

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 22 March, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: 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 Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Intercultural Council for the year ending March 31, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. M. SMITH introduced Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les garderies d'enfants.

HON. A. ANSTETT introduced Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 25 students of Grade 11 standing from the MacGregor Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Baranowski. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

There are 26 students of Grade 6 standing from the Marion School. They are under the direction of Miss Forest, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Concordia Hospital - expansion plans

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health. While neither the Throne Speech or last night's Budget indicated any plans for Concordia Hospital, I am aware that the Minister met with the board fairly recently. Are there any expansion plans being contemplated by this government for that health facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I could advise the member to be a little patient. You can't get all the news all at once.

My five-year capsule program should be announced during the Estimates, and I expect that my Estimates might be fairly soon.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of my patience. I think that the people in that area of the city have been very patient. It seems to me that expansion plans have been promised every time the NDP get ready to go to an election. Mr. Speaker, my question is simply this: has that facility reason to be optimistic about expansion plans in the coming year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is absolutely right. There was a complete freeze there for about four years a few years ago, but I think that in discussions that we've had we have started to move there, and I think the news will be good.

Number of farmers in financial difficulty

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and I'm pleased to see that he is in the House this morning, not out trying to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member does know that it is improper to comment on the presence or the absence of other members of the House.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your direction in making my comments.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture tell this Assembly and the people of Manitoba how many farmers will be unable to get their financial requirements looked after in time, or will not be able to get their financial requirements looked after in time, to seed their crops in about two weeks time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to respond to the allegation of being in or out of the House, and I know the honourable member previously raised questions with the First Minister when it just so happened that I had been in the House for a number of days and then away on government business, and when I was away he raised questions to the Premier. It appears to be the style of the honourable member that questions are raised when I'm out of the House.

Sir, the question of farmers in financial difficulty has been one that this government has attempted to address as best we can with the policies that we have put into place over the last three years. Admittedly, Sir, the policies were put into place in the hope that there would be a national recognition of the seriousness of

this problem, rather than going around and saying there isn't much of a problem.

Sir, from our best estimates that we have been able to glean there are approximately 150 farmers who are in the process of liquidation in the Province of Manitoba. There are another 200 farmers who likely have enough equity in order in which to put their crops in and, of course, an additional 400 who are just following on those heels.

Sir, what is required, and we have put forward proposals in the hope that there would be some recognition that the grains industry is in great difficulty and farming in general is in great difficulty, we have tried to be as co-operative as we can to bring about a recognition that agriculture in this country is one of the most important industries that we have, and it will take massive concerted efforts on behalf of provincial governments and national government.

In fact, Canadians, especially Western Canadians, were frustrated about the lack of national attention to agriculture by the former administration, the Liberal administration. They voted very strongly in favour of a change in western agriculture, Sir, and they have that change. But there is very little coming other than additional fees imposed on producers across this country of some \$33 million in one fell swoop; cutbacks in terms of agricultural lending, so we need and we plead with the Federal Government that they reverse some of their negative policies that will impact clearly on the farm community.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the specific question was how many farmers are not going to be able to put their crops in this year? And if I calculated it correctly, there would be some 150 farmers that will be liquidating, another 400 that possibly will not be able to get enough financing for this spring's operation.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, is the normal time period for getting a loan approval through the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation going to be shortened from what the normal time period is which I think is if not weeks, months, to get a loan approval? Is that being shortened, Mr. Speaker, so there in fact can be some of the funds made available to those individuals?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure that the question refers to an area within the administrative competence of the Minister. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question to make that quite clear.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is: what is the length of time, or what will the length of time be for an approval of an MACC loan to support those farmers who are having a difficult time in finding funds for this year's cropping program? What will the length of time be to get a loan approved through Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the impression that is being created by the Honourable Member for Arthur is that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, through the Province of Manitoba, should do all the refinancing of the problems in agriculture. We have a

very small portion of agricultural lending of approximately 10 percent and will provide support to between 4,000 and 5,000 farm families. But to suggest that now the MACC should be used as the total lending agency to refinance agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member either doesn't want to recognize the seriousness of the problem or really doesn't know.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the federal monetary policy is continuing to support high interest rates, interest rates are increasing at the national level and farmers are going broke. Mr. Speaker, at a time when they can bail out foreign countries, large Canadian corporations, it is time now to say that interest rates should be cut to the entire farm population because the farm community will not survive.

Mr. Speaker, I've asked and the First Minister has asked to arrange a meeting with the Federal Minister of Agriculture to deal with the question of the \$33 million fee increase on the farmers of this country and that those costs would not be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The answers to questions should not be turned into speeches.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the question is very specific and it's a very serious situation. The farm community wants to know and we want to know how long will it take to get a farm loan approved with the money that was announced last night in the Budget? How long will it take to get a Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation loan approved? Will it be weeks or months?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members - we have the \$100 million loan guarantee program - and he will recall, Sir, that when we approved this program, honourable members said that there would be no farmers that would qualify under the program and the program would be really a Mickey Mouse deal. That's what honourable members opposite said. They said it would take very long to approve those loans. Sir, we have assisted over 700 farm families in terms of providing operating credit. That program is in place . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: You have elected the right candidate, they really have. They have elected a has-been who lost the election in 1969, Mr. Speaker, who lost his deposit in 1969, that's who they nominated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I am having some difficulty in hearing the Minister's answer. Is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture completed?

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member should be aware that MACC has approximately

15 field staff in the field and they will be doing their utmost to approve the loan applications, but to make the assertion that MACC will now do all the refinancing in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the impression is not accurate. We can only do as much as we can through our own lending agency. We have speeded up the process in terms of our guaranteed operating loans and staff are handling those programs, but to say somehow that things will change overnight in terms of the speediness, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do the best we can with the staff that we have.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one last question and it can be a very straightforward answer if the Minister would care to be so straightforward - this difficulty that he normally has. Will the Minister of Agriculture request to MACC that they take as swift an action as possible to in fact help those farmers who are in extreme difficulties? Will he direct them to move as swiftly as possible in making the decisions that have to be made?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that the honourable members, by that request, will pass the Budget today so that we can instruct our staff to deal with financial questions. Certainly, we will be doing our utmost to handle the applications as quickly as we can, as we always have. But, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that with the limited amount of staff that we have, and we basically have the same staff now as we've had when they were in government, we will do our utmost but there will be delays from time to time - there is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker - but we could start today if they decided to pass that Budget.

Dairy Farming regulations

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one question. A few days ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he would call the Agriculture Committee to hear the dairy farmers and to hear those people who are concerned about recent directives that have restricted the dairy farm community from transferring quota, Mr. Speaker, either partially with their herds or without. Will the Minister of Agriculture be calling the agriculture committee to deal with that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have met with the marketing board personally on several occasions since last August when they tabled their new marketing plan dealing with no value for quota, but in going back since the honourable member raised the question about no value for quotas, I checked the approval of policy that was passed by him when he was Minister which basically is the policy that excluded value for quotas in the sale of cow herds. He approved that policy and in that policy, Sir, where is the statement that the board, the Natural Products Marketing Council, would have the authority to stop the policy of sale of quota with cows should the value of quota be included in that cow sales? He approved that policy, since that policy has not worked. We now have to find a policy that will work and we will be meeting with dairy producers and the board and other producers to try and develop a policy in order that the value for quota is limited, Sir.

Radio and mobile telephones - increased fees

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

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the First Minister and it has to do with complaints that I am receiving in regard to the exorbitant increases in fees for radio and mobile telephones. — (Interjection) — I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. ADAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, increases from \$55 per annum to \$130 - I would ask the First Minister what plans he has to deal with this exorbitant increase being undertaken by the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to you and to honourable colleagues across the aisle that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose represents farmers just as honourable members across the way. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has a right to speak out on behalf of the farmers of his constituency just as I wish honourable members would speak out for farmers in their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, in my opportunity to tour various parts of the province, including I must say the Swan River constituency and the constituency of Roblin-Russell, one of the most frequent presentations made to me by farmers and by farm organizations was the soaring increase announced to take effect by the Federal Government of user fees affecting farmers right across Canada, and in particular the impact that the increase would have on registered seed growers.

I remember in Swan River a representative of the Registered Seed Growers Association indicated to me that 20 to 25 percent of the seed growers might be put out of business if the proposed fees were put into operation April 1st. Mr. Speaker, I think we have no alternative but to ask for a meeting, which is being asked for this morning, in order to pursue this matter because I had hoped, I had truly hoped, Mr. Speaker, that by this date of March 22nd we would have had an indication by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Michael Wilson, that there would be a withdrawal of these announced fees. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable members aren't well versed. The Minister of Finance indeed has announced the intention of increasing the user fees insofar as Canadians are concerned. Maybe the honourable members weren't aware of that.

So this is March 22nd, there are only eight days to go. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have no alternative but to ask, as indeed have other Premiers directly, other Premiers, Conservative Premiers, met with the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa asking, pleading with the Minister of Agriculture to withdraw this sharp increase in fees that according to our farmers in Manitoba might very well squeeze them out of operation.

**Topley, Robert - Racing Commission -
Contract extension**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism pertaining to the report that he issued yesterday on the Racing Commission and ask him if Mr. Robert Topley, who is the Supervisor of Racing, has had his contract extended by three years by the Racing Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any immediate extension, but I will take that question as notice and report back to the House as soon as possible.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I'd like to ask him if Charles Ibey, a senior judge who has been the centre of much of the controversy that is taking place between the standard-bred horsemen this past winter and the commission, will the Minister review the fact that Mr. Ibey can be a judge and he's been into a lot of controversy between the horsemen and see whether Mr. Ibey is suitable to be a judge for this coming summer harness racing season?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, without dealing with the assumptions of the Honourable Member for River Heights, I think I should indicate that I have met with the Chairman of the Racing Commission. We have obviously dealt with a number of issues, particularly the number of appeals and the number of court references, the number of fines imposed by the judges at the track. One of my questions was: how do we compare in terms of the commission and the activities of the judges with other operations throughout Canada?

We did an assessment; we are not out of line. There are a set of rules; they are imposed. We have to maintain the integrity of racing in Manitoba, that is the job of the judges and the commission.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that they are doing their job. We are seeing an improvement of the situation out there because of the co-operation of the commission and the owner. I must say, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the horse owners as well, both the thoroughbreds and the standard-breds, I think the situation is improving and there are no unusual circumstances at all with respect to the charges, to the fines that are being imposed by the judges.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the same Minister if he would agree to a meeting with the standard-bred horsemen without having the commission members present, so that the horsemen could speak to the Minister in a frank and open and honest manner and display their complaints that they have regarding the Racing Commission to the Minister, and to the Minister without the commission being present. Would the Minister undertake to having such a meeting with representatives of the standard-bred horsemen?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, for the honourable member's information, I have already written a letter to the new President of the Manitoba Harness Horsemen Incorporated inviting them to meet with me without staff. The staff as a matter of fact were in Portage, I believe, yesterday dealing with the refinement of the rules governing the standard-bred operations. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of co-operation.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that despite the controversy that has surrounded a number of individuals that some confusion and some circumstances which are not resolved yet, that in the letter that I received from the new president indicated that the harness horsemen were willing to work with the commission, that the controversy and the individuals involved did not necessarily represent the views of the Manitoba Harness Horsemen's Association.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a good deal of improvement in the circumstances, and I certainly would be prepared to meet and have indicated so by letter to Dr. Val Isman, the president.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information, that he is prepared to meet with the horsemen without having staff and commission personnel within the same room.

I'd ask the First Minister if he would be prepared to keep a commitment to Winnipeg horseman and lawyer Lawrence Greenberg and have a meeting with Mr. Greenberg. I understand that the First Minister has agreed to having a meeting with Mr. Greenberg regarding the difficulties in the horse racing industry facing the horsemen in Manitoba, but Mr. Greenberg has made six attempts to get a date for a meeting with the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. W. STEEN: Would the Premier tell the members on this side of the House whether he is prepared to meet with Mr. Lawrence Greenberg regarding the racing problems?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, I have met with Mr. Greenberg, met at some considerable length with Mr. Greenberg, listened attentively to his concerns, asked him if he could make any specific recommendations. He indicated he didn't have any at that time, he had some general concerns; we discussed those, and Mr. Greenberg clearly indicated that he represented a number of individuals, but certainly not the standard-bred industry, nor the Manitoba Harness Horsemen's Association.

**Tax Rebate Discounting - proposed
changes to**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. At the Federal-Provincial Conference of Ministers of Consumer and Corporate Affairs last month in Ottawa, you presented a discussion paper outlining proposed changes to tax rebate discounting. I was wondering if you could indicate whether there has been any action on those proposals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: There has been no action as yet, except I should indicate to the House in answer to that question that the proposals which I placed before my colleagues in Consumer and Corporate Affairs, including the Federal Minister, were very well received. The Federal Minister, Mr. Côté, indicated that he would shortly be forwarding to Provincial Ministers some proposals, particularly with respect to things like Child Tax Credits and things of that kind which certainly there is a consensus ought not to be subject to tax discounting. He indicated that some proposals would be forthcoming from himself and the Revenue Minister in a short period of time, and that when the Federal and Provincial and Territorial Ministers meet, as it happens here in Manitoba - we're hosting the annual meeting in September - by that time we probably can reach a consensus on some proposals in time to be reflected for the forthcoming tax year.

MR. S. ASHTON: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, in view of the fact that changes have not been made this year, whether there have been any complaints to the Minister's department, and more specifically, whether any prosecutions have been laid under the existing Federal Income Tax Act?

HON. R. PENNER: Under the Tax Discount Act, the Federal Tax Discount Act, yes, two. One that I can recollect in January where, indeed, a tax discounter was fined the minimum, which happens to be \$1,000 on five separate charges, and we believe that to that extent the law and its scale of punishment operates as a deterrent. That's not the main problem, however; the main problem is the system itself which allows 15 percent tax discounting and includes within the kind of thing that can be the subject of the discount things like Child Tax Credits. That is where an important social program is being eroded by a scheme which was originally thought to be helpful to some people who can benefit from quick returns that were not forthcoming from the rather slow collection and rebate system at the federal level. We think that improvements in that and improvements in the levels of tax discounting and improvements in what can be encompassed in tax discounting are forthcoming and will be helpful.

