

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 19, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Waiding: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm proud to stand in my place tonight to speak on behalf of the people of the constituency of Gladstone and to convey, through you, Mr. Speaker, their concerns about the direction this NDP Government is taking.

Before commencing my remarks, I'd like to wish you well in the Session, Mr. Speaker.

I'd also like to congratulate the Member for The Pas on being appointed to the Cabinet and I wish him well in his endeavours there.

I would also like to welcome the new Member for Fort Garry. I look forward to working with him in our caucus.

I, too, would like to express my best wishes to the Member for Kildonan and to wish her a speedy return to health.

Now, the Throne Speech is the topic of the day, the Throne Speech we've waited for so long while the NDP Government, governed by Order-In-Council, spending thousands of dollars advertising their favourite catchword program, the Jobs Fund. We all heard from the Premier this afternoon on the wonders of the Jobs Fund and his hope for the future in that it has cured all the ills of the province. Well, we, on this side, really have a different opinion on that.

If you'll travel anywhere in this province, the place is littered with green Jobs Fund signs. You'll see Jobs Fund signs on churches - yes, churches, would you believe? - roads, rinks, hospitals, you name it. Apparently there were no roads, rinks, hospitals, or public buildings ever built before the Jobs Fund came along.

Last summer, a friend of mine from Southern Manitoba went to visit his mother's grave in a cemetery in a small town. There in the cemetery was a Jobs Fund sign. He was appalled and he felt that the place had been violated and I agree with him. Since when did a government agency invent cemeteries? This NDP Government is spending fortunes - \$1.1 million last year - on advertising this pet project, the Jobs Fund. Think of how many jobs you could create with that Jobs Fund advertising money alone. They're trying in vain to create the impression that they're actually doing something when, in fact, many of the jobs they claim to have created would have been there anyway. Highways have been built for years and other public buildings have been built for years. I'm sure they know that in their hearts, Mr. Speaker, but they still claim it's all because of the Jobs Fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government is telling us, and they keep telling us, that they're maintaining services, they're increasing services, and they're

generally managing the province well. There are, however, many people who disagree with that. There are people in my constituency who would disagree with the fact that they're maintaining the health care service when they find that their public health nurses are fewer in number and more scattered and have to travel long miles to serve the people.

Now, I've had complaints in the last few days, and I've noticed in one of the local papers that I get, complaints concerning driver testing. This is happening in at least two years areas in my constituency. There have been severe cutbacks in that service, and remember this was the government that promised no cutbacks.

I am told that in MacGregor the service has been cut by a reduction in 1984 from two-driver examiners on a regular basis of every two weeks - that's been cut to one. In 1985, they'll be further cut by having one examiner come every three weeks. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is not maintaining and expanding service. The same change is taking place in Gladstone, which means that people have to wait; there are backlogs, months and months for driver testing and it affects a lot of people, not just new drivers but drivers having to have retests for one reason or another.

Driver education teachers tell me that they have large classes in driver training, particularly because of a new policy the government put in about having students allowed to take driver training at the age of fifteen and a half and it takes a long time. For instance, in one class with an enrolment of 50 students, to get these people through the examinations, particularly with one examiner, you can only do 85 in a year. Just imagine with that class how long it will take when there are, of course, others waiting also.

Another problem with the cutback, it causes people having to wait and they have to go to another town where it causes a backlog in their files and people wait and wait. This causes a major problem with bus drivers, for instance, who get a job as a bus driver and then have to qualify by being re-examined. In the meantime, who's doing their job? How can they keep a job if they can't even get an appointment to have a test for two months?

So I think that is something this government will have to re-examine and if they are really true to the promise that the Premier keeps making about keeping rural areas vital and alive, then I think perhaps they should have another look at that and reconsider cutting that service. It's causing a hardship; it's causing people to wait much longer than they need to. When the Premier is telling us everything is so rosy, I wish to convey to him that it is not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Gladstone over the last year has suffered from the same financial and unemployment problems that many of the other rural constituencies of this province have suffered. Some of the areas in the constituency had reasonable crops in the last growing season; others, for the third or fourth season in a row, have had drought which produced

poor crops, of poor grades. Many of those farmers, Mr. Speaker, are in extreme financial difficulty and at this moment are hard pressed to negotiate loans to finance the planning of this year's crop.

They're interested that the Minister of Agriculture started making announcements earlier this year with respect to interest rates, and meetings to discuss their plight. They were quite interested. They thought perhaps there was going to be something done, but they soon learned how much value they could place on the announcements made by the Minister of Agriculture. While he was requesting the lending institutions to lower interest rates to 8 percent, the MACC, of which he is the Minister, was announcing a rise in interest rates to 13 percent. That embarrassment, together with the fact that no one would answer his call to a meeting to discuss the matter with other agriculture Ministers, causes a great erosion of confidence in the people of the farming community and it shows in what high esteem the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture is held in other parts of the country.

Yesterday I attended a meeting called by the MacGregor Chamber of Commerce on the topic of farm finance. Many of the 75 people that were there had strong messages for the Minister; unfortunately he was not there to hear them. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my constituency and in many others across this province are in serious difficulty. One of the people at the meeting yesterday, in talking to me afterwards, put it this way. He told me, "I've been farming, he said, for 40 years; I've always kept my bills paid; I own my farm. Now I'm having trouble financing because of some poor crops for three years in a row and higher and higher production costs and they tell me I'm a poor manager."

That farmer, Mr. Speaker, is not a poor manager. No one could stay in the business of farming for 40 years if he was a poor manager, so there must be some other reason for this and the reason is high, high production costs and low, low grain prices, high interest rates, all the things that are contributing to the problem. He is not a poor manager.

Some suggestions given by the speakers yesterday concerned ways to cut down on the costs of farming. It was suggested that farmers look more and more to custom work, leasing and sharing with neighbours in order to cut down on machinery costs. It was suggested that they build no new buildings, that they make do with what they have until things get better. It was also suggested that farmers diversify their operations - raise some chickens, raise sheep, hogs, cattle, milk a few cows - all this to help increase the cash flow.

