



**Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

33 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXXII No. 43A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 14 JUNE, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Hon. Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	IND
<b>CORRIN, Q.C., Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	IND
<b>DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virden	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Hon. Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, Hon. John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 14 June, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions  
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Committee on Economic Development.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Standing Committee on Economic Development beg leave to present the following as their Third Report:

Your Committee met on Thursday, June 14, 1984 to consider the Annual Reports of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. and Manitoba Development Corporation, the Financial Statements of William Clare (Manitoba) Ltd. and the Annual Report of Flyer Industries Ltd.

Messrs. David Gardave, Chairman of the Board and Malcolm Wright, President provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd.

Information with respect to all matters pertaining to the operations of Manitoba Development Corporation and William Clare (Manitoba) Ltd. was provided by Messrs. Hugh Jones, Chairman, Greg Goodwin, Assistant General Manager and Alex Musgrove, Treasurer.

Messrs. Hugh Jones, Chairman, Ken Clark, President and Chief Executive Officer and Greg Goodwin, Corporate Secretary of Flyer Industries Ltd., provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to the Company.

Your Committee examined the Annual Reports of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. for the year ended March 31, 1983 and for the nine months ended December 31, 1983, the Annual Report of Manitoba Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983, the Financial Statements of William Clare (Manitoba) Ltd. as at December 31, 1983 and the Annual Report of Flyer Industries Ltd., as at December 31, 1983, and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement.

Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for Manitoba. I would like to inform this House of the successful completion of one of this government's major economic initiatives.

I am pleased to announce that a contract has been signed with Northern States Power Company of Minneapolis, Minnesota, to supply that utility with 500 megawatts of firm power for 12 years beginning May 1, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this important power and energy sale represents a good business deal for both parties. For Manitoba, this firm power sale to NSP will generate an estimated \$3.2 billion in revenue. Studies undertaken by the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Hydro confirm a benefit/cost ratio of more than 2 to 1 associated with this sale. This means the province and the people of Manitoba will make a profit of approximately \$1.7 billion over the life of the contract.

Northern States Power for its part will obtain a reliable supply of firm power at a significant saving. The price NSP will pay Manitoba is based on 80 percent of the cost of electricity from a new coal-fired generating station, and takes into account all capital, operating and maintenance costs.

The Sherco No. 3 plant, in which NSP has an interest and which is scheduled to come on stream in 1988, will be used to determine the price. This plant will have up-to-date pollution control equipment. About a quarter of the plant's capital cost is due to this equipment. For purposes of the sale, Sherco 3's capital cost will be escalated to May 1, 1993, the date the sale commences.

Mr. Speaker, benefits are anticipated to be significant in this sale: first, because no new transmission lines are required; second, because Manitoba Hydro's electricity is inexpensive compared to the thermal and nuclear-based electricity produced by our U.S. neighbours. For example, NSP's customers today pay approximately twice as much for electricity as Manitoba Hydro customers.

Manitoba Hydro's electricity is cheaper to produce than NSP's for two reasons. First, the capital costs per unit of NSP's coal-fired plants are only slightly below the capital costs per unit for Limestone - mainly due to the costly pollution control equipment now required for coal-fired plants. This, together with the significantly higher cost of capital that NSP must pay, means that NSP's capital charges for their plant are higher than Manitoba's.

Second, the operating and maintenance costs of NSP's thermal plant are about 15 times higher than those for Limestone - mainly due to the fact that coal is an expensive fuel and water is almost free. Furthermore, coal prices will undoubtedly escalate with

inflation. This escalation will be reflected in the price Manitoba receives.

Mr. Speaker, within the month we will submit an application for an export licence to the National Energy Board. We expect a favourable decision by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my earlier statement to this House, the NSP sale will affect the start-up date for the construction of the Limestone Generating Station. Manitoba Hydro has accelerated its current studies aimed at determining the most economic time to begin construction. I expect those studies to be completed over the summer, and a decision on Limestone construction to be taken by the fall of this year. In the meantime, the Government of Manitoba wants to ensure that the maximum spin-off benefits go to Manitobans. Therefore, we will be meeting with construction industry and labour representatives, with potential Manitoba Limestone suppliers - particularly medium and small size companies in Manitoba, and with Northern communities and associations.

Building the Limestone Dam, Mr. Speaker, will mean a cumulative expenditure of approximately \$3 billion over the period required to complete the project. It will generate more than 17,000 person years of employment; 6,000 person years of employment will be directly related to the dam construction and an additional 11,000 person years will be indirectly related.