HERizons - grant provided

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Given that there are a number of good clean struggling magazines in Manitoba, and given that the Minister apparently has not paid much attention to their problems, can he confirm that he provided a special grant of \$10,000 to the militant feminists at HERizons magazine last summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I can confirm that there was a grant given to HERizons

magazine for a special issue sometime last year, a special cultural issue with regard to poetry and that of women writers in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister also confirm that this magazine is in fact heavily funded, and that Mr. Axworthy obtained for them two years ago a \$111,000 grant, a \$196,000 grant last year, and a \$212,000 grant this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. R. DOERN: Can he confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has poured half-a-million dollars into this magazine in the last three years?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Actions of the Federal Government are not within the administrative competence of this Minister. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point is simply this, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Minister — (Interjection) — well, wait until you hear the question. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that HERizons magazine has substantial monies available to it and doesn't need any money from the Provincial Government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question I would like to ask the Minister is this: would he be prepared to consider funding a good clean women's magazine in Manitoba, if approached?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The question, while obviously of interest, is hypothetical.

Brandon University - act re governance

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister of Education intend to introduce an act during this Session with respect to the governance of Brandon University?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the voice of the member opposite dropped just at the end of when he got to the question and I wasn't able to hear it.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that my voice dropped, I think her colleagues are making quite a bit of noise over there. I asked her whether she intended to introduce an act during this Session of the Legislature that would have respect to the governance of Brandon University.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated yesterday, when I was asked a question about another piece of legislation, and I have the same answer today - the legislation that is going to be introduced for education will be announced when I table it in the House.

Reduction in Revenue - reflection in Quarterly Report

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a question for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Minister of Finance and the First Minister have both indicated that there will be some \$35 million in income tax revenues lost to the government, I believe, during fiscal 1984-85. Can I ask the Minister of Finance whether or not that reduction in revenue is reflected in the Quarterly Report which was tabled by the Minister last night?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The receipts we have received so far are in line with the original projections. On the other hand, we have been informed by the Federal Government that considerably more than that \$35 million will be lost over the last three months of 1984-85. It looks like somewhere above \$80 million.

Of course, on the other side as a result of that, we receive extra funding from the Established Programs Financing Program for health and post-secondary education. This is something that's been happening right across the country. The member might have another question.

Lease of buildings - debt-servicing cost

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, further a question with respect to the leasing payment which it's shown in Estimates this year that the government will be paying some \$36 million to lease what used to be the government's own buildings back from a Crown corporation to which they have been sold, at least to a holding corporation. Will that 36 million, in effect, be a debt-servicing cost?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It certainly could be interpreted in that way, because basically what it's doing is paying the dividends on the preferred shares in the corporation, and certainly people could be justified in adding that on to the debt servicing, in a sense. In another sense, as I understand it, it's being done in a similar fashion to what other provinces, such as, British Columbia do their financing in.

Engineering Services Fees - increase in

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister indicate that the fees charged for engineering services to municipalities by the government have increased from \$75 an hour to \$175 an hour?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. The Department of Municipal Affairs provides no engineering services to municipalities. I think the member's question might be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Natural Resources, or any other department which provides services directly, but no such services are provided by my department, and therefore, there has been no such increase from my department.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister then, is he telling this House that he is not aware of an increase of \$75 an hour to \$175 an hour for the services that are being charged as Minister of Municipal Affairs?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked for confirmation. Not being the Minister responsible for Natural Resources, or any other department that provides engineering services, I am not going to confirm to this House and to the public the exact levels of fees.

I am aware that there have been some increases, yes. If the member seeks confirmation of that, and wants that, he should get it from the appropriate Minister.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister then, Mr. Speaker, does this Minister of Municipal Affairs support that kind of an increase of \$100 an hour?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is really not a proper question for Oral Question period. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

Water Power Rental Rates - revenue due to increase of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance. The Press today seems to be somewhat concerned, although I felt the opposition would be concerned as well, that water power rental rates were raised in the Budget last night. Could the Minister inform the House what amount of revenue the province expects to raise from this increase?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Approximately \$4 million, Mr. Speaker.

Water Power Rental Rates - impact on hydro rates

MR. P. EYLER: I have a question for the Minister of Energy. Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Energy inform this House of what he would expect the impact of that increase to be on hydro rates?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to deal with the question for the Member for River East. I must note that the opposition seems completely deflated by the excellent Budget presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, yesterday and have sagged very noticeably this morning in terms of asking questions regarding the Budget.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: In that respect, Mr. Speaker, Hydro is trying to be as productive as possible, and as efficient as possible, so I would expect the increase in water rental rate will have little or no impact. Hydro will attempt to try and make sure that it has as little an impact as possible, and hopefully no impact on future rate increases, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: They'll sweep the 4 million up off the floor, right?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, we'll just be a lot more efficient. We're trying to become efficient all the time. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Hydro is very efficient and will even become more efficient. Hydro is prepared to pay its fair share. I see people on the other side keep asking for more and more and more and, at the same time, complaining if they have to pay for it. We're quite willing to meet our fair share with respect to water rental rates.

Quality of Education - improvement of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Last week on a News Service release, the Minister indicated that one of her priorities this year would be to improve the quality of education. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Minister and government have finally come to the conclusion shared by most Manitobans that quality is lacking . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. C. MANNES: My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, was it the survey results within and without the Department of Education, or was it the terrible scores that were reached by the students within Winnipeg School Division No. 1, or was it some other reason that finally caused the Minister to come to the conclusion that quality of education is lacking within this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we have always been dealing with quality of education, we're just going to start talking about it more this year.

We also - I want to go on record as saying - have quality education in our classrooms right now. The students in Manitoba have never had better teachers, better facilities, better equipment and better programs.

We have more children that are in school, that are being taught, that are staying in school, that are completing school, that are going on to post-secondary education than have ever done before.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is always room for improvement, always. That improvement is in two areas. The improvement is to look to see what it is the public knows about what's going on, and to provide better information about the quality of education; and secondly, to look for the areas where there are deficiencies. In the coming months, I will be dealing with a number of issues that deal with both better public understanding about quality education, and improving the deficiencies that we recognize we have. We can always improve our system.

MR. C. MANNES: One more question, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 80 students of Grade 8 standing from the Parkside School. They are under the direction of Mr. Klassen, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I have a correction for Hansard for Friday, 15th of March, Page 166, the left-hand column, the seventh line where it refers to a speech of mine, ". . . victims of a great deal of social and economic justice." It should read injustice.

MR. SPEAKER: The correction is noted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is always a pleasure and a privilege to address the Budget Speech of last evening, and given the limited time that I've had to prepare for the response, I think there are a number of impressions that come from the Budget Speech in the manner in which the Minister delivered it.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Budget Speech, there is the overall impression created in one's mind of a Minister of Finance and an administration that is caught in a vortex of a whirlpool of its own creation. They are helplessly being tossed about by the current in trying to hang on before they're swallowed up by the results

of their own efforts of the first three-and-a-half years. So the best they can do after this three-and-a-half years in government is to give us a Budget that has a higher deficit, that has higher taxes and that has no increase or improvement in the fundamental public services that people look to their governments to provide.

Mr. Speaker, it only talks about unemployment and about the tragedy of unemployment which all of us recognize. It talks about job creation, but there is nothing in the speech that gives anybody the confidence and the optimism to expect that there will indeed be jobs created from the private sector investment in economic development, that we need in this province.

What an irony! This group, who in the fall of 1981, when they took government, were so brash. They talked about themselves being proactive. They said that they were going to change, revolutionize and improve everything in this province.

They talked about not being beholden to the bankers of the world. Now they have to structure the Budget in such a way - the Premier calls it, carefully crafted - so as not to offend the bond rating agencies. They had to go there ahead of time to make sure that what they might do wouldn't further downgrade our credit rating, which has already been downgraded this past year, had to go cap in hand to those bond rating agencies and now, further, for \$1.45 billion of borrowing expected this year will have to go on bended knee to the bondholders and the bond sellers in Zurich, New York and Tokyo. What irony, Mr. Speaker, for this group that said they wouldn't be beholden to the financial houses of the world.

They're giving us another huge deficit that robs from the workers, from those ordinary Manitobans who they say they choose to represent, and rewards the bondholders, those very people that they say are the problem in world finance today and in finance right across this country and here in Manitoba. It robs the workers, of course, because they're going to have to pay more taxes. But taxes for what purpose? To a greater and greater degree for the purpose of paying interest on deficits incurred, to provide services that have long since been consumed and over with, and people forget what those services were and what benefits they got out of them, and yet, they're still having to pay their tax money to pay the interest on those services long since consumed.

Mr. Speaker, it robs workers because more interest cost and, indeed, even on this deficit alone that's announced here in this Budget, that interest cost is probably going to be another \$60 million just on that one alone, and it's a great deal more, of course, on the cumulative \$1.85 billion of deficits that we've had in these four budgets of an NDP administration; and it robs the workers because their taxes going to pay interest means that they'll get less in the way of services from their government than they would otherwise have had if it had not been for those interest costs. It robs workers because, as well, that additional burden of interest means that less money can go towards stimulation, incentives for long-term job creation in the private sector.

What irony, that these idealogues sitting opposite are now eating humble pie. Those who said that they wouldn't be beholden to the financiers of the world are indeed in that very position, kneeling before them to

seek their continued good grace so that they can try and preserve that credit rating of theirs.

Mr. Speaker, in several places in the Budget, the Minister of Finance referred to the fact that he and his government know what Manitobans want. He said they've told this government that they want to live and work with dignity and purpose. They want a safe working environment. They want a province we can respect and learn from each other.

Well, I'd like to tell the Minister of Finance and the Premier and the others who have spoken about knowing what Manitobans want, that I too have travelled through this province extensively in more than 50 of the 57 constituencies in the last 15 months alone, Mr. Speaker. I've listened to what the people are saying, to what they're asking, and I have an understanding of what they want too. The most commonly asked question as you go through this province is: when is the next election?

So what they're really looking for, not only the things that the Minister of Finance has said in his Budget, they want this, they want that, they want the other thing, but they really want an opportunity to change dramatically and fundamentally, the outlook, the priorities, the opportunities for future work and future investment in this province and the only way they can have it is by calling a provincial election, and what they really want, Mr. Speaker, is a provincial election - fast.

Mr. Speaker, people talk about this government and it's interesting, there are certain words that keep surfacing when they talk about this administration. They talk about incompetence, of course, and we all know that. But they talk about lack of integrity. They talk about manipulation, and we heard it again last evening from people who were in the gallery and listened specifically because of special interest in certain things that they hoped the government would do by way of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, they tell us all of these things and they talk about all of these things and they say, we really just want an opportunity to get rid of this bunch in government. They play their games in the question period and they try and puff up their confidence and the jousting that goes back and forth is to try and raise the level of confidence of the Premier and the Finance Minister, and they quote each other in their speeches, and they become the authorities that they present to the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you about some of the things that we know for the people of this province - and I would hope that somebody will pass this along to the Member for River East who stepped up today again and asked some planted questions - to try and do something for the government, and we now know why because recently we've been doing some public opinion survey, and we found out about certain things in River East, Mr. Speaker. The Member for River East has a problem.

We found, Mr. Speaker, that two of the people who were considering candidacy for the Progressive Conservative Party in River East to run against this Member for River East have a higher recognition rating than he does, and he has been the member for three-and-a-half years, and the New Democrats are running substantially behind in River East, as everybody, of course, would understand. One of the prime reasons

is, people don't know who he is and what he does in this administration. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson, as usual, is leading with his chin. He says that I have the same problem; it's a recognition factor.

Mr. Speaker, that was a topic that the Premier used on a number of times when he took personal umbrage about things that I have been doing over the past, and it's reported that at the NDP annual meeting a month or so ago, the Premier, in regaling the audience, said that Gary Filmon, the Leader of the Opposition, has a low recognition factor. In fact, he said the Conservative Party was going to have commercials, these American Express commercials coming up; and it's one of those in which the person holds up the credit card and says, "Hi, you don't know who I am," and we were going to do it and it was going to be "Hi, you don't know who I am; I am Gary Filmon, Leader of the Opposition," and everybody in the New Democratic convention thought that was a riot, Mr. Speaker.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Ed Broadbent thought your name was Filmore.

A MEMBER: Well, that's Broadbent. He doesn't get anything straight, does he?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, Ed Broadbent hasn't gotten anything right yet, so I am not surprised.

Anyways what the Premier was referring to was the fact that in public opinion polling that's been done, 9 out of 10 people in this province know who he is and only 3 out of 4 in that same polling know who I am. But what he doesn't tell his members, Mr. Speaker, is in that same polling, although 9 out of 10 people know who he is, 2 out of 3 don't want him to be Premier.

Mr. Speaker, that's a problem. There are others over there who have a problem and we see signs of it. We see signs of how it's being addressed by this administration, they have all of a sudden become very very political in decisions they make. When they are making cuts, they are making them in areas that are held by Conservatives. The Portage School is one example. When they are doing things, Mr. Speaker, for a specific purpose to help people, they do it to help specific people in their caucus and we see a great deal of money being poured in to support the Minister of Agriculture.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is that last evening we nominated somebody to run against the Minister of Agriculture in the forthcoming election in the Interlake constituency, that is, if he chooses to run. A lot of us have our doubts about it because last evening over 1,500 people turned out in Eriksdale at a nominating meeting to nominate the Progressive Conservative candidate to run against the Minister of Agriculture. There were six candidates and there are over 2,000 Progressive Conservative members in his constituency today, Mr. Speaker, and they have joined in the movement that's taking place, that's sweeping this province because they want to get rid of this bunch so badly that all of them are going to put their efforts forward to that task.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could bring the members to order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I am obviously getting to the members opposite. I think it's important that we ought to get their attention, Mr. Speaker, because there are many problems that have to be faced and they are not being faced by virtue of the messages that we got in the Throne Speech.

The Throne Speech talks about jobs and job creation and goes through a series of statistics that seem to indicate that the government is proud of its record and happy with what exists in Manitoba today. They seem to be content with private sector investment because they say that it's up to levels that are very very impressive and they are delighted with it.