As I sat and listened to these suggestions I was struck by the irony of it all. True, these suggestions may be very reasonable and they may help some operations to become more viable, but it struck me as rather sad that in this day and age of high technology, when governments are training people for technological jobs of the future, and everywhere computers are buzzing, school children are taught to expect jobs and exciting new careers, and then the farm community is being asked to step backwards in time and adopt old methods in order to survive.

They're being asked to tighten their belts, do without, wait for better times. No one else is being told this. They're being told the good times are here, enjoy them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the farmers will adapt

because co-operation, working together, sharing machinery, sharing work, built this province and I'm sure that some of that will help them now. But it seems a shame, in an era of high technology and great expectations, that the one sector of society is expected to do this.

Going back to the topic of diversifying, I wonder if the NDP Government realizes how difficult they're making it for farmers to diversify. Just last week regulations were passed limiting the number of laying hens that a farmer could raise from 499 to 99. There goes that suggestion out the window. You can't diversify that way.

Also last week, new regulations were passed concerning selling milk quotas. There goes another suggestion out the window. It was also suggested that more and more farmers rely on off-farm income in order to ride out the agricultural crisis, for it is a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, where are these people going to get these jobs to get off-farm income? If any of you have been out in the real world lately, there are no jobs out there and with 48,000 people unemployed it will be very difficult for a farmer to find a job that will pay enough to pay the interest, let alone the principal, on a piece of machinery that costs upwards of \$100,000.00. Then, of course, if the off-farm income exceeds the farm income, then they're into paying taxes on the farm residence so there is another financial burden on them.

That is another issue that this government will have to address and address quickly, because the land assessment, the tax system is getting worse every day and it must be dealt with immediately.

Many, many farm operations are subsidized today by off-farm income already. Many farm women outside the home at jobs in nursing and teaching, as store clerks, as bankers; many of the men also work off the farm, so that unless some lending institutions are asking them to have three jobs, that suggestion will not work for many of the people. It was really a very sad commentary on Manitoba's No. 1 industry and I'm sure that there would be a huge public outcry across this province if other people in society were told that they should accept a scenario like this.

Most people in society feel that it's their God-given right to have a raise in pay every year whether they've earned it or not. A farmer, on the other hand, cannot set the price of his product, has no control over the cost of his goods that he must use to produce the crop, and he has no control over the climatic conditions under which he must produce it. Then it's compounded by government regulations that seem to be working against him instead of with him. And when he draws all this to the attention of the government, of the lending institutions and of other policy makers, he is told that he's a poor manager and that he should diversify and should get an off-the-farm job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not acceptable to the farm community. If the farm community could see this as a short-term, gone-tomorrow problem, I'm sure they would be quite willing to tighten their belts and ride out the storm, ride out the crisis, maybe doing it for some time. But they can see no light at the end of the tunnel, no hope of an immediate turnaround. They know that the NDP Government with all their promises of 1981, their continual propaganda telling us how great things are, and their preoccupation with the Jobs Fund,

ads and social tinkering are not going to help them - not one iota - they're not going to help them.

This government has no long-term planning for the agricultural industry of this province, just ad hoc, band-aid, stopgap help and that help given not on the basis of fairness and equity - remember? - 8 percent interest only to MACC borrowers; drought assistance to only a few of the many drought-stricken cattle producers. This Minister of Agriculture seems to feel that when rain falls, it falls along lines of municipal boundaries — (Interjection) — well, that is how he treats the drought assistance. And when it comes to the Budget Debate I'll have a bit more to say on that program, because there was considerable problem in my constituency with that and I want to address it at a later time.

In the meantime, the NDP Government is throwing up even more roadblocks. The criteria for the CRISP program was altered. As a result, approximately a thousand farmers were cut off from the CRISP program. For some obscure reason, the Minister of Employment and Economic Security changed the regulations respecting income to include the family assets. Mr. Speaker, just because a farm family has machinery and other belongings of value does not mean that they have a large income. The program should be returned to its original formula to help people who need it. If you're going to look at family assets, you should look at the debt incurred by them and whether or not they actually put dollars in the pockets of the people they're intended to help. When the bills for producing a crop are paid, when the mortgage is paid, does the family have anything left to live on? That is the question the Minister should be considering, not how much machinery the farmer has in his yard, but is it making money for him? I think if the rural communities are thriving today, it is in spite of the government and not because of it.

There are many more issues, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to comment on and I will take the opportunity in the Budget Debate to do so. I have some information that I'm waiting for concerning some cutbacks in public health nurses in some of my areas and also some other information that I want to give the Minister of Agriculture at a later time. So, I'll conclude my remarks now and tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I will be speaking again on agriculture problems because they are many. There is a crisis and I don't think the NDP Government knows it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.
Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted now to have an opportunity to address the theme of the Throne Speech and not have to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . face the discussion on the amendment that was before us, an amendment that was devoid of reason, really did not show any leadership on the part of the opposition party, but focussed as our Leader said today, on endless repetition of negative,

carping criticism when the people of Manitoba today want to hear about leadership, want to hear about parties concerned to provide an economic future for Manitoba.

We didn't hear it, Mr. Speaker, opposite. We didn't hear it from the Leader of the Opposition. We didn't hear it from any of the opposition spokesmen who made contributions during the course of the Throne Speech Debate. What we heard from the Leader of the Opposition, and that theme was picked up throughout his caucus — (Interjection) — well, one of my colleagues says which leader? Well, the person who is designated by their caucus as leader. All we heard was attempts to belittle the constructive efforts of this government to deal with the real issues that the people of Manitoba face. — (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Pembina says "Al, tell the truth." This member has been trying to convey to the Honourable Member for Pembina from Day One that it's his responsibility to address issues in this Chamber in a truthful manner.

Mr. Speaker, when I say in a truthful manner, I say present a true picture of this government to the electorate, a picture of a government that is not perfect, but is working conscientiously to determine ways in which we can make it possible for more and more people in Manitoba to have the dignity of being employed. Mr. Speaker, it is no pride to this Minister of Labour, it is no pride to any of us on this side of the House that there are people unemployed today in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, economists will tell you - and it makes common sense - that the greatest problem in our economy today, in Canada, in North America, is the fact that we have enormous numbers of people who are unemployed, who can't afford to buy things. There is no purchasing power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite represent a party that fought tooth and nail every progressive step the Democratic Socialists took - yes, with the help of some Liberals; yes, with the help of some few Red Tories - over the course of the decades of this country, to finally get more purchasing power to the underprivileged and those on fixed incomes.