Our province is fortunate in having abundant hydro-electric resources owned by the people of Manitoba for the people of Manitoba. These resources have benefited Manitobans and allowed us to have the lowest electricity rates in Canada. Mr. Speaker, Manitobans will continue to benefit from developing this hydro resource.

Mr. Speaker, full and comprehensive information on the Manitoba-NSP contract is being made public. In addition, I have asked the Government House Leader to meet with the Opposition House Leader to expedite having officials of the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Hydro come before the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature as soon as possible to review this sale and to review the annual reports of those entities.

With the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to table this contract between the Northern States Power Company and the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my statement, this is a great day for Manitoba and it also proves that Manitoba has an even greater future.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, in responding to the Minister's statement, let me firstly acknowledge and indeed thank him for tabling the documents that we have asked for, for some time. I look forward to a perusal and examination of those documents by perhaps somewhat more objective people than, understandably, maybe the Minister is. But let me assure him, if indeed those documents do prove out the fact that it is indeed a great day for Manitoba, I will be among the first to congratulate him.

I simply point out to the Minister and indeed to all members of this House, something that has been forgotten - it was forgotten some time ago, dating back to the mid '70s - that the principle clause in The Manitoba Hydro Act, Section 3, intent, purpose and object of the act that set up Manitoba Hydro, and I wish to read that into the record, Mr. Speaker - is, "Intent, purpose and object of this act is to provide for the continuance of a supply of power adequate for the needs of the province and to promote economy and efficiency in the generation, distribution, supply and the use of power."

I read that, Mr. Speaker, because as laudable as it is to provide jobs, as laudable as it is to earn money, I want to have hydro officials tell me that they are living up to Clause 3 of The Manitoba Hydro Act; that Manitoba Hydro rate users will not have electric power generated at costs higher than they ought to be because of the purposes and the needs of this particular government or to sell power to the Americans. It is all very laudable, Mr. Speaker, but that is the intent of the act. Mr. Speaker, if that is no longer the intent of the act, then change the act.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will look forward to those committee meetings and I do appreciate the fact that the Minister obviously has expedited the conclusion of the agreement so that we can facilitate the members of this Legislature to have the Public Utilities Committee meet during this Session, to discuss in detail the contents of the contract that he has just tabled.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to table the 1982-83 Annual Report for the Manitoba Forestry Resources Ltd.

## RETURN TO ORDERS NO. 6 and NO. 2

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table a Return to Order of the House No. 6, dated December 15, 1982, on the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition;

And also, Mr. Speaker, Return to Order of the House, No. 2, dated May 22, 1984, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, the order about which he asked yesterday.

## RETURN TO WRITTEN QUESTION NO. 3

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, not for tabling, but for inclusion in today's Votes and Proceedings tomorrow, a reply to written question No. 3, by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** introduced Bill No. 24, An Act to Amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

(Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

**MR. C. MANNES** introduced Bill No. 25, An Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act (2).

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 28 students of Grade 11 standing from the Thomas Greenway Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Hemtier. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

There are 15 students of Grade 9 standing from the Elmwood High School under the direction of Mr. Gustpodarchuk. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

There are 47 students of Grade 5 to 8 standing from the Southwood School under the direction of Mr. Enns. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

And there are 17 students of Grade 5 standing from the Bannatyne School under the direction of Mr. Shirtcliffe. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Hydro power - sale of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister of Energy's announcement today regarding the power sale to the States - and I might add, I congratulate the Minister on this announcement on the surface without having seen the details - I think it does sound good for the province; I direct the question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and ask him what assurances he can give the people of Northern Manitoba, particularly Indians and Metis and other Manitobans who will be affected, obviously, by Hydro developments in view of the power sale, what assurances can the Minister give these people - the claims they'll have for losses as a result of the flooding that will take place - that their claims will be fully compensated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The present government is working consistently and hard toward a resolution of the number of claims that have come forward as a result of the previous flooding. The previous government unfortunately, I think, neglected to a large extent the legitimate claims that came forward. There have been a number of them settled and a number of them are in the process of being settled. I don't anticipate, at least from my understanding of the project, any substantial additional

harm done to the environment or interference to the lifestyles of people of Northern Manitoba with respect to the new project.