Mr. Speaker, during their term of government we have lost more than 10,000 jobs in manufacturing alone; and that's between December 1981 and December 1984. The figure has dropped from the range of 65,000 to around 55,000 and that is a significant drop, Mr. Speaker. Now they have said, of course, and I have heard the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Minister of Finance and others talk about the fact that, of course, we have increased the number of jobs in the service sector. Well, they may be happy with that but I question whether or not the people of Manitoba are happy with that because the difference between jobs in the manufacturing sector and jobs in the service sector is a very substantial difference in terms of economic income.

The average wage in December 1983 in the manufacturing sector, Mr. Speaker, was \$370 per week; the average wage in the service sector was \$292 per week - 370 versus 292. They are happy with giving people service jobs and losing manufacturing jobs, and we're losing them by the thousands; in fact, 10,000 the first three years of this administration, Mr. Speaker. They didn't address that and they didn't address it all because they have no answers for it. Indeed, that doesn't fit in with their plans and they selectively quote statistics. They selectively quote now from Statistics Canada rather than the Conference Board and I will address that in just a few minutes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they have created here in Manitoba a climate that is hostile to private investment. It is hostile to business and job creation. We have heard all about the various aspects of it.

The Minister of Finance is content to say that they know what the people want, that they are happy that they have come forward with another \$500 million deficit. He calls it a "good" Budget. In fact, he says it's a "dream" Budget. The Premier said that it was a well-crafted Budget. Well, there is no shortage of modesty over there, Mr. Speaker. In fact, as has become the case over recent major announcements, they have taken to quoting each other as their sources of support and as their sources of expertise, Mr. Speaker. The self-congratulatory nature of that Budget Speech is something that we haven't seen in the past.

Referring to comments on social democracy, they referred to the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade

and Technology as the new world expert on social democracy. I question whether or not the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology really knows what he's doing when he lauds economies and unemployment rates of various social democratic countries in the world. Has he really checked into some of the differences and similarities in these countries that he says are models for social democracy? Does he really want us to have what they have in Sweden - the low-unit employment rates, the low-unit wage costs that they have there compared to here? Does he really feel that it would be advantageous for Manitoba? Does he really feel that the tax rates that they have in Sweden would be advantageous for Manitoba?

What about West Germany? He lauds West Germany as a model in terms of their low unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker. But what do they do with their workers, Mr. Speaker? They have an unusual system there of what's called guest workers - people who are brought in from outside the country - on temporary work permits, who leave when the work is over. In the middle of a term with their families in school, they have to leave the country when the job expires, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of brutal system that he says should be used as an example for Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. That's what we hear from these people. That's the kind of example they want to use of care, compassion, consideration; that's their example that they want to use of social democracy.

Mr. Speaker, they can't even find a suitable person as a reference, as an expert, so they have to turn to somebody within their own benches and quote their Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

Well, I'll just give them another quote from somebody who is a social democrat friend of theirs, James Laxer, who is the federal NDP research director and he said, not too long ago, just where would the NDP notion of economic recovery lead if it were actually implemented - to a sky-rocketing deficit in manufactured products trade, to a disastrous balance of payments situation, to a falling dollar, to higher interest rates. Indeed, the First Minister said that a falling dollar was something that you agreed with when he was at the First Ministers' Conference in Regina. — (Interjection) — Laxer said, Mr. Speaker, anyone who doubts these consequences — (Interjection) — Laxer, their former research director, said anyone who doubts — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Laxer concluded, Mr. Speaker, in referring to their philosophy and their economic outlook, he said that anyone who doubts these consequences need only refer to the experience of France in the first year of the Mitterrand Government. Mr. Speaker, we continue to have all of the negative disincentives to job creation and expansion in our economy.

The payroll tax, Mr. Speaker, labour legislation that is being quoted by union leaders as being the reason why businesses can't continue to operate in this province, why businesses have to move right out of this province and relocate elsewhere. Even their own union leaders are stating that their labour legislation is the cause of these moves outside the province.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the CCL, it was quoted by my colleague in the House a couple of weeks ago during the Budget Debate.

Mr. Speaker, they continue to have surcharges on personal income taxes. The only companies that they can convince to stay here, or to locate here and, in many cases, they're buying even the jobs that are already here.

They talked about Westeel-Rosco and, Mr. Speaker, they're paying Westeel-Rosco to help them in a consolidation that will actually reduce the total number of jobs that Westeel-Rosco has in this province. But they will keep a small percentage of those jobs with massive government input of money. That's what it's come to in this province because of the disincentives, the negatives that they have introduced into our province.

They talked about corporate welfare in the past and they said that the government should never grants. In fact, Alexa McDonough, the leader of the New Democratic Party in Nova Scotia said, while she was here, that the Nova Scotia Conservative Government was buying jobs in Nova Scotia, giving grants to private companies. What she didn't realize is that her own soulmates right here in the New Democratic administration are doing as much and more. They're now having to pay more for people to stay here. They're offering upwards of \$30,000 per job for people to come here, and that's private sector people, that's private sector investment. The people that they say they're not so sure about because, you know, they're not paying their fair share of taxes. They're a drain on the economy; they're corporate welfare bums. All of those things that they say about them today they're desperately trying to buy their support to stay here for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, they appear to be satisfied with the continuing shift of dependency off private capital spending on to public capital spending. They talk about the increase in capital spending in Manitoba and how some of it is an increase in private capital spending. But, if you look at the facts, if you look at the record, you'll find that in 1981 private capital investment in Manitoba — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If there are some members who wish to conduct a private debate, perhaps they would do so outside the Chamber. In the meantime, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your caution and I hope that members opposite will take heed of your advice.

I'm sorry that I've touched a sensitive cord with the Minister of Tourism and Small Business because, when he was up north a couple of months ago, he was embarrassed when I refuted all of the things that he was saying in front of an audience up there and he continues to be sensitive to those things. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking about the continuing shift of dependency of this administration off private capital investment and on to public capital investment and I was making the comparison between the proportion of capital investment in Manitoba that

was private in 1981, versus the proportion of private investment today in 1985. It was 71 percent of the total capital investment in 1981 that was private capital investment and today, 1985, it's 63.6 percent, a dramatic drop of almost 10 percent.

They talk about prudent fiscal management in the Budget Speech. The people who manage themselves wisely and prudently add over 1.8 billion to the deficit in three years. In three years they increased the total debt of the province by 140 percent, a 140 percent increase in just three years of their administration, of all the debt that had been accumulated for all time previously in this province. Is that prudent management? Is that the way you manage the resources of a province? Do they call it prudent management, Mr. Speaker, when they spend, even in their fourth year - it's gone three years previously and we thought that maybe they'd come to their senses - but even in their fourth Budget, they still spend 16 percent more than they take in? How many families, how many ordinary Manitoba farmers could take that kind of economics into their home life, that they could continually spend 16 percent more than they're taking in income?

Is it prudent fiscal management that resulted in our credit rating being downgraded last year for the first time in over a decade? Is it prudent fiscal management that has led them to the position where they are so vulnerable that they always have to throw themselves at the mercy of the bankers and the bond holders and the rating agencies of this country? Mr. Speaker, the people who manage themselves wisely and properly disestablish their entire housing department by an Order-in-Council and then a couple of weeks later, have to pass an Order-in-Council to re-establish the Department of Housing, and then a week later come forward and tell us it was all a mistake. That's prudent management. Mr. Speaker, is it prudent fiscal management to put yourself in a position of this year having to borrow from the lending agencies 1.45 billion to continue the operations of their administration?

You know, the Budget refers to projected growth rates for this coming year 1985 and, all of a sudden, their expert has become Statistics Canada. They've totally ignored the Conference Board. They've always referred to the Conference Board in the past as being their chief source of objective information on the economy. — (Interjection) — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says, "Don't be silly." I have a copy of a speech he gave to the Manitoba Outlook Conference last October. Manitoba Outlook Conference which was put on by the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce. In that speech, no fewer than five times, he refers to the Conference Board statistics for Manitoba. Today, he won't even talk about it, he won't address it. Not one person on those benches during the Throne Speech Debate mentioned the Conference Board statistics and what they mean.

A MEMBER: Why would that be?

MR. G. FILMON: Why? Well, I'll tell you why, because what he used to say was the most objective analyst of growth rates and economic activity in the country, the Conference Board, this year is projecting that Manitoba will have the lowest growth rate of any

province in the country. At 1.6 percent, we're going to be almost a full percentage point below the national average, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, moreso than that, and I quote from the Conference Board what they said about Manitoba's prospects for this year. Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board says in its most recent report about Manitoba's prospects for this coming year: "Many of the province's largest manufacturing industries, food processing, clothing, and agricultural machinery, for instance, have not participated in the general manufacturing resurgent. The problems facing these industries will persist in 1985, and progress in Manitoba's manufacturing sector will be slim once again." That's after three years in which they have already lost 10,000 jobs and over 200 manufacturing firms from our base.

Mr. Speaker, it includes the major focus of both the Throne Speech and the Budget. That takes into account this Conference Board report, Limestone, because it says here: "A major factor in this forecast is the assumed start of work on the multi-billion dollar Limestone Hydro-Electric Project. In total - that's including Limestone - "Manitoba's real growth is forecast to be 1.6 percent this year." It includes the Jobs Fund; it includes everything that's in that Budget and that Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and it is still going to be the lowest growth rate in the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer further to growth rates. In his speech on the Throne Speech Debate, the Premier said that: "In fact, in 1980, we had a drop in the economic growth in the Province of Manitoba when the rest of the country was doing well." He was talking about how bad things were under the previous Conservative administration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't recall that drop in growth rate, so I went to the Conference Board statistics, again the most recently available ones, to look at the gross domestic product in Manitoba. It shows that in all of the years between 1977 and 1985, there was only one year in which we had an actual drop in our gross domestic product, and that was 1982 under his administration when it dropped by 2.9 percent.

In fact, in the four years under our administration, Mr. Speaker, it increased by 5.9 percent, and in the four years, including the projection for this year, under this administration it's only increased 3.7 percent; 5.9 under the years that he said weren't good, and 3.7 under the years that he says were great. Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly depends on your perspective, and even this Premier can't keep his statistics straight with all of the research staff that he says he has.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about how good the economy is, and he ignores totally what has happened with the deficits that I referred to earlier. He ignores totally the fact that there are still 20,000 more people unemployed today in Manitoba than when his administration took government; ignores totally the fact that there have been 966 business bankruptcies since they took government. I read the litany of failures of businesses into the record in the past.

Mr. Speaker, a total of 154 farm families have declared bankruptcy, and the Minister of Agriculture told us that, for every one that declared bankruptcy, there were three others that voluntarily liquidated and went out of farming.

Mr. Speaker, welfare cases, they've always said what an indicator that is. In fact, the NDP in British Columbia

are trying to make hay of the welfare rolls, the size of the welfare rates and rolls in British Columbia, saying that, you know, the evidence there is of the disaster under a Social Credit administration. Well, here's some evidence that we'll send to British Columbia to see whether or not Mr. Skelly is willing to try and tell his people in British Columbia why in Manitoba, in 1981, the City of Winnipeg had 2,436 welfare cases and, three years later by 1984, it had risen to 7,259. That's a 197 percent increase in the welfare rolls in Winnipeg under this administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said, what about the increase in private capital expenditures in Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, let me tell him that even with the projections for 1985 taken into account of some increase, of some recovery, very very slight or slim, as it's said by the Conference Board, that the investment in manufacturing for this year, 1985 versus what it was in 1981, it's still 21 percent less

A MEMBER: Capital investment.

MR. G. FILMON: Capital investment, that's right. Mr. Speaker, the capital investment in utilities and communications, another very important part of our gross provincial product, is still less than it was in 1981.

Where has the progress been? Where have all of these successes of New Democratic administration been? Mr. Speaker, I thought that Budget Speech was perhaps one of the most partisan that I have heard in history. This Minister of Finance didn't refer to it as the government, he kept referring to it as a New Democratic Party administration. He wanted to emphasize the partisanship that he felt was behind the things that were happening in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we agree that there is a great deal of partisanship behind the policies and the decisions of this administration.

He said, and his Premier has said over the course of recent debates, and they've repeated it for months now, that Manitoba is a model for the rest of the country in terms of economic development. Mr. Speaker, I say to them, ask the Conference Board what they think about that statement, the model.

Mr. Speaker, ask Terry Sargeant and Laverne Lewycky who campaigned on that slogan during the federal election this summer in Manitoba. Ask them whether they believe that Manitoba is a model for the rest of the country and if that's the reason that they are where they are today, out of government. Ask the people of this province whether or not we're a model for the rest of the country, and they'll tell you, no.

A MEMBER: Ask them whether they want an election.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this administration piously likes to talk about its commitments to spending money in education, social services and various other areas that they believe they have a corner on the market of concern for. Many will recall in the late '70s that people from the New Democratic Party in opposition got involved in a major major issue, a public issue that they trumped up that said that Manitoba wasn't spending its legitimate proportion of federal transfer income on the things that it was supposed to, principally

on health and post-secondary education. At that time, they said that - horrors! - the Conservative administration was diverting some of the federal transfer monies into roads; into roads, they said, and other things that were not a priority for this province at that time.

Well a report has just been released in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and the report is called: "Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada." The author of the report was an individual by the name of Al Johnson. It was commissioned under the Liberal administration. Many will remember Mr. Johnson as the former head of the CBC in Canada. He did an analysis of what the provinces do with the federal transfer of monies under the EPF transfers to post-secondary education.

He took the provincial operating grants in 1977-78, and compared them with 1984-85. He found, Mr. Speaker, that in 1977-78 the proportion of federal funding that was being spent in post-secondary education was 80.3 percent. So of all of the EPF transfers for post-secondary education, 80.3 percent of it was federal money going into post-secondary education in Manitoba. That was in 1977-78. In 1984-85 it is 102.9 percent. In other words, all of the funding for post-secondary education in this province is federal and another 2.9 is being diverted into advertising.

Talk about manipulation, Mr. Speaker; talk about deception, doublespeak. Here are the people who are committed to funding post-secondary education and health, and are taking all of the federal monies and even siphoning some of them off, not even putting all of the federal monies into it - post-secondary education. Mr. Speaker, that was released in Ottawa last Friday. But I am surprised that this Minister of Education, that this Minister of Finance have not commented on this.