The founder of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the precursor of the NDP, and one colleague, A.A. Heaps, persuaded a then Liberal Prime Minister to commit the Liberal party to old age pensions. That was the beginning of old age pensions in this country, Mr. Speaker. Conservatives wouldn't go for it, but the voting power of those two members from Winnipeg, this province, started old age pensions in this country. And what has that meant to our economy over the years, Mr. Speaker? It has meant that despite the depths of the recession, — (Interjection) — They don't like Medicare. Well, we'll deal with that one after. My colleagues say that the honourable members over there don't like Medicare; I believe that, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that the Democratic Socialists in this country finally were able to convince an unyielding, old line party that in order to stay in power they had to promise something of social consequence to the people of Canada and that's how we got old age pensions. During the depths of the recession we have suffered, the fact that people on pensions still had purchasing power made it possible for the small grocer and for the small businessman to continue to operate because there was still a flow of income in this country.

In the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, that income dried up. There were no monies available, no monies available through children's allowances, through old age pensions. I have to give credit to a woman in the Federal Parliament who's now deceased, who stood up to the pressure of the financial institutions and insisted that there be Canada pension plans in Canada, a policy that the CCF, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the NDP had been urging upon government. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have heard members opposite talking about the need for greater vision in respect to payments to people in Canada and in Manitoba, systemizing and providing a fair, more equitable distribution, to make sure that everyone had some guaranteed income. That would have been a source of inspiration, Mr. Speaker, that would have been a challenge. But we don't hear any constructive, idealistic, visionary statements from opposite. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Virten says, "What did we do with the young people?"

A MEMBER: You stole from them.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, what the young people did in this country, under years and decades of old line parties, is they walked the bread lines. They walked the bread lines, and young people I knew, just a little older than I, didn't have jobs; there were no jobs available. It was only when a war started that our society was able to plan to put them to work.

Mr. Speaker, old-line party spokesmen and Conservatives in particular seemed to have a fixation that to plan, you sound somehow communist. It's somehow evil to plan to use your resources in a constructive way to help people. Mr. Speaker, their idea is what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was talking about. Their idea is the free market. Let the old forces of supply and demand look after society. Let the corporations, who are the real engines of our economy, create the wealth and it will trickle down to the poor in our society. That's the philosophy of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker. That's the philosophy of Ronald Reagan; that's the philosophy of our new Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney, that big private enterprise will look after things.

Mr. Speaker, obviously . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, obviously members opposite are uncomfortable when I characterize the nature of their party. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the analysis I make of their party is not a false one. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that from time to time there were progressives - they're not there now opposite - but there were progressives within people that call themselves Conservatives in Western Canada. And I consider it a privilege and an honour to have met Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, a man of vision, a man of moral integrity. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that no one is without hope. There is still a possibility that

from opposite, with a little encouraging, the Honourable Member for Lakeside will finally divorce himself of that negative carping criticism that sits around him and emerge as a true Leader of the Opposition; someone who can lift the carping criticism to some constructive criticism, some positive suggestions as to where this government can do more to further the economy of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Premier alluded to the contrast that exists in the opposition. At one stage when we talked about the Jobs Fund . . .

MR. A. DREIDGER: "Fraud fund."

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, now the Member for Emerson repeats again from his seat, "Fraud Fund."

A MEMBER: Tell him about the frogs, Al.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well if he's saying it's a "frog fund," that's no compliment to him either, Mr. Speaker. We've heard stories about what happened with frogs and the Honourable Member for Emerson, but I won't tell those stories and I won't tell the Animal Rights Society or anyone about the honourable member's disposition of that frog. I will leave it to their imagination.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members waged a long dedicated campaign during the course of Sessions here in this House to try and belittle in derisive comments like the ones that were used - fraud - suggesting that this government was not genuinely endeavouring to use the public will to further the interests of our economy. That was their attack, but, Mr. Speaker, when we called the Yeas and Nays - and I was in the House and privileged I think to urge that that call be made, or perhaps it was my colleague, I don't recall - it was just singularly impressive that all of those nay sayers, all of those critics finally had to accept the fact that they were going to be counted one day if they stood in opposition to that bill. So despite all of their negative criticism, they stood in their place and voted for the bill, voted in favour of the principle of the bill, which then of course went the usual route to committee and back and they voted in favour of it.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of conduct reveals the character, purpose and philosophy of the members opposite. They're prepared to talk two ways and to act two ways, Mr. Speaker, and then you'll remember how members opposite used to belittle and criticize the Main Street Program. Oh, how they thought, Mr. Speaker, that this government was being foolish; how the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Pete Adam, was never going to see any improvement in Main Streets in Manitoba. They belittled; they criticized; they carped; but, Mr. Speaker, residents of small communities in Manitoba - communities represented by members opposite - welcomed the program, sat down with the Minister's department, negotiated and developed attractive Main Streets for their communities, and the honourable members, they may say privately, oh well, you know they were giving money away.

Mr. Speaker, those initiatives engineered a contribution from private enterprise in those communities from other levels of government, the local government of those communities, and combined, there

Tuesday, 19 March, 1985

was economic initiative to create a better environment for the businesses and the people living in those communities. And they were opposed to it, Mr. Speaker. But when it came to the ribbon-snipping time, oh they were front and centre, Mr. Speaker, and they didn't stand and make speeches critical of the program; no, they loved the program. They didn't tell their residents, their constituents, that while they sat opposite this government they called him "Main Street Pete," "you're never going to get anything done." They never admitted to those things. They won't admit them now but, Mr. Speaker, I implore the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, during the extra time he has now, to pick out from their speeches the derisive comments, the negative comments, and we'll use them.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite think that they can say one thing in this Chamber, vote another way in this Chamber after what they've said and what they've spoken, and then go back home and make believe that they hadn't said those things. Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it appears that the members are somewhat uncomfortable at what I say. Well, so they should be; Mr. Speaker, because they have placed on the record some very demeaning things. During the course of this sitting of this House, it's very interesting that the two most significant areas of economic activity, for people they represent, hydro-electric development and agriculture, we haven't heard anything constructive or positive across the way, Mr. Speaker. We are the only province to have demonstrated a concern about the tragedy that's there in our farming communities.