I should say that the Minister of Energy and Mines was in Thompson approximately a month ago to announce the formation of a task force to ensure that Northerners do have every opportunity to become involved in a legitimate and meaningful way in the upcoming construction activity that will be ongoing as a result of this announcement, at least hopefully it will be. That assurance is there; that task force has been announced, is under way. Northerners will have every opportunity to explore ways that they can benefit by this announcement.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister can tell us what has taken place with respect to the Northern flood compensation applications since the 1st of April of this year.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the member may be alluding to the fact that the arbitrator who was in place for the Northern Flood Agreement, Justice Ferg, has resigned from that position. The four parties who are involved in the agreement are currently attempting to identify another arbitrator. That's a long and difficult process, mainly because it requires consensus on the part of each of the signatories to the agreement. However, I should say that many of the claims that have come forward have been dealt with in a straightforward manner by various departments within government and with Manitoba Hydro without going through the arbitration process. The arbitration process was set up to expedite those claims which were not met with favour by any one of the parties, but there are ongoing negotiations; claims are being settled; issues being resolved on a day-to-day basis.

If the member wants particulars about the settlement of any particular claim, I would be happy to provide him with those if he would explain further what he requires.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A supplementary to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister can tell us how many claims have been filed and how many have been settled to date.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact figure with me, but I can get it for him. I believe it's over 100 claims that have been filed, but I should say that there are many other claims that come forward on an informal basis that are dealt with by Natural Resources perhaps or Manitoba Hydro or the Department of Northern Affairs, on an informal basis, on an ongoing basis. I believe that, through the arbitration process, approximately 11 claims have been settled by that means, and a number are pending before the arbitrator and will be going forward when a new arbitrator is appointed.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I wonder if the Minister can indicate to us how many claims are being negotiated at the present time.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated that there were over 100 claims. All of those claims are being

reviewed by personnel in my department, personnel in other departments. Where a settlement is possible, where there is agreement that a particular remedial measure would be acceptable, those are going forward in all cases.

The cases that are not resolvable by mutual agreement would proceed to an arbitrator. But the vast majority of claims are being dealt with on an ongoing basis and are, at some stage, in the process of settlement.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House when a new arbitrator will be appointed to look after the claims.

**HON. J. STORIE:** I indicated previously that the job of picking an arbitrator is a difficult one, because it requires consensus. It also requires an individual who has a great deal of legal experience and requires a number of other attributes, so it's difficult to find that person.

I can tell you that we are working actively towards finding such an individual. As soon as one is found, those claims which are outstanding will be brought before the arbitrator.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines following upon his announcement this afternoon. The Natural Resources Committee was informed by Manitoba Hydro officials last year that hydro power from Limestone would be required for use within the province by approximately 1992 or 1993 based upon their projected load growth, which would seem to coincide very nicely with the date under which power would be required through the sale just announced.

My question for the Minister of Energy and Mines would be, what factor is there involved in this sale that might allow the restarting of Limestone construction to move ahead from the approximately 1987 date that was mentioned by Hydro officials in committee?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, that's a technical matter that I am quite certain that Manitoba Hydro officials will answer when we have the committee meet.

### Students - placement of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, on May 29th the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain asked me a couple of questions, and I would now like to give him the full answers. I did provide him my understanding as to what the full response would be, but now I have the details.

He asked whether or not the Parks Branch is employing fewer students and part-time employees this

summer than was the case last summer. The information I have now is that, as a matter of fact Parks Branch last year employed 605 students and part-time people; this year we're employing 614. I indicated there was a marginal difference one way or another and that seems to be the case. There are nine more in that category being employed this year.

He further asked if I could indicate whether or not the students who were employed last year with Parks Branch and who did satisfactory work and will apply again this year, had they reasonable expectation that they'll be rehired, that the same number of jobs indeed exist, although they may be for a shorter period of time. The answer is yes, provided the students were employed in normal park maintenance programs.

If a student was employed in a Capital Works Project last year, then it would depend on the duration of that project, and the normal park rules prevail, that is, seasonal staff are rehired each year.

### Bait carcasses - Rossburn

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have letters, copies of editorials from the Brandon Sun, phone calls and CJOB news release today indicating that the new bear hunting and bear regulations that have been recently passed by the Minister of Natural Resources and the staff are not working, and the reason is quite simply because they're not being enforced.

