It was established because of some pressure by my party at the national level in 1972. And we have a Foreign Investment Review Agency which is far too weak, but at the same time it's the only agency in our country that reviews foreign takeovers.

And we have had a tremendous concentration of foreign control over our economy. Right now we have 80 percent of the petroleum industry foreign controlled. We have 90 percent of the chemical industry foreign controlled. We have 60 percent of our manufacturing industry foreign controlled. We have 70 percent of our mining industry foreign controlled. That is a tremendous problem, of, in a sense, loss of sovereignty facing Canadians and facing governments in Canada. And that is why there are a number of people in Canada who are saying that it's very important for Canadians to recapture control over our economy.

And although it's not a good mechanism, Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Investment Review Agency right now is the only one we have, and rather than talking about strengthening it, rather than talking about establishing the mechanisms whereby foreign takeovers of Canadian companies can be stopped - and in fact what we need in order to achieve that is a tremendous strengthening of the public sector and the Canadian Development Corporation so that when a foreign company comes along and wants to buy out a Canadian company, the Canadian people are in a position to take over that Canadian company themselves for the people of Canada.

And we've had that in a number of instances, and the Member for Inkster, I think, went before the Foreign Investment Review Agency trying to stop Tantalum being taken away from Manitoba, being taken away from Manitobans. And he was unsuccessful in that respect, Mr. Speaker, because the Canadian government didn't have a mechanism in place to purchase Tantalum, and the Manitoba government, under the Conservative Party, didn't want to keep control of Tantalum in Canada.

So we have this tremendous problem, Mr. Speaker, with respect to foreign ownership. There are many of us saying that we should strengthen the Foreign Investment Review Agency. There are many people who say that we have to strengthen the other instruments of government to ensure that more control over our economy is gained by Canadians. And we have indeed, Mr. Speaker, on November 2, 1979, the Premier of this province going off to the United States - he wouldn't even do it here in Canada - and he indeed said that he wanted to abolish the Foreign Investment Review Agency because it is a damper to prospective investment in Canada. He in fact is going to the United States on his knees and begging Americans to get more control over the Canadian economy, and that is precisely the problem

Wednesday, 27 February 1980

that we have. That is precisely the problem that we have, Mr. Speaker. And to go there on bended knees, saying that I am going to tell my colleagues in Ottawa that what they should do is abolish the Foreign Investment Review Agency, and then invite more American equity control over the Canadian economy, is completely the wrong policy for Canada, completely the wrong policy for Manitobans.

And frankly I'm delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada turfed out the Tories on February 18th. I'm delighted they did so before this man had an opportunity to further sabotage the Canadian economy by turning more of it over to Americans. Now the point is, the Americans themselves would respect us a lot more, Mr. Speaker, if we were much more independent with regard to our own economy. They, in fact, themselves want to protect their economy from foreign domination, and they realize that that is part of a process, in a sense, of growing up.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier will never grow up. We know that. He will never grow up. He will in fact have to go to wherever the largest pools of foreign capital are, because he has no mechanism and no vision as to how he, as head of a government, might in fact be able to stimulate investment in a province when after 27 months it's not been happening, and when after 27 months 22,000 people have left this province. And he has no solution to that particular problem, Mr. Speaker. He has no solution, apart from a bit of corporate welfare by the Minister of Economic Development, who this year is now providing a grant - a no-strings grant of \$300,000.00

I, in fact, went a bit different than that, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Minister of Economic Development whether in fact he was going to get caught up in the game of give-away, whether he felt he could match Ontario, whether he could match Alberta in respect to government give-aways to private enterprise and he said no, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to get into that type of game. That's the wrong type of game to get into. It's a very dangerous game. We are not as big as they are. And it's the wrong policy. You can't buy people, you can't buy people. That's what he said last year. And I said, Mr. Speaker, that we lack venture capital, we lack Canadian venture capital here in Manitoba. We lack it in Canada. And I said, what are you going to do about it? Well his Premier went off to the United States begging Americans to come in, but he provided no mechanism. He's abolished the Manitoba Development Corporation and he established no mechanism whereby Canadians might, in fact, gain a bit more control over the economy.

And, Mr. Speaker, the saddest case - and I'll get to this tomorrow - concerns the sell-out of Tantalum in this respect by this government. And it's really quite unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because it fits in entirely to what I have been saying to date, that this government is quite prepared to preside over the continued selling out of our resources to interests outside this country. And when we do that, Mr. Speaker, we lose the leverage that we as a province, and that we as a people, have against multinational corporations.

And that is another very large problem facing us, Mr. Speaker. When we get caught up in the situation where multinationals who have interests in about ten or twelve countries start playing one country off against each other, we are in a very disadvantageous position. And the only way you can start countering multinationals is to start asserting some independence on your own. And the strength that we have, Mr. Speaker, the strength that we have as a province is that we the people, in the province of Manitoba, own the resources so we can't be whip-sawed. We can't be whip-sawed as easily as people in provinces where their only source of income is manufacturing industry.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he got the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite convinced that this man would go out and try and sell farmland, yes, to foreign industry --(Interjection)-- Pardon? I wouldn't want to own your farm - the Member for Rock Lake wants this - Mr. Speaker, if his performance as a farmer is anything like his performance as a member, I would think that that land is full of rocks, Mr. Speaker. I would think it's full of rocks and is very unproductive --(Interjections)-- Yes, I am hoping that he will get up and speak, Mr. Speaker, because we are having a number of them speaking from their --(Interjections)-- I thought it was rockhead.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30 the house is adjourned and stands adjourned till 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)