A MEMBER: Wait till the students at the universities hear this.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, over this period of time, between 1977-78 and 1984-84, Manitoba has had the third highest reduction in their usage of their funds. They have increased the proportion of federal funding the third highest, Mr. Speaker. That's what's happening.

These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who said in the past that they were opposed to taking federal funds and diverting them for other purposes and they are doing it. They are not putting their share in and they are the ones who rased the issue in the late '70s and they have done nothing about it. In fact, it's worse.

Mr. Speaker, talking about doublespeak and misleading, some of the people who were in the gallery last evening were here for the purpose of finding out what this administration was going to do to help some of the areas of their particular concern and amongst them were people from the heavy construction industry.

The heavy construction industry has had a tremendous reduction in the numbers of construction firms, in the volume of work, ever since these people have been in government because they have systematically reduced their proportion of the Budget and their commitments to highways construction in this province. As a result, 13 major firms have gone out of

business entirely in Manitoba in the three years that they have been in office; and those who are here are now having most of their work outside of the province.

Now they know all about that because this group, the heavy construction industry, gave them the reports, met with them privately and gave them all of this information. Well, they were here in the gallery last evening to listen to the Budget in hopes that there would be something of encouragement in there because they are big employers, big investors and very very important to the economy of this province.

When the Minister of Finance talked about the fact that there was something like 20-odd million - 26, 28 million more being spent than they took in, in revenues in highways, they thought this must mean we are going to get more. Then they waited and they waited and they waited until they actually got the Budget numbers. They found that as part of the Budget this Minister has actually added taxes to fuel and added certain licence fees and things that have increased the take from this administration by \$24 million - \$24 million dollars as a result of this Budget - more coming out in so-called user fees from the automobile, construction, highways sort of side of things, the highway side of things, and they put \$2 million more into highway construction. They are taking \$24 million out and putting \$2 million more in.

So we asked them, how does the Minister come up with his figures that say they are actually putting a great deal more into highways than they are taking out? Well, he said, it's very interesting. He ignores the revenue from licence fees and he ignores the revenue from the automobile registration in the province. In fact, if he took that into account, the analysis would be entirely different. So they said, in sitting here listening, we now understand what you people have to put up with, with this doublespeak that goes on.

Mr. Speaker, other people were here and listened to the Budget. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business, for one, had a representative here. The Premier spoke earlier this Session, during the Throne Speech Debate, about how important the development of small business in this province was. He talked about the job creation that came from small business and I agree with him wholeheartedly. As a matter of fact the statistics show, Mr. Speaker, that two-thirds of all the jobs that are created in Canada are created by businesses that were fewer than 20 employees 20 years ago - that's a very significant number, very impressive - and it says that we are a nation and we are a province that has been built on the development of small business. You only need look at some of our largest companies in Manitoba and you know that a generation or two ago many of them were small family-owned corporations, and today they are world-wide in stature, they are international in their influence and their investments and everything else, they're into 50 and 100 millions of dollars and they started as small family-owned operations a generation or two ago.

A MEMBER: They are the Versatiles.

MR. G. FILMON: That's right, they're the Versatiles of this world. They are the Tan Jays of this world. They are the Monarch industries of this world. They are the

Richardsons. They are all of these people who started with family-owned corporations that have grown into world-wide stature, Mr. Speaker, development firms that are doing almost all their investment outside of Manitoba, whether it be Lakeview, whether it be Imperial, whether it be so many of those other firms who are now not investing in Manitoba because the opportunities aren't here, because there isn't a climate that allows small business to grow into large and large business to continue to prosper. It's not here.

Of course, these people who the Premier just said last week were very important to Manitoba, these small business people, what did they say about the Budget last evening? Well, here's what the representative of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Botting.

Botting scored the government for its big brother approach with grants and handouts, development agreements and Jobs Fund. Top of the list for small business is the hated payroll tax, repository of the worst of the government's sins according to small business. "That tax is extremely unfair," he said. "Yet it comes from a government that says it wants tax reform and fairness. Unlike corporate taxes, the payroll tax is levied regardless of whether or not the small business has made a profit."

So that's what the people who could create and would create employment, investment, job activity in this province, small business people, that's what they say about this administration and its policies. So I have to say that the Premier and the Minister of Finance obviously didn't ask the right people when they've come up with their policies in the past because what they've done has created nothing more than disincentives and roadblocks to investment and growth in our province.

Where are their priorities? Let's take a look at some of the clues that we might get in looking at the things that were released last evening in the Budget in the Estimates: Management and administrative salaries in the Executive Council increased by over .25 million; Business Development and Tourism expenditures are down by \$2.1 million, Mr. Speaker. That's because, of course, we've got the new Minister here who knows everything that needs to be done in this province in Business Development and Tourism and because he knows, he can cut the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the funding for CRISP programs, now this is the program, Child Related Income Support Program that gives low income families additional support to be able to make their way in the world today under difficult times. This CRISP program has had a reduction of \$353,000 this year. That's because they have changed the rules to disenfranchise and disallow 1,000 farm families from getting CRISP assistance. These are the people who are concerned about the welfare of the farmers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we were talking, and we heard the Minister of Health saying he agreed with some of the things I was saying about promoting well-being and health in this province, changing the focus of just treating the sick and putting it on to improving the health of the people who are already well and keeping them healthy for longer periods of time. He said he agreed with me, but they are very committed to that, they have been doing this and, Mr. Speaker, they haven't changed the Budget on it. They're not spending any more money on that particular sector.

Dental Services are down \$1.4 million. Now we know what that is, and that's because they refused to give the Children's Dental Health Program to the people of Brandon. That's their confrontative attitude. They say, our way, or the doorway, you wouldn't get the Children's Dental Health program in Brandon because we say to you that it either has to be implemented by the dental nurses or not at all.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Minister of Finance talked about confidence and optimism. In fact, the Premier challenged us on this side saying, that we keep being negative; and he says they, the Conservatives, are not confident and optimistic about Manitoba and Manitobans. He has said this repeatedly, and some of his Ministers have said it during the Session. Well, Mr. Speaker, he fails to understand. We are indeed confident and optimistic about Manitoba and its opportunities for the future. It is this administration in which we have no confidence and no optimism, no optimism that they could do anything.

Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge better than anyone that there are resources here that can be developed for the long-term benefit of all Manitobans. The Hydro resources that we've spent so much time talking about, are Hydro resources that shouldn't be developed to export the energy and the jobs to the United States. They should be developed to have the jobs come here, to attract energy-intensive industry. We should be attracting heavy energy-intensive users: aluminum smelters, magnesium production, hydrogen, aerospace, high tech, all of these things, Mr. Speaker, but we are not; and we're not because they continue to add to the debt load and the rates of Manitoba Hydro in a manner that reduces the incentive for people to come in here by virtue of an attractive energy price.

Mr. Speaker, we know that it can be done. We know that confidence and optimism should be here because we have a strong vibrant and energetic work force; people who have a strong work ethic; people who have themselves attracted investment here because of the reputation that the Manitoba work force has outside of this province. We compete in textiles with third world countries. We compete with third world countries in mining because of our productive work force and our strong management.

We have the entrepreneurial talent. I talked about so many small enterprises that have risen to become large multimillion dollar operations right here in Manitoba, and we continue to have those opportunities, Mr. Speaker.

We have water resources, water resources that are largely undeveloped for tourism purposes, that are for secondary processing, because in many cases the water isn't in the area of the province in which it could be most productively used, and that might require some long-term investment, in dams, in canals and other things, Mr. Speaker.

We have various different mineral resources that are still in the ground waiting for investment capital and markets to be developed. I remember the Minister of Finance when he was the critic in 1981 with respect to some of the projects that were coming into Manitoba, and they talked about us being negative. I remember the Minister of Finance when he was then just the Member for Rossmere, and he was criticizing our entering into potash development in this province with

International Minerals and Chemical Corporation, and he argued that we weren't getting a good enough return in terms of royalties.

His argument was that Saskatchewan had a higher royalty rate, or was going to have a higher royalty rate and therefore get a better return. He totally ignored the fact that our deposits were a little less in quality, and that there would be a greater investment today in developing the mine than there was when Saskatchewan developed those mines. In fact, in order for there to be an opportunity to get any economic return, that those rates had to bear some relationship to the ability of the investor to get some return.

So he said, and I can't remember if it was a couple of percentage points different, two or three was his argument, that we should be getting the same rate as Saskatchewan. So rather than get a percentage of hundreds of millions of dollars coming out of the potash industry, which would have taken place were IMC investing here in 1981, today we're getting three percent more of zero.

A MEMBER: One hundred percent of nothing.

MR. G. FILMON: Zero. That's what we're getting because his administration took the attitude that we'll squeeze them for an extra couple of percent of royalty, Mr. Speaker, and ignore their opportunity for a rate of return and get no investment. We were talking at that time \$600 million investment in a potash mine, but he said, no. Well, that was their positive attitude in 1981 towards things that were being done by the then-Conservative administration.

Mr. Speaker, how can the people of Manitoba have confidence in this administration? How can we, on this side, have confidence in this administration when we see all around us the signs of waste and mismanagement; when we see the losses of Flyer Industries, of Manfor, the mismanagement of McKenzie Seeds, the conflict of interest and all sorts of problems that have torn that company apart, Mr. Speaker, under this administration, and their politically motivated operatives who they have put on boards and put in a position of running these operations?

Mr. Speaker, talk about positive. I was just reviewing from my own memory the little manifesto that was produced in 1980 by the Member for Brandon East, who at that time did his analysis of Manitoba and its prospects in its economy. I want to tell you, if you can find one positive word in this analysis, then I'll eat this paper.

Mr. Speaker, he was so negative, so destructive about Manitoba, so uncomplimentary about Manitoba, that it was unbelievable. What a shame. Mr. Speaker, it's incredible that today these people are proud of a 1.6 percent growth rate in 1985, when that growth rate in 1981, when they said it wasn't good enough, that growth rate in 1981 was 4.2 percent, I believe.

A MEMBER: 4.7.

MR. G. FILMON: It was over 4 percent, and they said it wasn't good enough. They tore it down and were negative about everything that happened. Every time a mega project was announced in this House,

negotiations, whatever, they jumped on it, Mr. Speaker, and now they have the audacity to tell us that we aren't demonstrating the kind of confidence and optimism that we ought to be in Manitoba! We're confident and optimistic in Manitoba and in Manitobans but not in this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on, just briefly, a couple of other things. One, specifically, is a matter that has taken a great deal of attention in debate already in the House and undoubtedly will continue to be debated - the issue of the advancement of construction of the Limestone Generating Station, the commission of development of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Energy and Mines, have been hammering away at the opposition because they appeared as interveners before the National Energy Board. They keep saying that they are negative interveners, Mr. Speaker. In fact, they plant questions with the Member for Concordia to stand up and say, who are the interveners? Mr. Speaker, would you name the interveners, he said to the Minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, you rightfully ruled it out of order at the time. I'll tell the Member for Concordia who the interveners were.

These people, who they wanted to deny the right to appear before the National Energy Board, deny the right to ask questions, to seek information and to be assured that this government and the Manitoba Hydro were proceeding in the proper manner; that's what these people went for before, and they say, Mr. Speaker, that they should not have been able to do that. They call them negative interveners. I will tell them who they were, Chief Walter Monias of the Manitoba Keewatinowi Okemakanac, Inc. which is a group of Northern Indian Bands. Those people, Mr. Speaker, appeared legitimately as concerned citizens of this province, and they say they had no right, that they're negative interveners. They shouldn't have been asking the questions. That's what they called them, Mr. Speaker.

We had people coming from the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, from the Ministry of Resources in Quebec. We had the Consumers Association of Canada represented by Arne Peltz. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Manitobans represented in the Consumers Association of Canada, and they say that they were negative interveners and shouldn't have been there. Some of the things that they're quoting from are directly from the questions asked by the Consumers Association. They say silence them, they're negative, they had no right to ask those questions.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of hammering away, that kind of intimidation tactic, to say that anybody who appeared before the National Energy Board was wrong to have appeared, was wrong to ask questions, is the kind of tactic that they may get away with in a totalitarian environment, but I want to tell you - thank God! - we don't have that here.

Thank God Manitobans can go before a public body in a democratic forum and ask questions of their government, ask questions of the people to whom they pay the taxes, the people to whom they pay their Hydro bills, ask questions about their development plans and about the elements that go into this, but these people say, no, they have no right, they're negative, they are bad for Manitoba.

There are others who came before them: the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Association, Hydro Quebec, the

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He had no right to ask questions before that body. That's what the members of this New Democratic administration say.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Energy for Ontario, Ontario Hydro, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Northern Flood Committee representing thousands of Northerners, they had no right to appear according to this New Democratic administration. The Mennonite Central Committee of Canada, they had no right to appear according to this administration. Mr. Speaker, the Crossroads Resource Group, the Manitoba Environmental Council, negative interveners according to these people, no right to ask questions. That's the kind of administration we have.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Percy Mink, on behalf of the Easterville Indian Band; Moose Lake Indian Band, Grand Rapids Indian Band, The Pas Indian Band, Grand Rapids Special Forebay Committee, they had no right to appear before the National Energy Board. According to these people, they're negative interveners and they're bad for Manitoba. That's what they say, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — and of course, Donald W. Craik.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please.

The Member for Concordia on a point of order.

MR. P. FOX: The matter of privilege is that the honourable member is imputing that those people, negative interveners, had no right, and he's attributing it back to me. I say that is wrong, he has no right to attribute that to me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that kind of harassment will not work with us. You're not going to stop us from asking questions. You're not going to stop us from asking for information and from putting the truth on the record.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

Does the Member for Concordia have a point of order?

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, and of course there were two other interveners that the Minister of Energy wanted to have on the record, and I'll put them on the record: Donald W. Craik, the former Minister of Energy and Mines, the former Minister of Finance; and the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, what did they say during the past number of days? They have said that the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba appeared as negative interveners before the National Energy Board, was opposed to the sale.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, they said that the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba appeared as negative interveners before the board. This Minister, who was not there, Mr. Speaker, at any time during the proceedings, said that we went to oppose him. Well, I'd like to put on the record quotations from what we said before the board, Mr. Speaker.