Can I ask the Minister today if he is prepared to rehire some of the staff that's been laid off, or move over to the Minister of Employment Services and get a couple of employees from the Jobs Fund, to go back into the Rossburn area especially, and all across the rest of this province and clean up this problem once and for all?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I'm tempted to reply in rather a critical way of the honourable member, but I will refrain from doing that.

One of the reasons why that sometimes there is misinformation out there concerning programs and policy, is the fact that some people deliberately misinform or, in my opinion, misconstrue the activities of government.

When the honourable member says, will I rehire people that have been laid off and so on, or fired, Mr. Speaker, there have been no lay-offs that I'm aware of within the Department of Natural Resources. There have been some redeployments, some reallocations where it was determined that extra effort was needed. So to suggest in a question like that - will I rehire people that have been laid off? - that is misinformation, Mr. Speaker, that distorts fact and that's undesirable in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we have an ongoing concern in respect to people who have problems with wildlife and I respect the fact that within the honourable member's constituency there are constituents that have problems

with bears and other predatory animals and we are looking at those concerns.

As a matter of fact, just the other day I had the privilege of meeting with a number of beekeepers who had been invited by my colleague, the Honourable John Plohman, to his office to discuss with me and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture their concerns about the predation of bears on their hunting operations. We are conversant with those problems and we are looking at them, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member knows that there have been bear problems in this province for many many years.

I asked one of the beekeepers why is it that there's such a high incidence of problems with bears? And he indicated to me — (Interjection) — well, the honourable members don't want a full answer, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, can you believe that that's a Minister of the Crown that just spoke?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, there's all kinds of evidence. Editorial pages in the Brandon Sun are showing that this Minister is not doing his job.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The purpose of Oral Questions is to seek information and not to give it.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister, can he give me or the people of this province, one good reason why these regulations are not being enforced? Why are they not looking after this bait problem? Can I ask him now if he's prepared, again, to get hold of the Minister of Health and his Premier and set up some kind of regulation to protect the people of this province from this infestation which already has turned out to be tuberculosis in the area? And he says I'm misconstruing the problem. What is the problem? Is it a staff problem? Is it a Minister problem? Is it a government that doesn't care?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell has a problem in presenting a fair question and in presenting fair facts to this House. That is a problem for me and it's a problem for his constituents, it's a problem for the people of Manitoba that we have to live with.

The honourable member knows that for some years he was part of a government that had the same sort of problem and apparently didn't develop regulations, or really didn't deal with the problem. Now he complains, Mr. Speaker.

I have assured the honourable member in earlier questions that he put on this matter in my responses to him, that we were aware of the concerns and we are addressing those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister is now asking me for a solution to the problem. I'll give him a solution real quick.

Can I ask him if he will pass regulations today or this week or next week, and only allow fish as bait for bear hunters?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's suggestion is rather interesting. He suggests that bear-baiters should only use fish. I think that's a suggestion that perhaps staff could look at. Certainly I know that some bear-bait hunters do use fish, and certainly I would assume that that would be allowable.

### Hydro power - sale of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. There was some talk a couple of years ago about selling 500 megawatts of power to the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder if the Minister can tell us what kind of profit there would have been in that deal.

**A MEMBER:** Good question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice. I'm sorry, I find that the Conservatives are now saying that that deal was hypothetical.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh! Oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister.

**A MEMBER:** I think they were hypocrites.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** For once, Mr. Speaker, they are accurate. I will take the question as notice because I would want to be completely accurate on this. But I might indicate that for the first 25 years of that hypothetical agreement there was no profit built in at all. The power was going to be supplied at cost and, in fact, there were some questions as to whether in fact Manitoba wouldn't even be providing a subsidy. So I will certainly take the question as notice to get specifics for the . . .

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy. It seems that "profit" is a dirty word for the Conservatives. I wonder, was there any more profit in the deal for 1,000 megawatt sale to Alberta?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I will again take the question as notice, to get full details. But again, that hypothetical agreement did stipulate that there were to be no profits for 25 years, that the power had to be provided at cost, that there may be a subsidy involved, that there might be something after that. But I'll certainly take that question as notice because I think one should be able to get a good idea of what might have taken place as opposed to what actually is

happening today, namely, a profit of \$1.7 billion over 12 years for the people of Manitoba.

**MR. P. EYLER:** One final supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister in any position to gauge to what degree the people of the United States will be subsidizing the consumption of power in Manitoba?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, there is going to be an estimated profit of some \$1.7 billion to the people of Manitoba.