When the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was speaking - I've reread Hansard - there were interjections; "Well tell us about words reflecting on Russia; What's the paper you're reading, Pete?"; derisive disinterest. That's right! From politicians whose actions and whose words in this House reflect the disinterest in the plight of farmers in Manitoba and reflect the disinterest of the plight of farmers throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose said, and very eloquently, "Honourable members opposite would like to see the whole of the agricultural industry faced with a free market economy." They like to see the free flow of goods. They're all for freer trade. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but in their heart of hearts they know that in every one of the major agricultural producing countries in the world, governments make sure that their base in agriculture is sound whether it be in France, in Germany, in England, in Australia, in New Zealand. You name it, Mr. Speaker. There is some undergirding of an essential enterprise and that's agriculture, but we don't hear it across the way. We don't hear strong statements defensive of the Wheat Board, strong statements defensive of farmers' interest for better guaranteed prices. No, they want to return to free markets. They love the idea of the railroad being able

to charge variable rates. Where have I heard one speech over there critical of the CNR's attempt to introduce variable rates? Not a word, Mr. Speaker. That indicates, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
I'm having some difficulty hearing the honourable member.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't reflect further on the lack of constructive argument from opposite, but I will point out in just a few minutes, because I know other honourable members would like to participate in the debate, perhaps another time, I would like to point out that those personal comments that have come from opposite will not be responded to by this Minister or, I believe, from others on this side of the House. We're not going to reduce ourselves to the level of debate that has been typical from over there.

I want to tell honourable members here before I sit down, because there have been derisive comments about my attitude to our neighbours to the south, that I have in all my meetings with Congress people and Senators, indicated that I'm prepared to go down there and make speeches in favour, for example, of the people's right to have water development projects in their area. All I said, Mr. Speaker, is that those projects should not be developed at our expense, and that was understood. That was always made very clear.

I want to tell honourable members opposite if they would cease their continuing chatter, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . that I have been privileged to be invited and did accept the invitation and was a guest lecturer at the State University in North Dakota. I've been privileged to sit down and meet with Congressmen and Senators from North Dakota, and there is good will, Mr. Speaker. There is some misunderstanding, but there's basic good will. But good will, Mr. Speaker, is not fostered by the kind of inanities, the kind of thoughtless expressions that come from opposite. Honourable members, Mr. Speaker, are not concerned with the accuracy of the things they say, they're concerned to try and cloud and confuse and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, distort what are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I am saddened by the attitude of members opposite, saddened by their conduct. I expected more from mature people in a Legislature. I expected that they would want to appear to be constructive, appear to be showing some alternate leadership. We have seen none, Mr. Speaker, and I'm saddened by that. I hope that honourable members opposite in the Budget Debate that will follow shortly will show a change of attitude and a change of direction,

indicate some constructive criticism, some alternate leadership, because that's what the people of Manitoba expect. They don't expect the kind of idle repetitive carping that we've heard from opposite, so that's a challenge I leave with honourable members as I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for my second opportunity in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate again, especially having just seen a demonstration of the fact that no radical is too old to display youthful enthusiasm, idealism, and a total lack of a grasp of reality.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has been perhaps one of the people opposite who has been most responsible for some of the more erratic behaviour of this government that has earned them a reputation of incompetence and bungling out there amongst the electorate. This is the Minister who epitomizes more than any other, with the possible exception of the Member for Inkster, the anti-American attitude of this government which will, in the long run, work to the detriment of the people of Manitoba. This is the Minister, Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for the deplorable relations that exist today between Manitoba and North Dakota.

This Minister resorted to a form of dealing with the people of the United States and North Dakota in the halls of Congress that was bound to lead inevitably to the kind of reaction that we've seen from the people of North Dakota, from the legislators of North Dakota. It was totally unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, because the Schreyer Government and our government had taken the same stand with respect to protecting the interests of Manitoba. We had fought against that project on the basis of an international treaty, Mr. Speaker, and there is no stronger guarantee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the honourable member would accept a question.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, even though the Minister of Labour would not submit to a question from me when he spoke earlier, I'm prepared to submit to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain has indicated that the Minister of Labour was doing something apparently irregular or something he didn't agree with in talking to Senators and Congress persons in Washington in respect to the issue of Garrison — (Interjection) — does he then condemn his colleagues, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, or the

Honourable Member for Arthur for willingly accompanying me and making the same representations to the same Senators and Congressmen in Washington.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question the members has asked and I'm going to respond to it. I hope, Sir, that this will not take away from the time that I have to address the motion before us.

When the members opposite accuse us on this side of being negative, Sir, that is not a fair accusation because the very reason that we went along with the proposal of the former Minister of Natural Resources and that government was because the issue of opposition to Garrison was a non-partisan one in this province and every party had stood behind the same position.

The only difference of opinion was on how that opposition should be expressed, and rather than place the province in a situation where one political party was not supportive of whatever action another one was taking to try and protect the interests of Manitoba, we went along. But the Minister knows full well, because in the Legislative Committee, before we ever went to Washington, I took exception to the way the Minister was planning to proceed and I warned him of the consequences.

I said what we have between these two countries is an international treaty, the Boundary Waters Treaty, and when there's a dispute between two countries, there cannot be any stronger form of guarantee for the resolution of that dispute and that difficulty than an international treaty. We have an international treaty and we have a report by a bipartisan commission, the International Joint Commission, that reported in favour of Manitoba's position and all that Manitoba needed to do was to continue to put forward that position through the diplomatic channels, through our Federal Government to the Federal Government in Washington which had given its assurance that that treaty would not be violated. That's all they needed to do; that's what diplomacy is about, Mr. Speaker. It's to gain your ends without aggravating the other party. But no, this government saw an opportunity to exploit an issue.