"The Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba supports in principle the interconnection of Manitoba's power systems with neighbouring systems in Canada and the USA, and the sale or exchange of power and energy on a mutually advantageous basis." Negative? I wouldn't say so.

We further said: "Our interest in the matter before the board stems from a desire to gain an understanding of and to support any reasonable exchange, sale or commitment of energy resources by Manitoba Hydro which would result in long-term . . ."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: . . . benefits to the power consumers, the public and the industrial economy of Manitoba, Canada or our neighbours in the USA."

Mr. Speaker, I remind you this was said in October. It has nothing to do with incidents that have taken place since. Mr. Speaker, further we said: "Until we have had the opportunity to participate in the hearings, our support of the sale of firm power to NSP remains conditional."

We did say that we objected to the applicant's call for urgency to advance the construction of Limestone by up to two years, and we gave reasons why, Mr. Speaker. But we said: "Our objections to the applicant's call for urgency . . . - and the call for urgency was in the advancement - ". . . in no way implies opposition to the sale of power and energy to the NSP system. NSP has been and remains a natural customer and supplier of power and energy to Manitoba Hydro."

Is that a negative intervention, I ask, Mr. Speaker? We went there to ask questions, because we believed, Mr. Speaker, that alternative development sequences, not sequences so much as timing, would have been more advantageous to the people of Manitoba, and we still believe that because the NEB never did refute that point of view.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that our position has never been refuted, that our position has never been addressed was that it was outside of the terms of reference of the National Energy Board to look at alternate development sequences and scheduling. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about that, all we have to do is to read from the statement that the Minister of Energy put before the House just the other day. It gave the three terms of reference of the National Energy Board.

Those were very simply to make sure that the power wasn't required in Canada. So the National Energy Board said they qualify on that. They said they had to make sure that the price of sale to Northern States Power was less than the price it would be charged to Canadian customers, to Manitoba customers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are selling it at the system rate, they are comparing it. The National Energy Board's

frame of reference is to compare it to the system average rate. In the system average rate, that's the rate that tells you what you're going to be paying in Manitoba at the time of the sale, and they're satisfied that Northern States Power will be paying more than we're paying in Manitoba. But you have to recognize that it isn't just the cost of energy that's produced by Limestone. That's the cost of the entire integrated system and that includes, energy that's being produced by all the plants on the Winnipeg River that have been long since paid for, long since amortized and today are producing energy at less than one cent a kilowatt hour, that includes power that's being put into the system by things like the Grand Rapids Project that was developed in the early '60s, again at a very much lower rate of cost than the ones we're building today on the Nelson River. It might be something in the range of a cent or two a kilowatt hour. They all come into the mix to give you your average system rate and that's what the National Energy Board compares their sale price to.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, what we're doing in that respect, is we're giving the benefit to the American customers. Of all of the development that has taken place for decades, for generations, that has arrived at a low cost of operation from all of the various components in the system, the plants on the Winnipeg River, Grand Rapids and others, that's the base sign of comparison. Well, if you can't sell to the Americans for more than that, Mr. Speaker, you're in pretty big trouble. So of course the price is going to be higher than that . . .

A MEMBER: Buildings galore going up in Minneapolis. The boom. I'm for development here.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the other thing that we said to the National Energy Board was that the board might be inadvertently lending credibility to the proposal by this administration to advance the construction of Limestone by two years. The board came back and said very clearly, they are not inadvertently lending credibility, that it is not their purpose in responding, Mr. Speaker. So we weren't wrong in that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said last evening in his Budget Speech that the National Energy Board found no reason to believe that this wasn't the best development sequence for Manitoba Hydro. But, Mr. Speaker, they were only given one development sequence to consider. They weren't given alternative development sequences. They weren't given different opportunities to look at what is the total benefit to the people of Manitoba, if you don't start it two years ahead of time. They didn't look at it from that context, they only looked at the narrow terms of reference of the development sequence that was before them. — (interjection) — So how could they tell you that this was the best, when it was the only one that they could consider?

Mr. Speaker, these people opposite have taken such great liberties. They have said in statements that National Energy Board said it was a good deal for Manitoba and Canada. It didn't say that anywhere. It said it met their criteria and they were satisfied that the numbers as presented for the sequence and case as presented, went through the computer and came

Friday, 22 March, 1985

out the same as it did through Manitoba Hydro's computer. That's right, Mr. Speaker. You know, I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the things that are being said by — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the things that are being said by the Minister of Energy and the Premier inside this Chamber, the kind of "rah rah" taking liberties with what the National Energy Board said, are different from what they're saying outside in the public. Out there, they have an obligation to tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker, here and I quote from the announcement that was made by the Premier just the other day, March 20th, to a number of business people when they were opening the Limestone development office. He said, "As you know, the National Energy Board has approved the sale and we have opted for a 1990 in-service date for Limestone." He didn't say that the National Energy Board said it was the best plan, that it was the best way to go. He said, "we have opted" and he differentiated between the sale being approved and the decision to be advanced.

Mr. Speaker, I'll get to the point that the Minister of Finance is attempting to make in his own simplistic way. The Minister of Finance says — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister of Finance says that the National Energy Board reviewed the figures that were before it with respect to the two-year advancement and came out saying that, indeed, it showed a net return on expenditures, Mr. Speaker. He calls it a profit.

Mr. Speaker, they gave them two years in which there is only bridge financing on the project and they compared that to opportunities to sell for uncommitted markets, to sell some additional interruptible sales and they said, they will come out ahead. That's Manitoba Hydro's analysis. And according to that analysis, if the things come according to what they've projected, that will be an advantage.

But what he doesn't tell you is that when you move forward the two years of bridge financing, you bring forward by two years the first year on which you have to pay the interest on the total investment - that's \$300 million. That \$300 million is nowhere in the calculation that results in that response, Mr. Speaker, \$300 million dollars a year of just simply interest. If you add on operating costs, capital recovery and all those things, you're into \$350 to \$400 million. That has to be borne by the system, because if you didn't have those bridge financing costs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: If you didn't have those bridge financing costs in 1991 and 1992, you'd have them in 1993 and 1994. So there would be less cost. But by 1993 and 1994 you're already now into paying the \$300 million plus in interest in operating and everything else, so you just move it forward. But that doesn't show up

in the analysis on those individual years because all you show in those two years is the bridge financing which is a small fraction because the real bill comes later and it's borne by the system as a whole. — (Interjection) — Well, fine, but that's not the way it has to be, if you do it on a total cost analysis. — (Interjection) — That's the only answer they have, Mr. Speaker, is that that's the only way it's done and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. COWAN: The big question is whether or not Manitobans would actually save the \$300 million in interest for two years, and they would if you didn't proceed in this manner. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Other members will have the opportunity to put forward their opinions to the House in due course. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines on a point of order.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sent the Leader of the Opposition a note indicating I had a meeting at 12:00 noon today which was arranged some time earlier. I'd like to let the House know that I certainly will read the rest of his speech, because frankly I found his comments different but certainly warrant reading. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank the honourable member for that personal explanation. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: You know, I find it strange that members opposite will make certain quotes and then not relate it to what the figures are being shown to them by the Minister of Energy. For instance, last year at the Natural Resources and Public Utilities Committee meeting we had here, it was revealed that in their analysis as to what their returns are on the Sale Sequence, Manitoba Hydro only includes about 300-and-some-odd million of capital costs because they say that you really don't include the capital costs of Limestone. All you do is the differential cost of advancing the construction to meet the sale, so that out of a \$3 billion investment all you've got in the mix for capital is about \$300 million in order to make your comparisons that give you the so-called \$1.7 billion profit.

Yet just last week, the Premier, on the CJOB Action Line, said 40 percent of Limestone is being committed to the Northern States Power sale. It would seem to me that it should occur to him that if 40 percent of Limestone is being committed to that sale, why isn't 40 percent of the capital cost of construction in it? It isn't, Mr. Speaker.

Why not the interest at least on that 40 percent being shown in their actual costs? It isn't, and the reason is because it's become utility convention to say that you sell it out of your system as a whole, and therefore you don't really sell it from that last plant you build, you sell it from the system as a whole. So what that does is give to the Americans the advantage of all of the

low cost invested in the system to keep our rates down over all the years, and they get some of the benefit of that by virtue of the sale.

Mr. Speaker, that's what strikes me as being strange, that the Premier would say that 40 percent is committed, yet he isn't even prepared to say that the interest on that 40 percent is part of the calculation. It isn't. That's why, when you have that kind of analysis, you say to yourself is there really a benefit or should we be looking at this in isolation? Even if you argue that for the purposes of the sale, you don't take it into account because you're selling it out of the system for the purposes of advancement. I say and so do many others, Mr. Speaker, who appeared before that committee, you have to take into account the capital cost of building that plant two years earlier. You can't just say it's a portion of the cost and its borne by the system. Because, if you do, what you're saying is that now the people of the whole rate system, all of the customers of Manitoba Hydro, are going to be paying more in order for you to justify that advancement. That's exactly what we have been arguing, and it has not been refuted, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, in making his analysis, keeps saying that this sale is so much better than the Western Electric Grid, because he says that we are getting all of these profits and that we would be getting a marginal return on the grid. But the comparison on the grid, Mr. Speaker, is that on the grid they would be paying the full common bus. rate from Limestone which is projected to be somewhere between .06 and .08 cents a kilowatt hour. That's what they would have been paying.

The interesting thing is that the Northern States Power sale is returning about 7.5 cents a kilowatt hour, so we would be getting approximately the same returns from the grid, but the difference in the grid was we didn't have the risks. You see, all of these calculations are predicated on the fact that Hydro is projecting an interest rate of 11 percent, that they're projecting cost escalation rates of 6 or 7 percent a year, that they're projecting an 81-cent dollar and all of those things. If all of those things go negative, Mr. Speaker, Northern States Power has no risk because they have a fixed price, we bear all the risk. He says that in the grid, in the case of the grid, that Manitobans were bearing the risk on the construction costs.

Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement that the escalation and construction costs would be shared by the partners, that any escalation in the rates of interest would be shared. We had no risk on those things. The only risk that we had was that our estimate of cost of Limestone had to be firm before the escalation costs - in today's dollars, it had to be firm. He says that was a risk for us, but they're using exactly the same estimate in their calculations for Northern States Power, so they obviously think that it's a firm estimate it's a good estimate. Where is the risk? Mr. Speaker, he doesn't know what he's talking about.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of thing that they're doing. They criticized the Alcan deal where Alcan was going to be paying for the entire cost of their portion of the plant, that Alcan was going to be paying for upstream invested costs in Churchill River Diversion, Lake Winnipeg Regulation, some costs on transmission and all those things. Alcoa, they were going to give them

the power at system rate just out of the system and have all that invested cost by the people of Manitoba paying for Alcoa. That's the difference, but that's the way they operate, Mr. Speaker. They make those false comparisons and they don't back them up.

Mr. Speaker, they have said where do you stand on it? Well, Mr. Speaker, they have made an agreement; they have signed a contract. We will ensure that Northern States Power gets their power in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, they've said would you stop Limestone? Mr. Speaker, they're making commitments today - it's in the Budget Speech - of over \$1 billion. Mr. Speaker, we will deal what we have to deal with when we take government, and we'll ensure that it's managed to the best advantage of the taxpayers and the people of Manitoba. It won't be managed for a political timetable. It won't be managed for people who are trying to regain power in another election, it will be managed for the best advantage of the people of Manitoba, and we will minimize the costs and maximize the benefits for Manitobans. We won't in any way, Mr. Speaker, deal in the way that this incompetent, discredited bunch are dealing. Mr. Speaker, we will get the markets that we need to justify the energy that's being produced when we're put in that position.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we concerned, or why do we believe it's important that Manitobans know that this government, this administration, is proceeding in a way that mismanages and squanders our valuable hydro resource? We know because there was a Commission of Inquiry that was done here in this province that said what they believed about how Hydro was being administered under the former New Democratic administration that resulted in increases in hydro rates of over 100 percent over a period of two-and-a-half years. Mr. Speaker, I'll just quote, "The board has not ensured that Hydro's managerial capacity and decision-making process were adequate to its task. Hydro has not demonstrated the confidence which should be expected from a corporation of its size and importance."

Mr. Speaker, they talk here about the board and the relationship, because the Minister of Energy said it wasn't our decision, it was the board's decision. I've looked at the people on the board, and I fail to find people who aren't committed and appointed and in awe of this government.

A MEMBER: You wouldn't say that about Peter Fox, would you?

MR. G. FILMON: The Member for Concordia, right. That's one of the objective people who made that decision. Mr. Speaker, the former NDP Minister of Finance was the chairman, the appointed individual who is now the chairman came as the chief researcher for Ed Broadbent's office. These are the objective people who made that decision, who made that recommendation to the Minister. These are the people who have the expertise, financial and otherwise, to be able to make these kinds of multi-billion dollar decisions.

This is what the Commission of Inquiry said previously about the relationships of boards and management. It said, "Hydro's Chairman," this was in the '70s, "came to be regarded as the voice of government. Professional

independence and the autonomy of board members were inhibited. The chairman intruded and was permitted to intrude into political matters." Can anything be said differently about this current chairman of the board?

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that at a gathering in Brandon just a few weeks ago, a person, who is a good friend of these people - in fact, he's rumoured as their next prospective candidate in Brandon East - said publicly that Hydro was being totally manipulated by the New Democratic administration, that it was being politically run, and that all of its decision-making was political. That's what he said in front of many people at a gathering in Brandon. He's expected to be the next candidate for the New Democratic Party in Brandon, and he said that we should be stopping this procedure based on a politically motivated decision to advance construction of Limestone, and that's the kind of response they get from their own people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, while the Premier was up huffing and puffing the other day, and growling at us to try and tell us how strong he was and how tough he was in his resolve about the things that are going on in this province, he said, where do we stand on hydro development. Well, I want to make sure that he understands, without equivocation, Mr. Speaker, that we are totally opposed to any move to divert funds and siphon off funds from Manitoba Hydro into the general revenues of this province. We will oppose it firmly and, should this administration force it through in its dying days, we will repeal that legislation. We are not going to have the Hydro funds siphoned off and hydro rates continually skyrocketing as a result of the mismanagement of these people so that the funds can be diverted to advertising and other government priorities. No way will that happen. That's where we stand on Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, I've got a few questions for the Premier and I hope that he'll read them and give us the answers because the people of Manitoba want to know where's this Premier who keeps saying to us, where do you stand on Hydro? Well, he can read today where we stand.