**A MEMBER:** Play it again, Willy.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I believe that that profit should go some way toward ensuring that we have stable hydro rates in Manitoba and balanced economic development in this province which is what we, on this side of the House, are striving for, Mr. Speaker.

### Special parents - ad

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services. My question to the Minister is generated because of an ad that appeared in Sunday's Winnipeg Sun advertising for special parents. The ad describes a girl of 14 suffering from rejection, traumas and her problems; a boy, 12, who is overweight, and his problems; a boy, 12 1/2, who is like a six year old, and his problems. Does the Minister consider these ads to be in good taste?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question asks for an opinion, it should ask for information. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?  
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, is this part of her department's policy to have that type of ad in the papers?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the ads were placed by the Interim Board of Children's Aid, Winnipeg. The practice, I guess, through the last years, originally there was no practice of putting anything public out for adoptions. Then, as the number of difficult to place children - particularly sibling groups, special needs youngsters and older children - grew and there was some difficulty finding placement for them, there was a period of time when Children's Aid Societies actually printed pictures and small descriptions. They discontinued that and they have occasionally gone to the practice of printing a brief description. That is, I take it, the ad that the member is referring to.

It is difficult, when you can't go into very much detail in an ad, to determine precisely what information should go and what should not. I certainly have asked that the issue be looked at and that some format be

developed which would ensure that the information we put in is useful and in good taste.

**MR. A. BROWN:** My question to the Minister is, how would she feel if she were a 14 year old girl and saw her difficulties appear in an ad in a paper?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The question seeks an opinion. Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question to seek information.

**MR. A. BROWN:** My question to the Minister is, why doesn't the Minister advertise for foster parents and then mail a list to the interested persons? This would eliminate that type of personal problem from appearing in the paper. Will the Minister take that under consideration?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the tact taken by the honourable member as he rephrased his question because he shifted towards an attempt to solve what is a difficult problem. There is a lot of publicity to solicit foster parents and that will be developing further as we find that foster parent placement is one of the preferable options when we have occasionally to remove youngsters from their own homes; but the practice of moving to a more precise description of a youngster has been done only in the case where youngsters who are difficult to place have been around waiting for permanent placement for some time.

I think the member will appreciate that we can't just do things as they have been done in the past. We have to be willing to try some new patterns, and I would welcome, Mr. Speaker, his suggestions as to what kind of criteria should be in place governing such an ad. I would invite him to submit to me his proposals for criteria.

### MHRC - Jobs Fund Assistance

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for St. Norbert raised the question as to the accuracy of my statement last Friday that last year, with the assistance of the Jobs Fund and Manitoba Housing, there were 1,905 units started, a sevenfold increase over the previous year.

I must admit that initially I thought perhaps I was a little carried away with my enthusiasm for the Jobs Fund. However, upon investigation, I find that I had underestimated the impact of the Jobs Fund in the provision of apartment units in Manitoba, the Jobs Fund and Manitoba Housing. The member had asked that I specifically identify the number of those units. I would like to now take that opportunity.

First of all, Manitoba Housing, Jobs Fund, was involved in 100 percent capital financing for 202 units of family housing: some 56 at Brandon; 8 at Morden; 20 at Selkirk; 16 at Notre Dame and Furby in Winnipeg; 30 at Notre and Spence in Winnipeg; 30 at 388 Kennedy Street; and another 42 units at 400 Kennedy Street. That was 100 percent financing by Jobs Fund, Manitoba Housing.



In addition, Manitoba Housing and Jobs Fund was involved in 25 percent share-capital financing of Section 40 Housing, some 54 units: these being located at Eriksdale; Granville Lake; Grunthal; Gunton; Inwood; Langruth; Mallard; Oakburn; Oakville; Pine River; Sandy Lake and Wanless.

In addition, Manitoba Housing and Jobs Fund, specifically Manitoba Housing, were involved in providing 5 percent provincial grants to private non-profit housing, Section 56(1). This involved some 386 apartments and Manitoba Housing put up some of the capital. Ivan Franko Manor in Winnipeg, 67 units; Lions Club Affordable Housing in Winnipeg at Beaumont and McGillivray, some 72 units of family housing; 42 units of elderly housing at St. James Kiwanis Lodge; 147 units, L'Accueil Colombe at St. Boniface on Masson Street; and 130 units for the Riverside Lions in Winnipeg.