They knew that every Manitoban was against Garrison and they knew that although we had effectively opposed it for four years, we did it quietly and in an unostentatious way, and they saw an opportunity to begin this advertising program that we've seen today, blown so out of proportion and so many other issues of government as well. They began advertising and they sent people to Washington and they lobbied in the Halls of Congress, not realizing that once you enter into that game, you've got to have something to trade and they had nothing to trade. When it finally came about that the President's Commission decided that that project should not proceed in the way it was originally planned, what else could one expect but to see the legislators of North Dakota look around for somebody to lash out at.

Who did they lash out at? The people that had been running around the Halls of Congress doing things that

they saw as interference in their activities. That's what happened, Mr. Speaker. To add insult to injury, instead of the Minister of Energy or the First Minister standing up and saying, I understand the feelings of the legislators in North Dakota, I understand their feelings, but they must also understand that we have a position to protect and that we don't want to sacrifice the interests of Manitobans. No, instead, Mr. Speaker, they call them childish and petulant - those were the words they used, guaranteed to keep those people opposed and antagonistic toward Manitoba and it all stems from the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Labour's attitude.

I'd like to deal with the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, since some of the members opposite seem to believe now that we in the opposition have backed off our statements with respect to how that fund operated. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that after two years of operation of the Jobs Fund, so-called, I have simply had my worst fears about that fund confirmed. That fund was indeed a "Fraud Fund," fraudulent to the extent that the people of Manitoba were led to believe that something new was going to happen, that the government was going to make a new thrust and devote all kinds of new resources into job creation. Well, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the case. There's been very little new financing, new funding go into job creation. What they did was take a bunch of programs that existed in some form previously and draw them under one umbrella so they could be advertised. That was the primary reason for bringing them all together - to advertise.

They spent \$1.1 million in fiscal 1983-84 to advertise the Jobs Fund and in the year that we're just closing now, Mr. Speaker, I'll guarantee, as sure as we're standing here, that there's going to be more than \$1.1 million spent to advertise that fraudulent fund in 1984-85. We saw such outlandish things take place, Mr. Speaker, as money, taken from the budget of the Minister of Highways and the present Minister of Natural Resources - they took money from the Highways budget and they put it into the Jobs Fund and then they allocated money from the Jobs Fund to the North of Portage Development and they made great fanfare about the announcements, and then they admitted they wouldn't be able to spend it there so they put it back into the Jobs Fund. Then they took it out of the Jobs Fund and gave \$5 million back to the Highways Department and had another advertising campaign to say that they were going to have highways construction take place - all made possible because of the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker. What a fraud!

The First Minister stood this afternoon and asked us, would we cancel the Jobs Fund. I told him two years ago, they would never be able to cancel the Jobs Fund because there's nothing in it; there is nothing new in it, Mr. Speaker. In order for the normal level of activity of job creation to go on in this province, in order for some semblance of a program for highway repairs and street maintenance and bridge building and things like that to go on and youth employment programs, they have to have those kinds of programs so it wouldn't matter what happened.

Employment in this province would never reach the point where they would be able to say, aha, at last the goals of the Jobs Fund have been met. But I'll tell you what we'll do, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what we will

stop. We will stop the wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' funds to undertake their image advertising for that fund. That's what we'll stop. There's \$1.1 million to be saved right there and maybe the Minister of Education won't have to go downtown into the core area of Winnipeg and organize volunteer campaigns to collect parkas for kids who don't have parkas in the wintertime; we won't have that kind of value, Mr. Speaker. We don't have to spend money on advertising while kids go cold because they haven't got parkas. That's what we'll do, Mr. Speaker.

It was interesting this afternoon to listen to the First Minister talk about the number of people in Manitoba and the negativism of people on this side of the House. You may even recall yourself, Mr. Speaker, how the members opposite, when they were in opposition, used to make much of the fact that the population in the province was staying more or less stable as people left the province, and they used to put out their little advertising campaigns, "Will the last person out please turn out the lights." That was the negative sort of approach they were taking. Now they're talking about people coming back - I think 33,000 people was the figure that the Minister used this afternoon.

Well, let's look at some of the figures of what's happened. During the four years of our administration when all of these people were allegedly leaving the province, there were 35,000 people added to the workforce, and there were 33,000 jobs created in this province. There was only a shortfall over four years of 2,000 people from the number entering the workforce to the number who had jobs, and if I recall the statistics correctly, Mr. Speaker, of the young people between the ages of 15 and 24 who entered the job force here - every one had a job.

Now, if there are so many people coming back, why is it that in over three years of this government only 25,000 people have entered the workforce? During four years in our administration there were somewhat over 8,000 a year entered the workforce; in their first three years somewhat over 8,000 a year have entered the workforce. Where are all these people? Where are all these people that are coming back? I'll tell you where they are. A great number of them are on unemployment insurance and on welfare.

In the first two years - and I only have two years of information because the third year isn't available - but from 1981 to 1983, in 1981, Mr. Speaker, there were 20,439 people drawing unemployment insurance in Manitoba. Two years later that number jumped to 40,135 and the payments under unemployment insurance had risen from \$136 million to \$310 million. And what happened to the people on welfare? What happened to the numbers of people on welfare? I have some information dealing with the City of Winnipeg. This is what people came back to. In 1981, the City of Winnipeg had 2,436 welfare cases. Three years later, in 1984, after three years of NDP Government - "great future under the NDP" - the number of people on welfare in the City of Winnipeg had risen to 7,259, a 200 percent increase in three years. Is that what people came back to Manitoba for? I doubt it. If these people would stop practising their duplicity and doublespeak, they'd understand what's happened in this province; that while we were in government there were opportunities and the resource boomed in areas of

Saskatchewan and Alberta and B.C., and young people and older people were going there as well and, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you duplicity is not in the book.