Tell us! Where does he stand with respect to pornography in this province? Is he in favour or against it? He says in the Throne Speech he wants to stamp out pornography; he says they're going to classify home video movies, and then he says to his Minister of Culture and his Minister of Education, it's okay to let that go into the schools, to pay for it, to spread it. Where does he stand on pornography, Mr. Speaker?

Where does he stand on the sex education course that was brought in by his Minister of Education from Calgary? Where does he stand on that where divisions are deciding today what they should do about their health and sex education course? They are getting no guidance from this administration because it's now hands off, they got burned badly. It involves so much material that is not in keeping with the religious and moral standards of the vast majority of people of this province, and they've got hands off, but behind the scenes they are saying it's okay, you can go ahead with it, we won't do anything, just don't let us get involved. Where does he stand on that, Mr. Speaker?

Where does he stand on aid to private schools? We have told people publicly where we stand, Mr. Speaker,

and the Federation of Independent Schools know where we stand. What are they going to do about it? Where do they stand?

Mr. Speaker, where do they stand on anti-scab legislation? They passed it successively at conventions of New Democrats in this province. Time after time they passed anti-scab legislation. Is that what we can expect when they are re-elected to government in 1999, or whenever that might happen - a long time away - but is that what we can expect? Is that what they are going to run on?

Mr. Speaker, where do they stand on getting into the life insurance and pension management industry in this province? We have had one Minister, the Minister responsible, say they were studying it and they were making a decision; we had the Premier say they are not getting into it. Let him tell us where he stands on that one, Mr. Speaker. Those are the kinds of things that he ought to be addressing instead of trying to make some issue out of us to try and find out where we stand on this issue. Finally, of course, Mr. Speaker

HON. G. LECUYER: I didn't say it.

MR. G. FILMON: I just did. The Minister of the Environment has difficulty understanding. I will let him read it in Hansard.

So what we are faced with in this Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, is another example of a tired, worn out discredited administration, a government that lacks integrity, a government that lacks competence, a government that has mismanaged our economy so badly that we have a higher deficit, higher taxes and no improvement in social services, and no offer of encouragement to let us believe that the economy is going to revitalize and grow and bring in new job creation activities.

Mr. Speaker, they called it a well-crafted document, a "dream" Budget. The only dream that Manitobans have to look forward to from this Budget, Mr. Speaker, is the dream of a provincial election.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the motion be amended by striking out all of the words following the word "House" and adding the following:

Regrets that the budgetary policy of the government

- (1) fails to offer a framework for economic renewal that will provide jobs for the record numbers of unemployed people in our province;
- (2) has resulted in deterioration of social services and basic infrastructure;
- (3) has imposed increased taxation;
- (4) has failed to control the rapidly expanding provincial debt which places a burdensome cost on tomorrow's taxpayers, the young people of today;
- (5) continues their sad record of incompetent management of Manitoba's public affairs.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling on the next member, I would like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my left. We have a group of law students from Oslo University.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

BUDGET DEBATE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I enjoyed the debate, the contribution to the debate by the Leader of the Opposition much more today than I did on his previous debates in the House, and I want to congratulate him on a speech that was full of fury, even if it signified very little.

He told the convention story and about the card and the advertisement, but he got it just a bit wrong. How it really happened was there was a mention of "Hi, you may not know me, I'm Gary Filmon" and then it went through the rest of the advertisement. But what the Leader of the Opposition suggested happen was that the whole crowd thought it was a riot. I think his exact words were, "Everyone thought it was a riot." That's not how it happened, see, half of the people there turned to their neighbour and said, "Who's Gary Filmon?" And the other half said, "I don't know."

He reminds me a bit of a song that Kris Kristofferson sings about a silver-tongued devil, and he mentions a man that's partly fact and partly fiction, and if he'd just added in a bit about distortion he would have had an illustration of the Leader of the Opposition exactly it is.

So I thought we might find out a bit more about where the Conservative Party stands on the issues from the speech by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, there was a statement in his speech that I wrote down, hopefully verbatim, that I think spells out very clearly where they stand on the issues.

The Leader of the Opposition said, and I quote: "We will deal with what we have to deal with when we take government." That's a quote. That's what he says. Now I'm really worried because now we'll never know, or at least we won't know for a long long time because it's going to be a long long time before they get to be the government in this province again.

Once again, they've led us through a diatribe of despair and a lacklustre litany of half facts and half fiction that, I must admit, in this case was more craftily constructed than in other cases, but still nonetheless constructed mostly out of innuendo and assumption in order to substantiate what their perception of the world should be. That's their negative perception of the world. In spite of his lengthy speech, we know less right now about where the Conservatives stand on the important issues of the day than we did before he made his remarks.

How many times, Mr. Speaker, have we stood in this House and challenged them again and again and again to put on the record where the Conservatives stand on the important issues of the day? They've been challenged to rise above political opportunism and their

readily apparent lust for power so they can tell the people of Manitoba just what it is the Conservatives stand for in 1985, and they refuse to do it.

We have challenged them to lift their heads from the dark clouds and look at all the good things that are happening in Manitoba, and there are many good things happening in Manitoba today. We have challenged them to outline their party's policies and to tell Manitobans what they want to do, what it is the Conservatives want to do in order to make this a better province, and they refuse to do that.

In this Budget, the New Democratic Government has put our vision of Manitoba and what it is today, and more importantly, what we believe it can be in future years before the people of Manitoba. We've done that. We have told them what we think are the important issues, and we've told them how we are going to respond to them.

In the Throne Speech that we presented just two weeks ago and in the Budget, and an excellent Budget I might add and congratulate the Minister of Finance and those who worked with him on that, in that Budget just last night we have clearly outlined the vision that the New Democratic Government shares with Manitoba and its people.

We have talked about the types of things that Manitobans across this province have been telling us are important to them. We have built their hopes and their aspirations into our government and budgetary programs and policies. We have listened carefully and what it is that they have been telling us, Mr. Speaker, is very clear.

Firstly, they have told us that out of all things they want a government that believes in them. They want a government that believes in individual Manitobans and how we can collectively work together to make a better province. We listened to them: Tadoule Lake and Thompson, to Churchill and Carman, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, Lundar, Granville, Lac de Grandview, Shamattawa to South Indian Lake to Souris, from Brochet and Lac Brochet to Brandon, and they all want the very same thing from their government.

They want an opportunity to build their province and to feed their families through productive employment. They want a government that cares about them and is compassionate. They want a government that doesn't turn its back on them. More importantly, they want a government that is fair. As the Member for Inkster says, from all that it soon becomes pretty obvious that they sure don't want a Conservative Government back in this province again for a long long time. So I'm afraid we may never know what it is they are going to do with the issues that they intend to do whenever they might happen to become the government, as they have suggested they will tell us at that time.

So what does this Budget mean to those Manitobans, and how have we responded to those hopes and aspirations? It means more opportunity for Manitobans.

During the Throne Speech Debate a couple of days ago I spoke about a constituent of mine in one of the Reserve communities who wanted his sons and daughters to have a fair chance at employment on Hydro. This Budget and its \$210-million commitment to job creation and preservation of jobs through the Manitoba Jobs Fund means that his sons and daughters will have that fair chance that they deserve.

We have already heard what members opposite have to say about the training programs, and about the affirmative action programs, and about the preferential hiring programs that we have put in place to ensure that happens.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What did we say?

HON. J. COWAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek says what did we say? I would suggest that he go back and read the speech from the Member for Radisson or read the speech from some of the other members, and he will find that they are against it. He will find that the record very clearly states that they are against those programs that we have developed in consultation through dozens of meetings across Northern Manitoba that will mean Northerners and especially Northern Natives will have a fair chance at employment and business opportunities arising out of Hydro. It's there.

I would ask the Member for Radisson if he would suggest that I'm wrong in saying that in his speech he very clearly outlined his concern about those programs, and very clearly said he was opposed to some of them. I think the record is clear.

The Minister of Finance, in his Budget Address, said that the Jobs Fund has made a difference. Well it certainly does make a difference to that man and his sons and daughters as they look for that fair chance, but that commitment goes beyond the rhetoric of the Budget Debate. This year, our government will allocate millions of dollars through the Jobs Fund for employment and training programs to assist Manitobans and especially Northern and Northern Native Manitobans to prepare for jobs and business opportunities which hydro development will create in our province.

So we spoke of vision. The New Democratic Government vision means jobs, jobs through upcoming hydro development, but jobs elsewhere throughout the province as well. Again this year millions of dollars of Jobs Fund monies will provide community infrastructure and new employment opportunities for hundreds of communities throughout the province.

Last year, in Granville Lake, the residents there in a small community in my constituency worked four months to build a fire equipment building for their community. To them, the Jobs Fund means a difference. To them, it means jobs, jobs, jobs, but more than that it means long-term assets and a safer community. So the Manitoba New Democratic Government vision means working together for those jobs and for those assets.

A couple years back, the Conservatives in a style that has become all too familiar to those who take the time to listen to them, were deriding our government, and the Minister of Finance will remember this very clearly, for our efforts to co-operate with the Federal Government to bring long-term prosperity through mutually funded projects to Manitoba.

Now we put forward a list of projects that we were prepared to cost share as part of an overall recovery program. What we really wanted them to do was to develop an overall national recovery program because we care for the country as a whole. But what we did was convince them that, that at least in Manitoba it

was in their best interests, the best interests of this Provincial Government and the best interests of the people of this province to have that sort of co-operation in place.

At that time, we talked about a long list of things that we really wanted to do, but we knew we couldn't do it alone. They were big projects. They were expensive projects. They mean a lot to the province but we didn't have the wherewithal to do it on our own so we went to the Federal Government. We said, can we work together on behalf of Manitobans to make these things happen? Now members opposite, the Conservatives, told us that we were foolish to even think that we'd be able to successfully negotiate a co-operative approach with the Federal Government to these projects. Do you remember the debate in this House? They stood up, time after time after time, and said: No. 1, it wasn't good to be doing this; No. 2, even if it were, we couldn't.

Well, today, many of those projects are reality. Again, in my own constituency, work is ongoing on the Port of Churchill, which will ultimately mean expanded use of the port and a long-term commitment to the future, not only of the port, but to the community as well, through a cost-shared program that was part of that overall recovery program that we put forward. It benefits, not only the community of Churchill, but it benefits the agricultural community in the west, and it benefits the province as a whole.

If you think back on that particular instance when we first talked about a possible federal-provincial agreement to provide that commitment to Churchill, you will quickly recall what the Conservatives said. They were opposed to it; they said we shouldn't be doing it. Not only were they opposed to it, but they were adamant and unequivocal in their opposition to it: Now you must also take care to remember that, when they were in government, they had exactly the same opportunity that we had to do something for the Port of Churchill. The New Democratic Government did something.

What did the Conservatives do when they had the chance? They talked. That is all it ever seems that they do. They talked, they talked, they talked. When they were in government they talked about all the things that should be done. At that time, they were talking about support of the Port of Churchill. Now that they're in opposition, they talk about all the things that shouldn't be done. So, it isn't changed; they haven't changed. They haven't changed at all their basic approach to government - talk, talk, talk. It's just that they have changed about how they talk about things, but we know that Manitobans want more than just talk from the government that they elect. They want action; they want to work with their Provincial Government, and with their Federal Government, to make things happen in this province for the benefit of everyone. So the Manitoba New Democratic Government vision means working together with the Federal Government and with Manitobans across the province to build a better tomorrow, to bring that prosperity here.

Think what that commitment means to the small business person in Churchill who, for far too long, has lived on the edge of uncertainty and apprehension because there was no real way for them to plan for the future. There was no way at all. Think about what

the completion of the Hydro line, which is part of that joint Federal-Provincial agreement, means to the industrial development of, not only the port itself, but the business community and infrastructure in the area as well.

Just the other day I received a letter from a long-time resident of Churchill in which that person asked about how they can start a business in their own community. Because of our Jobs Fund, and our commitment to both small business in Northern Manitoba, we were able to send to him a whole list of materials that outlined programs that might help him help to make his community a better place to live. That person shares our vision and shares our confidence in his community. He shares our hope and our commitment, and he is a part of that vision of Manitoba, as Manitobans across the province are a part of that vision.

So we know there are times when it is appropriate to co-operate with the Federal Government, to make these sorts of agreements that provide benefits to communities across the province and to the province as a whole; but we also ask for more from the Federal Government, we ask for fairness from the Federal Government. That's why our budget calls upon the Federal Government to treat Manitoba fairly. We ask for no more than that which is due us. But, Mr. Speaker, we will accept no less. Just as we try to be consistent and fair with our dealings with other levels of government, we expect the same from the Federal Government.

It's interesting to listen to the opposition, and others like them, who decry our inclusion of the 72 million owing to us from the Federal Government in our list of revenues. You know the previous Minister of Finance under the Conservatives talks about how we should not have included the 72 million in transfer payments. That's what he says, and others have said the same thing. Well, that's just another example of how those Conservatives will turn their backs on their own province in order to protect their federal counterparts.

A MEMBER: Not true.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, after all, it was a Liberal Government that set up the formula in the first place that resulted in the loss of 72 million in the first instance. Following that, of course, it is a Conservative Federal Government that refuses to make right that inequity, that refuses to provide what is fair to the Province of Manitoba, and they have already told us that they think it was fair for us to ask for that money. But, when we included it in the budget, they insinuate that there is something wrong, or deceitful, or distorted because we do that. Well, how would they have it? For us to throw up our hands in despondency and despair and say that we don't want the 72 million? Are they telling us to give up and forget about fairness just so they can protect those friends in Ottawa? What do they say now? Do they speak out on behalf of Manitoba? Do they say to us, yes, Manitoba deserves that 72 million from the Federal Government, and we want to fight with you for fairness on behalf of the people of Manitoba? No. They recommend to us that we throw up our hands; that in despair and despondency we give in.