In addition, and I notice that the Member for St. Norbert had made reference about excluding CRISP units, the member should be aware that by agreement between Ottawa and Manitoba, we have reached an agreement to provide rent supplement up to 33 percent of those units. There were 819 units started in Manitoba under that program; those projects that have applied for rent supplement are the Setter Street project, which is 138 units; 88 units on Cambridge Street; 48 units on Leila Avenue. So that responds to that question.

### Constitutional amendment - Supreme Court

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information.

I have a question to the Attorney-General arising out of news reports and proceedings before the Supreme Court yesterday. Could the Attorney-General inform the House whether Counsel for the province offered to the Supreme Court as one of the province's alternative positions in that the Supreme Court might impose upon the Province of Manitoba the proposed constitutional amendment that the government brought forward last year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** That is not the impression I have from newspaper accounts to date. Of course, all I have are the newspaper accounts. I will be meeting with Counsel for the Province of Manitoba tomorrow and get a full briefing from him, but I do not believe that to be the case; namely, that he suggested to the Supreme Court that it could impose a constitutional amendment. I don't see how he could have.

### Peter Warren - Human Rights Commission

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney-General. In view of the decision in the Court of Queen's Bench yesterday with respect to the Human Rights Commission matter involving one Peter Warren, could the Minister indicate whether or not the province intends to appeal that decision or make amendments to the act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I've asked for officials in my department to look at the reasons for judgment to see whether or not, indeed, there may be grounds for appeal, and I will be meeting with officials of the Human Rights Commission early next week and will make a decision on the basis of both the opinion from members of the Civil Litigation Department in my department, and as a result of the information from officials in the Human Rights Commission.

### Mediation - Transit Union and City of Winnipeg

**MR. G. MERCIER:** A final question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the public threats by Mr. Harry Cohen of the Winnipeg Transit Union to stop bus service during the Pope's visit to Manitoba, could the Minister of Labour indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether her department is involved in conciliation or mediation proceedings with the Transit Union and the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M. B. DOLIN:** I would have to check, Mr. Speaker, to see if conciliation officers are working with that group, but I know that they have been negotiating or attempting to negotiate a contract for some months now.

### Hydro power - sale of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the cost that we will be paid for the hydro supply to Northern States Power Corporation will be at 80 percent of the cost of producing alternative power in the United States based on a plant to be finished in 1988. Will the cost that they pay us be at the cost of that plant for 1988, or as if that plant was completed in 1993, some five years later, where the cost would be substantially higher and the revenues to Manitoba substantially higher?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Member for Inkster does have the opportunity of perusing Hansard, I'll certainly get him a copy of my statement. He will find in it, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of the Sherco 3 plant will be brought forward to a 1993 figure to ensure that there is comparability of an actual nature with the Manitoba cost.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Based on that the estimate for a \$1.7 billion profit for Manitoba, would that be significantly higher than that \$1.7 billion figure if inflation for the cost of the price of coal is substantially higher than their projections currently?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** I wonder if the honourable member would wish to repeat his question, I don't understand it.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** I'll be very glad to help you out, Mr. Speaker, so you can understand the question.

The price of power that we are going to receive is going to be based on 80 percent of their cost of production on a coal-fired plant that is environmentally sound in 1993. If the price of a coal-fired plant, which I understand their operation cost is some 15 times - from a statement the Minister gave earlier - as much as our cost of operating our plants, if the price of coal in the future escalates beyond their current predictions, does that mean that Manitoba will have a greater profit on this sale than \$1.7 billion?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now that I understand it, it is hypothetical.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, when the price of something is based on a future cost, I find it hard to understand how that can be hypothetical.

To follow up, Mr. Speaker, with an additional question. I understand from the Minister's statement that he will be meeting with members of the construction industry, the labour industry and suppliers of Manitoba industries who supply goods toward the construction of a plant; when will he start meetings with those industries so that those industries can get geared up as fast as possible toward the construction of a power plant in Manitoba and to get the greatest benefit of jobs in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I would hope to be able to meet with members of the construction industry, labour representatives, and other people as soon as possible after this Session ends, so that we can give them sufficient advance notice so that they can gear up to take full advantage of any possible developments that might take place in the future.