The people were going there for opportunities, just as people have left other jurisdictions and have gone there for opportunities. The population of Saskatchewan remained stable for almost 40 years because young people went elsewhere to find opportunities. That didn't mean that there weren't opportunities there as well, but there were opportunities elsewhere as well, and that's why people left Manitoba. They weren't driven out of Manitoba and now the bloom is off the boom in Alberta and Saskatchewan and B.C. and they're not coming back here for jobs. They're coming back here because if you're going to be without a job, it's better to be at home among your friends, because over three years there have been 15,000 more people added to the unemployment rolls in this province and only 11,000 have got jobs. That's not opportunity. With a 200 percent increase in the number of people on welfare in Winnipeg, why don't they understand what's happening? Why don't they acknowledge what's happening?

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister said again that one of the things they had set out to do three years ago when they came into government was to turn the economy around. You may remember that, Mr. Speaker, that pledge to turn the economy around. Well, this government of incompetents has taken an economy that was growing at 4.7 percent, the third highest in Canada, above the national average, and they brought it to the point this year where the Conference Board projects it's going to be 1.6 percent below the Canadian average and tied for dead last. The lowest growth of employment in the whole of Canada. That's what they've done; that's how they've turned the economy around and they were going to use an activist approach. An activist approach was what they were going to use to turn the economy around.

The First Minister believed that you had to spend money to turn the economy around. In the *Financial Post* in December of 1981, he said, "I believe the policies of restraint are worsening the debt and if we're to reduce the debt, we must move away from acute protected restraint." You know, at that time they had an activist approach; deficits were good; they were going to spend money and they were going to turn this economy around. Well, of course in the first year we had negative growth in the province, but it wasn't as bad as it was elsewhere and that's exactly what one would expect in the Manitoba economy. We don't suffer the same depressions; we don't benefit from the same booms. Mr. Speaker, they simply were taking credit for something that was basically taking place in the economy.

Now we see an economy that is beginning to fall behind the rest of the country, because the rest of the country is moving ahead. Remember the philosophy a couple of years ago in the Budget? They were going to stand by and be able to catch hold and take advantage of the national recovery when it came along. Well, the national recovery seems to have come along but it's passed them by. They missed it. — (Interjection) — Exactly.

The First Minister this afternoon talks about manufacturing. He has the gall to exercise the doublespeak again, talking about manufacturing. One

of the reasons in this province that the economy is expected to perform as badly as it is, and one of the reasons that there are so few, that the number of people employed is so low - only 11,000 new jobs in three years - is because of what's happened in the manufacturing area.

Because, Mr. Speaker, from December of 1981 to December of 1984, there's been a decline of 10,000 people employed in the manufacturing area of this province, from 65,000 down to 55,000. That is bad news for Manitoba and I don't care whether the members opposite say that's negativism. That is bad news when the people employed in manufacturing drop from 65,000 to 55,000, because that's how we get a lot of wealth coming into this province.

We even sell to the Americans, Mr. Speaker, and that's how people are employed here. That's what creates the wealth so that we're able to expand the service industries and we're able to pay for the services that government provides. But we're suffering a serious decline in the manufacturing area. And what are these people doing? They are putting on a payroll tax and when you want some more of a product, Mr. Speaker, you don't put a tax on it - but this government did. They've raised the costs of workers' compensation by about 60 percent already and that falls far short of covering off for their incompetence and mismanagement of the fund. They've raised the pension costs and they pass labour legislation that says that a company taking over a bankrupt one has to pick up the collective agreement. So what have we got? Industries that might be made viable again in this province, leaving, because it's non-competitive. Is it any wonder that the number of people employed in manufacturing has fallen from 65,000 to 55,000? And the First Minister this afternoon talks about the careful plan, the careful strategy that they have outlined in the Throne Speech. It's ridiculous.

But you know what they're hoping for? What they are hoping for is that Limestone is going to do for this government, for the economy under this government, what Hydro construction did under the Schreyer Government in its second term. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. It's not going to work. And I'll have to put again some figures onto the record as to why it's not going to work, and some of the backbenchers and some of the Cabinet Ministers should be aware of this.

In the years 1974 through 1977, in 1982-83 dollars, there was over \$2.3 billion spent on Hydro construction in this province - 2.3 billion - until prior to the election. In 1977, they at last saw the folly of their ways and they quietly stopped construction on Limestone. They didn't tell anybody that before the election. Then the members opposite, and ever since, have had the consummate gall to try and tell the people of Manitoba that the Tories stopped construction of Limestone. All the Member for Thompson has to do is have a look at the prospectus that his Minister of Finance filed and he will see who stopped construction of Limestone. They stopped it, Mr. Speaker, because there was, at last, a realization that the foolish plans that they had undertaken - as they would say, based on the best of technical information available through a politicized Manitoba Hydro - that the plans had gone awry and it had to be stopped. Nevertheless, in those four years, it was 2.3 billion.

Tuesday, 19 March, 1985

In the next four years, there was something like \$750 million spent on Hydro construction as that project was wound down. So, there was a drop of something over \$400 million a year taken out of the economy; \$400 million a year that had been, to a very great extent, invested unnecessarily during the Schreyer years. So before the economy could even get back to where it had been, other government activities in the private sector had to pick up an investment of \$400 million a year.

Now, they're hoping to repeat that. But if they'll look at the information that Hydro filed with the committee, they will see that in 1982-83 dollars, the impact of Limestone construction will only be slightly more than half the impact of Hydro construction during the last years of the Schreyer administration - slightly more than half - so that all of the boom that took place because of that overheated construction of Hydro is simply not going to be there, so that despite their fondest hopes, Mr. Speaker, it's simply not about to happen. — (Interjection) — Well, I would bet on it. The Attorney-General says, don't bet on it. I'll bet that it won't have the impact that he thinks. I know what impact it will have. I know that it's going to create the opportunity for this government to pick the pockets of taxpayers once again to advertise as to what's going to happen, what they tell the people that's going to happen.

Of course, the danger with that is that we have a situation here where a government that is desperate to retain power, that has failed in so many of its activities, so many of its programs, are going to undertake a project, the bill for which won't be presented for a decade. That, to me, is an extremely dangerous situation for the people of Manitoba to find themselves in.