Well, we're not going to take that advice, and I can tell you, quite frankly, that is not the type of advice that the people of Manitoba have been giving up throughout our discussions in dialogue in consultations with us.

They have told us that they believe in fairness, and they have told us that they don't believe the federal cuts to be fair. They tell us that they want to work with us - and they want to work with members opposite if possible - in order to ensure that fairness is reinstated in that system, and that's exactly what we're going to do.

But the budget is not about revenues alone. It's about how a compassionate and a caring government provides services to its citizens in difficult economic times. Those opposite, much like their counterparts across the country, and particularly at the federal level, prefer only to fixate on the deficit, blinded by their own rhetoric and their own ideology, but the deficit is not the real issue.

The real issue is, how does a government ensure that it responds fairly to those in need and, at the same time, provides a type of economic environment that enables those people to find meaningful work, and thereby reduces their dependence upon their government? That's the real question, the real issue that confronts us, and I would suggest that this Budget illustrates very clearly exactly how a New Democratic Government responds to that challenge.

But the Conservative don't want to talk about people. They are obviously more concerned about the deficit than they are about the people in Manitoba, and that's becoming more and more obvious every day. They are more concerned about slashing the deficit than they are about providing services.

So we have to ask them this question: how is it that they propose to cut the deficit? It's not enough for them to beat their chests and wail and wring their hands and sweat about how the deficit leads us to ruin; it's not enough to try to mask their lack of any concrete plan or vision with screams of prolonged anguish about the deficit; it's not enough to say, as the Leader of the Opposition said today when asked about what they will do, or at least when he had the opportunity to say what they will do about issues in government, to say, "We will deal with what we have to deal with when we take government." That's not enough; that doesn't provide the answer; that doesn't provide any insight; that doesn't provide any indication of how it is. They will deal with those circumstances, and they are going to have the opportunity to do so.

The Budget Debate is in its early stages — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain says that was one issue and I shouldn't distort it. I will agree that he made that statement in reference to one issue; if the Member for Turtle Mountain will agree that on all the other issues he didn't even say that much, because he didn't. We know less about what they are going to in respect to those issues right now than we knew a couple of hours ago when the Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet, supposedly to give us some indication of what their vision is; and we no less than we knew two weeks ago when this House started, and they said they wanted to get into this House to debate those issues; and we know less today than we knew a year about what it is they see as a vision for Manitoba.

I think the case is they don't have a vision, they don't have a plan, they don't know what they want to do, and if they did know what they want to do, they don't know how to do it, because if they did they would take the opportunity of the debate in this House to put clearly on the record where they stand on the issues and how they propose to respond to the challenges that confront all of us. So it's not enough to beat their chests and wail. For example, they have to provide an alternative. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain asked me to put it on the record where we all mind our position when we are in the opposition.

I can remember all too well standing up in this House and saying we will have better Workplace Safety and Health legislation when we're in government. Workers will have the right to refuse unsafe work. We will have a better workers' compensation system. We will have better pensions. We will have a more humane economy, and we did all those things and more. So we put it clearly on the record. If he cares to go back to the record, he will find out that it's there.

The members opposite want to suggest that in opposition we didn't tell them what we were going to do in respect to the unemployment. We told them very clearly what we were going to do in respect to unemployment. We were going to work with the people of this province to develop an economic system that was in near ruins after their four years at government and has been influenced strongly by the recession across the country - not just across the country, across the Western World - to bring back some confidence and some optimism and some hope in this economy and that's what we've done as well through the Jobs Fund and through the other programs like that.

So we, in fact, have said what we will do and more than that, we've done what we said we would do. We said that we would expand on the facilities at the Port of Churchill; we've done that. We've said that we will bring in better health care services; we've done that. We've said that we will make the educational system more responsive to the needs of students today; we've done that and the list goes on and on and on.

But the debate today is not about what we told them we will do and what we've been able to do, but the debate today is about what are they going to do in response to the very clear initiatives that are outlined in the budgets and the list of expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year.

What are they going to do? They have to provide an alternative. They have to tell us what taxes they're planning to raise, if they are. They have to tell us what services they will slash if they are contemplating that. For example, they asked me to say what it is we told them we would do when we were in government and give some examples. I'll do that.

Are they going to cut back the air ambulance program which is part of the Budget before us? They have to tell us that. Think about that for awhile. It's something that they knew was needed for Northern Manitoba when they were in government. As a matter of fact, they voted in this Legislature in support of a resolution that I put forward when in opposition, that called for basically the kind of service we are providing this year. I remember that resolution and I remember them voting in favour of it and I remember how it outlined the type of program we'd like to have for the air ambulance services in this province.

What did they do when they had the opportunity? They knew it was needed; they are on the record about that, yet they never did anything. Why was it, Mr. Speaker? Was it because they were fearful of the impact it would have on the deficit? Is it because they put that fear before the needs of Manitobans? Or was it because they really didn't mean it when they voted for it in this Legislature and that vote was only politically motivated?

MR. H. ENNS: That's imputing motives, Mr. Speaker.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, you're right, you're right. Mr. Speaker, he's right. I apologize; I did not want to impute motives. You know very well that we're not supposed to suggest motives on behalf of the members opposite.

So if we can't question their motives for voting for the resolution, we can only come to the conclusion that it was a fear of the deficit that kept them from providing this service, and it's that same fear of the deficit that may encourage them - and I don't know if it will or not, they haven't told us - but may encourage them to remove that service if in fact they ever have the opportunity. I only am thankful that they won't have that opportunity for a long time.

So that's what they really mean when they talk about cutting the deficit. They are really talking about cutting back programs like the air ambulance program, maybe not that one specifically, but they are going to have to tell us what social services they are going to cut. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Emerson thinks that an unfair question to ask?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It certainly is.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, then maybe I'll refer the Member for Emerson, who says it is an unfair question to ask, to a speech in this Legislature on April 23, 1981 when the now Leader of the Opposition was speaking to the Budget Debate in defence of his own government. What did he say?

He said, and I quote - this is the Leader of the Opposition stating it - "I would like to know what the opposition wants us to cut out. I would like to know what part of this \$219 million they would like us to cut because let's take a look at it reasonably. Where are some of the large amounts of additional expenditures going this year?" And then he talked about health and he listed a series of items, just as I'm doing, and asked, "Is that what they would want us to cut?" in referring to us when we were on the opposition side. What about education? He asked us what we would want to cut in education. He even said, "Would they suggest that we cut additional monies being spent in education" - and I quote - "because between those two, between health and education we could balance the Budget if we cut off those additional expenditures?" That's what the Leader of the Opposition said when he was in government and speaking to exactly the same type of Budget. Well, not quite as good a Budget, but speaking in the Budget Debate.

So if it was fair for him to ask those questions then and we answered them, I think it's fair for us to ask those questions now and I think it's fair for them to answer them as well. So I'll ask the question again. Are they going to cut out programs like the air

ambulance program that will bring better health care and services to all of Northern Manitoba?

And what are they going to say to Manitobans when they are put in the position of having to tell people what they are going to respond to more, the deficit cutting dogma which has led them through governments across this country? And we have all seen the results of what's happening in other provinces in the cuts by Tory governments in essential services. Or are they going to respond to the very real need for services for Manitobans? You know they hinted that they'll stop the construction of Limestone. They have already hinted at that, and from no less an eminent source than the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Deputy Premier. He has very clearly indicated that they will consider that - or Deputy Leader, excuse me - I apologize for that.

They have hinted they will stop the construction of Limestone. What else are they going to stop? Will they stop the air ambulance? I don't know; they are not saying anything. Will they drown the air ambulance? I don't know; they are not saying anything. They've already told us they don't like the Jobs Fund in spite of the fact that they voted for the Jobs Fund, and I am not going to impute motives as to why they would vote for the Jobs Fund and then stand up day after day after day in this House and criticize the Jobs Fund and then go out in their constituencies and participate and support the Jobs Fund when it has an impact on their own constituencies. I don't know what motives motivate them to do that and I wouldn't even question them, much less impugn them.

But the fact is that that is exactly what has happened time and time again. So are they going to undo the Jobs Fund? Are they going to destroy it so that the communities like Granville Lake . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, someone said yes. I am not certain who said yes from the members opposite but I can tell you it was one of the Tory benches, one of the Conservative benches that said in fact they were going to stop the Jobs Fund. So let the record be clear; now we are starting to get some answers. I would like that member - the Member for Minnedosa? I would like that member, if he is the one who made that statement that you would stop the Jobs Fund . . .

A MEMBER: I never heard him.

HON. J. COWAN: Oh, see, twisting and turning in the wind again and again and again. He'll have a chance to speak; maybe he'll tell us when he speaks what it is he'll do about the Jobs Fund.

MR. D. BLAKE: A bunch of grass cutting, scrub cutting jobs, do you call those jobs?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, now I did hear him. What he said, and I'll try to relate it verbatim, "A bunch of grass cutting, scrub cutting jobs, do you call those jobs?" I think we're beginning to get a hint of what they are going to do with the Jobs Fund.

MR. D. BLAKE: We want some meaningful jobs. Cut your own boulevards.

A MEMBER: Under our Conservative Government, the grass will grow green, the skies will be bluer and the cows will give more milk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: Offer anybody a handout and he'll take it.

HON. J. COWAN: I think we're beginning to get a bit of an idea about what they would do with the Jobs Fund, and I think I did hear him correctly when in the first instance he said they would cut the Jobs Fund, they would destroy the Jobs Fund. Is that the case?

MR. D. BLAKE: We'll put meaningful jobs in the marketplace for people.

HON. J. COWAN: What about the Jobs Fund? — (Interjection) — What are you going to do about the Jobs Fund? — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I sense that you're about to rise to break my energetic group to order, but you will recognize that the speaker is provoking us and were he, in fact, addressing his remarks to you, Sir, to the Chair, we would, perhaps, act a bit more decorously in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: I appreciate the advice, Mr. Speaker, and given the choice between trying to get answers from them and talking to you, I'd prefer to talk to you because they just don't have any answers. Every time we ask them a legitimate question about where they stand on an issue we get the type of answer that we got from the Leader of the Opposition - I'll quote it again because I found it so illustrated, yet I realize it's the third time that we've had opportunity to say it - but what does the Leader of the Opposition say when he's asked to respond directly to an issue: "We will deal with what we have to deal with when we take government." Now what does that say? It says that we're not going to find out where they stand on the issues. I would suggest that there is reason for fear and concern that they may, in fact, stop the Jobs Fund. So communities like Granville Lake will have to wait decades more for essential community infrastructure, like their newly built fire building.

They've already told us that they're opposed to the Churchill development agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments. Are they going to continue to discontinue that sort of co-operation; are they going to undo that which is already been done and do nothing as they did during their four years in government? Those are all very real questions that they will have to answer sooner or later. The fact is they haven't found the courage to put their intentions squarely on the record yet, but they will have to sooner or later; and there are other questions.

This Budget provides for the highest per capita day care support of all the provinces. Well, when I talk about the highest per capita day care support, the Member for Turtle Mountain talks about the highest per capita debt and, in fact, what he is saying is that the deficit is more important to him and his colleagues than his day care services for Manitobans across this province, and we reject that sort of Conservative ideology. That's what he says; he says the debt is more important, the deficit is more important than providing services where they're needed.

You know, Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I've been working with a group who are forming a new day care in South Indian Lake. It's a day care co-op for South Indian Lake, and they've worked hard in their own community to work with their own neighbours so that people in South Indian Lake could have the same opportunities and services as those in other communities across the province. They formed that day-care co-op; they worked hard on it and it was hard work and there were frustrations, and there were times when they were wondering whether it was all worth it. But they now have a day care in their community because of our commitment to providing essential services, and our commitment to day care, specifically, they are now operating a day care centre and mothers and fathers and sons and daughters in South Indian Lake are using it. We did that because we care more about people than we care about slashing programs in some sort of ideological way just to reduce the deficit. And that's what they're telling us they will do. And it is fair to ask the Conservatives now about what they will do about day care, given the fact that they did very little when they had the opportunity to do so when they were in government.

One has to wonder why they did so very little. Was it because they didn't care? I don't think it was because they didn't care because I give them more credit than that. I think they really do care about day care services, but why didn't they do more then when they had the opportunity? I think it's because - and it was just substantiated by the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Finance critic - that they care more about the deficit and debt than they care about providing services to people. They care more about debt than they do about day care. What are they going to do? I think that's a fair question to ask. What will they do, raise taxes or will they raise tuition fees when it comes to educational issues?

We've heard the Member for Morris suggest that they were going to look at raising tuition fees significantly if they ever had the opportunity. Well, maybe I'm wrong. If I'm wrong on that, I apologize and I'll have to go back and look at the records as to what was said when he was running for leader of his party. — (Interjection) — Well, I'm sorry, he's telling me that doesn't count. What he says when he's running for leader doesn't count. Well, I'm sorry, I apologize if I misconstrued his words, but I think the fact is the question remains, what are they going to do? He hasn't given us an answer to that.

What will they do when it comes to health care? Are they going to implement user fees or are they going to raise taxes? Or are they going to cut programming? What are they going to do when faced with a situation like Lynn Lake that we're faced with now, because we've

heard them say different things? We've heard them say that they wouldn't have given the loan to Sherritt-Gordon in respect to Leaf Rapids and Ruttan when they were asked to do that. We gave the loan and that community is in better health today and those workers are working today, and that mining company is surviving today, in part, not totally, but in part because we did that. They said they might not have done that. Where do they stand on those issues? What - and I think that I'm quoting him right - unnecessarily bureaucratic Workplace Safety and Health legislation are they going to repeal, because they say that in their publication?

They have to tell the people of this province what safety and health legislation they're going to undo. — (Interjection) — Well, they say, no they don't. The Member for Arthur, I believe it was the Member for Arthur, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, says, "no, they don't." Well, they're certainly going to try to prove that they don't have to say anything before an election, but that won't wash, they will. Sooner or later, somehow, sometime, they're going to have to say to the people of Manitoba exactly what that safety and health legislation cut will be under their government. — (Interjection) — What pension legislation are they going to repeal or undo, because they talk about that in those terms as well? They're going to have to say to the people of Manitoba what it is that they intend to do if ever they have the chance to be government. We've told what we're prepared to do; we've told what we have done, and we've said what we believe the people of Manitoba want to see us do in the remainder of this term and many terms to follow.