It's unfortunate that in this province, there is not some opportunity for an objective evaluation of the plans of Manitoba Hydro to undertake this kind of expenditure. — (Interjection) — The Attorney-General says that's what the NEB would do. The Attorney-General is either practicing duplicity again, Mr. Speaker, or else he doesn't understand what the National Energy Board was supposed to do. The National Energy Board never had the mandate to examine the advisability as to what the government was undertaking, with respect to advancement especially. All they were doing was looking at - was there a surplus of power and would it be in Canada's interests, Manitoba's interests, to export the power? That's all they were looking at. They clearly say they had no mandate to look at whether it was advisable to advance it. They clearly say they had no mandate to look at that, aside from the fact that the government didn't even ask for a two-year advancement; they only asked for a one-year advancement. So no one - not the Committee of this Legislature, not the National Energy Board - no one has had an opportunity to objectively examine the second year of advancement that this government is calling for that happens to coincide so nicely with their re-election plans.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite can't seem to understand why we are so skeptical about what they are undertaking, and indeed, why the public out there are so skeptical about what this government should be doing. They seem to think that the public should be grasping on to this and falling in behind and saying,

hallelujah, look what this government's doing, but they're not. You know why? There are a number of reasons.

No. 1 is the experience of the Schreyer years, because they saw what politicization of Hydro construction could do during the Schreyer years and they saw what happened to their hydro rates. They saw that hydro rates went up 157 percent as a consequence of this government's politicization and incompetent management of the public utility. That's one of the reasons why they're concerned.

Another of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is that the NDP in 1981 promised that they would build Limestone - regardless. They promised they would build Limestone. They were pressured continually by the Manitoba Federation of Labor to proceed and build Limestone irrespective of whether they had sales or not.

What kind of impact has the pressure that the Manitoba Federation of Labour has put on this government had? There's legitimate concern out there, Mr. Speaker, as to what effect that has had. We've seen a complete and total politicization of Hydro under this government; how they've brought in their political hacks from the NDP office in Broadbent's office to take over the Energy Authority and then subsequently, to take over chairmanship of Hydro as well. Whenever anyone approached Hydro to ask questions about what was going on, they were always directed to the Energy Authority - they'd get their answers from the Energy Authority - until they went before the National Energy Board, and then the Energy Authority was nowhere to be seen. Only Manitoba Hydro people were then put on the stand to defend the decisions that had been made by the Energy Authority and this government. That's why they're concerned, because they don't believe that this government has the interests of the people of Manitoba at hand. They believe that this government has the interests of the NDP at hand.

The other thing that should give people grave cause for concern is the fact that we know that this government has an advertising program worth hundreds of thousands of dollars ready to go. They passed a Special Warrant last December for \$590,000 - more money to be spent on advertising. Why is that necessary? Did the Schreyer Government undertake advertising like that, Mr. Speaker? Did they spend millions on advertising when they were spending, in effect, twice as much money in order to be able to tell people that there were employment opportunities, and to tell suppliers that there were opportunities? Nonsense, nonsense. They didn't have that kind of a program going. This government doesn't need it either, except to try and make the people believe that what they're doing is going to be the salvation of this province economically.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not going to work because the public has seen what's happened with Hydro before. They see what this government is spending now; they know that a great many of their promises that were made in 1981 have been broken. They promised the people jobs, not welfare, and they gave them welfare. They promised them a rose garden, Mr. Speaker, and all they gave them was the brambles and they know that and they're not going to be taken in by some advertising program financed by money that's filched from the pockets of Manitoba taxpayers.

What the government intends to do, to add further insult to injury, is that they're going to finance their political propaganda during the election from the taxpayers' pockets as well. This grandiose advertising scheme is going to run from now until the election is called. We're going to see saturation advertising and then the moment the election is called they may have the decency to stop the taxpayers' money being spent on government image advertising; they will take over immediately with their own political advertising, Mr. Speaker, with the intention that they're going to pick the taxpayers' pockets to pay for it.

Well, we've made the commitment to the people, Mr. Speaker, that if we're elected they won't get a nickel of that money to advertise their political propaganda for the election. They should go to the people at their own expense, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to join the debate, but I was listening to some of the member's comments upstairs and I found them so out of tune to what he was saying in 1981 and I saw him screwing whatever bit of self-righteousness he could screw up and I wanted to point out some immense contradictions in that person's statements . . .

A MEMBER: And some lies.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . and some great untruths, Mr. Speaker, some great untruths. Here is a person who gets up and says, we haven't been having a chance to look at Hydro. We should be referring these things to a Public Utilities Committee or we should be sending them to a Public Utilities Board. I ask him, when he was a member of the 1981 government at that time when it made an announcement about a Western Power Grid, where was he? Did he say that should go to a Public Utilities Board so that people could assess the costs and benefits? No, that person was in hiding, Mr. Speaker, because he was too afraid of his leader at that time to ever screw up the courage to get up. That is what a coward does, Mr. Speaker. I heard nothing of him at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Perhaps the honourable wishes to reconsider his words.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I'll withdraw that comment; it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, but when a person sticks his head in the sand through that whole process and then gets up here and tries to talk in terms of character assassination about the politicization of Hydro, when they in fact fired a chairman right in the middle of a hearing, Mr. Speaker, that was terribly shameful. When they appointed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: What we are finding now, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

If members wish to hold a private debate, perhaps they would do so outside and then we can all hear the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives don't like to hear the truth about the past. They then appointed a person who they said was political and we accepted that the Chairman of Hydro could be a political appointee and that person went before the Public Utilities Committee and made a number of statements and came back a day later after we'd called them to task and said, oh, I might not have told the truth exactly here, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Did they fire him?

HON. W. PARASIUK: They didn't fire him for that, Mr. Speaker. They didn't fire him for that.

A MEMBER: It was okay; he's a Tory.