We have a vision and it's clearly on the record. We have a plan and the plan is clearly on the record. We have confidence, and optimism, and pride, and a sense of opportunity for this province and for ordinary Manitobans who deserve all we can do to work together with them to build a better province. We have a vision of a province of a province working together; ordinary Manitobans working together to build a better future through a strong and stable economy where the individual is respected and where needs are met by a caring and compassionate government.

Mr. Speaker, that is our vision. This Budget clearly demonstrates how we intend to pursue that vision, and I would ask, if anything, when members opposite speak they answer some of those questions and try to tell the people of Manitoba, through us, what vision they might have, if they have any. I would suggest that they have none.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with some interest to the Minister who just finished his remarks and I think I know what the vision of this administration is. It's a broke, bilingual province, that's the vision of this government. Money doesn't count, deficits don't matter - spend, spend, spend, spend, spend, that's the approach of the Minister who just spoke. When you get cornered, Mr. Speaker, and when you get pinned down, you pass the buck. Pass the buck, that's the name of the game; blame it on Ottawa. Shades of John Turner, holy John Turner, who said, "I had no choice, there was no way out, I couldn't

do anything else." That's the position of the government and the Minister. We can't do anything; we're in a tight spot; it's not our responsibility; the forces are greater than we are; the problems cannot be solved by our administration. So what do you do? Blame Ottawa; get in the feds. \$3.6 billion, talk about the 72 million, don't talk about the 3.6 billion; don't talk about the 500 million. Focus on something else, bring in the old red herring. Tell the people that you couldn't do anything, you couldn't help it. It's all the bad bad feds down there in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, that's the second envelope, isn't it? It's the old second envelope. But wasn't it the American President, Harry Truman, or was it somebody else in the American presidency who had a sign — (Interjection) — no he had another sign, that was one of them - "If you can't stand the heat get out of the kitchen." But I was thinking of the other one - "The buck stops here." Now, who was that? Was that Harry S. Truman? — (Interjection) — No, it was Truman. That's a sign that should go on the desk of every minister of that administration, and they should stand up and be counted and make the hard decisions and take the responsibility of government.

Mr. Speaker, the government has handed the Progressive Conservative Party the election on a platter; that's what they've done; that's what this Budget does. They think they've pulled a fast one. They think they have gone to the people on the basis of no taxes. You expected a big tax increase, and we gave you little tax increases, and they think that the public is just going to ignore a \$500 million debt.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Leader of the Official Opposition this morning, I listened to the Minister of Finance last night, and I thought to myself, what are they saying? What is their approach? How effective are they, and how will this go over in the public? How will the people of Manitoba respond to these two positions?

Mr. Speaker, I say that on a scale of 1 to 10 I give the Minister of Finance - 4, he had a limp speech. And I would give the Leader of the Official Opposition - 8, he got an 8 today. That was probably the best speech he's given in this House, or one of the best speeches that he's given in this House.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to get into trouble on this Budget is that they have demonstrated clearly to everybody in sight - and it'll come out in the next weeks and months and in the Budget Debate next week - that they have no guts, that they cannot make the tough decisions. It's one thing to give away money, buy votes, and hand out grants to all of your buddies and all that sort of stuff, but if you want to make a good Minister, if you want to be in government, you have to make the tough decisions. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody on that side prepared to do it.

The Premier, for sure, he's the last guy who could say, no, to anybody. Anybody who comes to him with a weak scheme the prospect of votes will get something, just like the Minister of Cultural Affairs, just like the Minister of Education. They are forever running into Cabinet and getting more money for some project. Never, ever do they cut anything out; never do they eliminate a program; never do they reduce a program; never do they cut a program. All they do is spend. That

isn't government, Mr. Speaker, that's giveaway, that's giveaway stuff.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, I happened to turn on CJOB, hoping that there would be a discussion on the Budget, and there was. Mr. Warren said, we have a special guest today, the Minister of Finance himself is in our studios. I was thrilled at the prospect of listening to the Minister of Finance, and there was the Minister of Finance. He got into his big car, drove down to CJOB, came on the airwaves, turned on the mikes, and he started to wait for all the bouquets that he was going to get that morning. I just could tell, you could tell, Mr. Speaker, that he thought, boy, is this ever going to go over big. They're going to love me because, you know, the papers said, low taxes, no sales tax, no this, no that. Boy, it looked great. Pulled another fast one; bamboozled the public; outfoxed the opposition. How great thou art.

Well, Mr. Speaker. There's the old Minister of Finance sitting there, waiting for those calls. Well he got a first call from his sister-in-law, or his executive assistant who said, right on Vic. Keep it up. Keep up the good work. Terrific! Then, Mr. Speaker, in came the real calls.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they didn't go over as well. They did not go over as well. Somebody phoned in and said, well, you know, you raised the gas tax, you're hurting ordinary people; and other people will explain how you're going to raise transportation costs and raise farming costs and raise business costs. The price of food will go up. That doesn't become clear at first glance, but that is the result of raising that tax.

Then some old fellow phoned up and said, he's just a poor puffer. He smokes cigarettes. He's an old man, he has one of the few pleasures in life. He can't afford a subscription to HERIZONS magazine, all he does — (Interjection) — can't appreciate a dirty movie anymore, just simply has a cigarette. That's one of his small pleasures in life, Mr. Speaker, and he was complaining about that.

Then we got some shrewder callers that phoned in, a shrewder - not a Schroeder, a shrewder caller - somebody phoned in and said, what about this deficit? Is \$500 million insignificant? Well, the Minister of Finance started to try to explain that. Someone then said, well, what about Limestone? Why are we building this Limestone? We've got the biggest debts; we have a huge deficit. We're borrowing 500 million, now, you're going to start borrowing hundreds of millions for Limestone. That was a good question.

Then a lady phoned in, very intelligent - I'd like to know who that was, if it was one of my supporters, I'd sure like to know which one. But it was a woman who phoned in and said she had been in the NDP since the war, a long time. I think she said she was about 60-odd-years old, and she said she had quit in disgust over the French language question. She put a lot of tough questions to the Minister, very articulate, very intelligent, and she made probably the most effective presentation of anybody calling in.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, when the poor Minister of Finance left, here he'd had the boots put to him by the man in the street and the woman in the street. Now he has to come in here, and he's going to get the boots put to him for a whole week by members of the official opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, that didn't go over very well.

Mr. Speaker, this is not only the last NDP Government in Canada, it's also the last of the big-time spenders. When this government goes, there goes that day when a government could spend, spend, spend, spend. I mean, this government still hasn't grasped that particular point.

So they brag about the fact this is the only mega project in Canada. They think that's terrific. There's only one thing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. If it is, doesn't that cause a person to reflect upon the fact that maybe there's something unwise in this decision. Maybe, if no one else is undertaking multi-billion dollar projects in Canada, that they're doing so for good reason. That should occur to these members opposite.

Then they brag about the fact that they have the biggest day care program in Canada. Now day care is a very good thing, who can be against day care? The question is, Mr. Speaker, can we afford to enrich and expand the day care program at this point in time? That's the question.

So the point is, the government isn't prepared to make the hard decisions. In so doing a lot of adjectives come to mind - squishy soft, mush for brains, chicken livered. Mr. Speaker, where is somebody on that side in the front benches of the government who will make the tough decisions and show some leadership because it isn't coming from the Premier, it's not coming from the Minister of Finance and it's not coming from the Minister of Energy. Mr. Speaker, those are the big spenders, the big-time spenders.

Mr. Speaker, they have a massive deficit, and that is the bottom line, and you have to look at the deficit. Don't give me the stuff about spend whatever you want, do all these good works and ignore the costs. We've got to look at the bills. You have to look at the fact that we may have to spend a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, on programs. We have to spend \$500 million; we have to borrow money to pay that. Every man, woman and child in Manitoba is now on the hook for 500 bucks, 500 additional bucks this year, about \$2,000 a family of more debt and more interest payments and so on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister for the Environment, or of the Environment, the Minister who either doesn't know what's going on in his department or doesn't have a staff that knows what's going on in his department, a Minister who wants more spending on bilingualism, Mr. Speaker, he wants to know what to cut. Well, the first thing that has to be cut is image advertising, \$8 million of image advertising, Mr. Speaker, and I want to give the government some advice in that regard. Try as they may - and I hope I'm not being unparliamentary here, it's an old adage - but you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. You can try, you can spend all the money you want. You can avoid all the issues that you want, but in the end you're going to be called for account. Mr. Speaker, cut out some of these phony organizations that you're setting up. Cut out some of these new ethnic organizations that you're setting up and funding and waving \$50,000 cheques in front of other ones to try to elicit support for the government.

Mr. Speaker, in the heat of the French election debate, the French language issue — (Interjection) — well, we'll have a French election very soon, the Minister of Cultural Affairs called in all the ethnic organizations here one afternoon, with cakes and tea, and he gave to two very

small organizations - I don't know which ones, I don't know if it was the Vietnamese, or I don't know which particular groups - and he gave each one of them a \$50,000 cheque. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and there was a little message in there. Now, I'm sure it wasn't obvious to the members of the government, there's a little message in there, a little implication, that was not lost upon all the people present, and that is that if you are good little girls and boys, and if you deliver to us your votes you will get some nice dollars and some heavy funding, some big bucks from your government. Yes, and that message wasn't lost, and that message was there, Mr. Speaker, very clearly.

Then, the House Leader, that paradigm of an example in this House, Mr. Speaker, he said that when someone said to him, well, you're not doing anything for French Language Services, probably the Minister of Environment and the Franco-Manitoban Society, he piped up and said to the media, well, we're doing all kinds of things. We've been continually increasing and enriching and extending French Language Services. — (Interjection) — Yes. This is quoted in the Free Press. Perhaps it was someone who looked like you. Mr. Speaker, he said we've made all kinds of improvements so the Franco-Manitoban Society doesn't have anything to complain about.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of 78 percent of the people of Manitoba, in spite of overwhelming opinion in the Province of Manitoba, in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court hasn't ruled on the language question, the government through the back door is handing out grants and is doing things that they are trying to keep quiet.

Then, of course, there are jobs for their friends; and then, of course, there is funding for obscene publications, Mr. Speaker. Then, worst of all, is a \$3.2 billion gamble on Limestone. I want to have a full debate on that question, and I don't want this government making a move in terms of signing contracts until we've had a full-scale debate in this House. Let them set aside a couple of weeks. Let's have a full scale debate because the Premier of Manitoba promised that debate to me, personally. Over CJOB one morning he said he welcomed that. They are so confident of their position on Limestone, then let's have that full-scale debate, but let no contract be let, and let no irrevocable decision be taken until the Legislature of Manitoba has voted on that particular question.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to everyone that the acceleration which is the issue - the issue isn't whether we're going to build Limestone some day, it's not whether a government of Manitoba is going to construct Limestone at some point in the 20th Century - the question is, are we going to accelerate Limestone? That's the issue, and that's the case that has to be fully aired and fully debated.

Mr. Speaker, when you come down to the government's program, the government's job creation program in this Budget, it comes down to Limestone, and it comes down to only Limestone. I say that, Mr. Speaker, that inspite of \$3.2 billion, which is more money than most of us can actually imagine, in the end it's 40 jobs. Oh, but during construction, it's 1,200 jobs, a lot of jobs, Mr. Speaker, probably as many as all the McDonald restaurants in Manitoba put together. Mr. Speaker, when you look at that and you compare it to

Swifts, and you look at that and you compare it to some of the companies in Manitoba that are folding, and you look at some of the companies in Manitoba, it isn't a lot of jobs. — (Interjection) — It's a lot of money, as the member says.

Mr. Speaker, out of those 1,200 jobs I know that they are not all going to be for Manitobans; I know it. I'd like to hear the estimates that the members have because I was up in Kettle Rapids 10 years ago or more when they were under construction, and who was building it? Who are all these workers that I looked around at, wearing their hard hats, and so on? Where were these guys from? To my astonishment - and the members are guessing other provinces - this gang that I was talking to, a whole bunch of workers standing there, they were from Portugal. — (Interjection) — Portugal. They were brought in by this big construction company, flown into Manitoba, worked on the project, sent money back home. When the project was over they went back home. Mr. Speaker, is there any guarantee that we won't again have a lot of people from Europe or from the United States working on this project? I'd like to hear about it; I'd like to know about it.

So, don't give me this stuff about thousands and thousands of jobs. You're talking about a thousand jobs, and you're not even talking about a thousand jobs for Manitobans. But, in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, you're talking about gambling \$3.2 billion for 32 jobs. Those jobs over there, those MLA's jobs, \$100 million apiece. You've got to be kidding, Mr. Speaker. Is there anybody over on that side who's worth \$100 million, or even \$100,000.00? Mr. Speaker, that's what the gamble is all about. It's to take public money and get the re-election of this particular government. I was going to say buy the re-election of this government, but it didn't sound too good. Mr. Speaker, that's a shocking thing.

In the old days, I used to teach history, and I used read about elections in Eastern Canada, in the Maritimes, people getting a few dollars under the table,

getting a bottle of booze, getting a free drink. Some guy in Quebec, Union Nationale, they buy his family a refrigerator; they buy his kids a pair of shoes. Well there was something to that. It was bad and it was wrong, but you know at least, if you would buy some clothes for some kids in a family, there was something there. There was something there.

What is this government doing? Mr. Speaker, they are trying to buy the North. They are trying to buy votes up in the North. They are trying to buy the votes of the construction industry; they are trying to buy the votes of the electricians and the carpenters and so on; and they are trying to buy the votes of Northern Manitobans and the Northern Natives of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it's not going to work. Let them get all those votes, let them take the North, let them take the contractors, let them take the Northern Native vote. They won't have enough seats because they're going to blow it in Winnipeg; and they're going to blow it in Brandon; and they're going to blow it in all the rural parts of Manitoba; and they're going to wind up, Mr. Speaker, as the government that gambled away our money, that spent all our money, that blew the election and that put in a government with 40 seats.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member completed his remarks?

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 1:30, an adjournment hour, this House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.