HON. W. PARASIUK: They then went forward over a period of years desperately trying to consummate a Hydro deal and not consummating a Hydro deal, but that government, and the Member for Turtle Mountain was a member of that government, launched an advertising campaign, paid for by the public, talk about sitting on a gold mine, the worst type of political Machiavellian activity I've ever seen because they had the following: They put the ads on television; they put them in the paper and that night they had the Leader of the Conservative Party, the then Premier, going on with a five-minute statement which they said was paid for by the Conservative Party but meshed in entirely with the \$250,000 publicly-paid-for campaign and that Member for Turtle Mountain was the person who voted that in as a member of Cabinet. He was the Finance Minister at that time; he was the Treasury Minister.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore we then had a situation, with that type of sanctimonious untruth, we had a situation where during the campaign, the Leader of the Conservative Party, the now deposed Premier, made a statement saying that we had a deal and told Hydro that they should get ready to build Limestone, didn't refer it to a Public Utilities Committee, didn't refer it to a Public Utilities Board, said we are the government; this is what is going on. Where was the Member for Turtle Mountain then? Where was he then, Mr. Speaker? He was still Chairman of Treasury Board, still a senior member of that Cabinet and not one peep out of that squeak, not one squeak, not one peep, not one squeak.

A MEMBER: How do you feel now, Brian - pretty small?

HON. W. PARASIUK: And he has the gall to get up today and start talking in his sanctimonious way about politicizing Hydro. Where was he when the former Minister responsible for Hydro in the Conservative administration called in the members of the board and told them, if you don't get ready to build Limestone, we're going to set up a new corporation to build Limestone. Where was he when that type of threatening and bullying was taking place?

Mr. Speaker, that had been told to me by the previous board members and they're now trying to say that is

nonsense. Where was he when that was being said? Where was he when he was assessing whether in fact the people of Manitoba would benefit or not benefit out of the Western Grid? Did he do a calculation as to what our costs might be? Did he do a calculation as to what our benefits might be? No, he never, Mr. Speaker. Did he ask Hydro to give their assessment of what the government had negotiated? No, he didn't.

When I came into office, I asked Hydro to give us an assessment of what the previous Conservative Government had negotiated and they pointed out that there were a number of liabilities; there were a number of costs that would have cost in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. The interesting thing that I never heard him say a peep then, never heard him say a peep.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, he talks about advertising again. When I took on being Minister responsible for the Manitoba Energy Authority, I found that there were a number of costs associated with a fellow called Scott, out of Toronto, and I said, what did this person Scott do? They said he was organizing the Conservative campaign. His costs were being billed to the Manitoba Energy Authority, Mr. Speaker. Where was the Minister responsible for the Treasury Board then?

I can appreciate his fears that this government might be as rotten as that government was when it comes to advertising and we can give the commitment that when we provide a public information program it will be about real programs; it will be about real activity; it will be about real jobs, not make-believe things that the Conservatives were trying to cook up without consuming any one of them and we won't back down from a public information program.

We have an opportunity here, with respect to 6,000 construction jobs - and those people might laugh at 6,000 construction jobs - but the unemployed in Manitoba, the young, they want those jobs, Mr. Speaker, despite the negativism of the Conservatives and they want the opportunity to get those jobs and they want to know about them and they want to know when they're going to take place and they want to know about the training opportunities, Mr. Speaker, and there's 11,000 spinoff jobs as well; and the various construction companies, the various supply companies, they want to know about those as well and the public has said, let us know more about them. We think these are very good things, let us know, and we'll put forward a program, Mr. Speaker, not sneaky, not under the table, not dealing with fanciful untruths and things that won't happen. We'll talk about the real McCoy.

We will in fact put those figures on the table, unlike those people. We won't hide them in the back door. We won't pay for the Premier's advertising campaign, for a fellow called Scott, because Scott had nothing to do with the Manitoba Energy Authority. We won't use those types of tactics, Mr. Speaker, not at all.

And he goes further - and it's amazing what depths people will sink to when they want to do character assassination. They said that at the National Energy Board there were no people from the Energy Authority present. Is that what he just said a few minutes ago? There was a person there, Mr. Speaker, from the Energy Authority on one of the panels answering questions throughout. Now why would a person say something as untrue as saying there was no one there from the Energy Authority?

I also, Mr. Speaker, got daily reports as to what was taking place, so we had a very good view of what was happening. We presented our proposal in a technical manner to the National Energy Board, because we've said that the National Energy Board hearings weren't a political forum. We were going there to present the facts, to have them take their best shot at looking at our analysis, to do their independent analysis, and we would see what they would have to say. That's the approach we took.

That was in contrast to the Conservative position where they went there, postured on a political basis, never asked one question at the hearing, Mr. Speaker, not one question, because as I said before, they were afraid of the truth; they didn't want to find out the truth; they didn't want to find out that Manitoba Hydro would make a \$400 million profit in 1984 dollars, or a \$1.7 billion profit and as received, because that would completely contradict their political posturing.

So we're not afraid of the facts here. We're not afraid of the facts at all, because the facts speak for themselves. People have looked at the facts and they find that the position and the analysis put forward by the Leader of the Conservative Party were completely wrong. They found that the past claims of the Member for Turtle Mountain, when he criticized the Northern States Power deal, were completely wrong. They found that the position in some of the hysterical rantings of the Member for Lakeside, when he was criticizing the Northern States Power sale over the last year, both here and on television and radio elsewhere because we've saved the transcripts of some of those statements, were completely wrong and completely unjustified.

So if the people of Manitoba have to choose between the unfounded rantings of the Conservative Party or the considered analysis and judgments of a New Democratic Party, based on considered analysis and considered judgments of professional people at Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Energy Authority, let me assure you that the people of Manitoba will choose the New Democrats and cast out the Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, history will judge that the Conservatives don't accomplish anything with Hydro, it's the New Democrats who get things done.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

In accordance with our Rule 35(4), I'm interrupting the debate to put the question to the House on the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Wolseley and seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, for an address to her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, in answer to her Speech on the opening of this Session.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MESSAGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I have a message from Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba.

Tuesday, 19 March, 1985

MR. SPEAKER: I have been informed of proposed Bill 10 which will provide Interim Authority to make expenditures from the Consolidated Fund commencing April 1st, 1985, pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1985. It will also provide Commitment Authority and a portion of the Borrowing Authority provided for the 1985-86 fiscal year. I recommend Bill 10 to the House. Signed this 19th day of March, 1985 by the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines, that the said Message be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

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