### Surface Rights Board - firings

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I also have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines on a somewhat different subject. I realize he has had a certain preoccupation with energy and hydro and that, so I would like to ask the Minister if he can confirm that three members of the Surface Rights Board of Western Manitoba have been relieved of their responsibilities?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister also confirm that the three members that were relieved of their responsibilities - I believe there's a total of 6 members - all came from the Virden area, is that correct?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, this relates to a matter of confirmation which I'm not sure is a proper question under the Rules of the House, but I certainly would be prepared even to do that, but I certainly would want to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly will refresh my memory as to the exact geographic location of all of the six former members on the board. I will get back.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will treat that question with courtesy and I'll get back to the member as soon as possible.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Another question to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. Since most of the long-standing problems in the Surface Rights area all stem from the Virden area, would the Minister not consider it somewhat important that that area have some representation on the board, or is it going to be the case that the less you know about the subject matter the better qualified you are to arbitrate in the Surface Rights deal? Is that the philosophy that the Minister is now putting forward for membership on the Surface Rights Board?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member should know that is argumentative.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

### FAST - alarm systems

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing.

Over the last several weeks I've asked the Minister if he will provide information to me on the installation of the FAST alarm system in MHRC housing units in Winnipeg. In view of the fact that the Public Utilities Committee will consider the Telephone Annual Report for the last time, probably on Tuesday, is that Minister making the information available?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Member for Pembina for reminding me of this question. I do have an answer.

The question raised, I believe about two weeks ago, was whether the installation was tendered. The answer to that is that the FAST system installation was not tendered. The system was installed by a Manitoba Telephone System and the Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority. Under The MTS Act, agencies that have existing systems in place are deemed to be operators who may extend those systems. The Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority qualified as an operator by virtue of having had a Scriber terminal unit hooked into the

MTS Telephone lines previously. That was for the relaying of nursing calls.

The Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority did look at tendering out the system, installation, some two to three years ago, receiving one quote from a non-government body which was far higher than the cost of installing it themselves.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Was the basis of the decision to install the FAST alarm system done on the basis of recommendations by a consultant report?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, I would have to check the minutes of the Housing Authority to find out as to the basis of why the FAST system was installed. I will certainly have a statement on that in conjunction with the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System within the next week or two.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of an answer on the consultant report as to whether this decision was made on the basis of expert opinion on the best available system, can the Minister assure the taxpayers that the most economic system was indeed installed by MHRC at taxpayer expense?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** The assurance that I can provide at the present time is that the efforts of the Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority made in looking at this system did indicate that it was more cost-beneficial for them to go the Manitoba Telephone System route.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to move the motion for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Sir, I would like first to advise the House that, after consultation with the Opposition House Leader, the list that was distributed and the announcements made with respect to the distribution of departmental Estimates between the House and the Committee of Supply in the Committee Room, Room 255, has been amended slightly. So in that committee, we would proceed with the Estimates of the Minister of Energy and Mines commencing at the next opportunity in Supply, and that in the House we would deal with the Estimates of the Minister of Finance's two additional department responsibilities, the Department of Crown Investments first, followed by Civil Service Commission and following that, the Estimates of the Premier and the Department of Executive Council.

That, Sir, would then conclude Estimates of the departments. There would be the additional votes at the end of the Estimates book which we would then consider in full Committee of Supply, such as Jobs Fund, Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would be Crown Investments, Civil Service, Executive Council in the House; Energy and Mines in Committee Room, Room 255.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be a willingness to grant leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour

today. If that is the case, Sir, I would add that to the motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and that committee sit through Private Members' Hour.

**MOTION presented.**

## MATTERS OF GRIEVANCE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, before the committee moves into Supply, I certainly think I should stand in my place today and express some of my concerns and the people of my constituency regarding the incompetence and the inability of this government to deal with some of the maybe not serious problems but problems that are very very important, and reach right down to the soul of a lot of people in my constituency and I'm sure in other constituencies across this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting today when I read from the pages of the 1982-83 Annual Report of the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited. The opening pages of this annual document whereby this Crown corporation lost a substantial sum of money over the past year, some 24.7 million - here's the opening statement of the Chairman of the Board, Murray Harvey.

He says: "When an industry is in trouble, all of the companies within it suffer, some more than others." Mr. Speaker, that's the problem I would like to raise today about this government. When you have a government in trouble, not only the government suffers, Mr. Speaker, all the people suffer.

I wondered, Mr. Speaker, last year why, first of all, the First Minister escalated his Cabinet to the numbers that he has there today and then they took a reduction in salary. Does that indicate that they are incompetent or they're not able to deal with the problems of this province? Does it give me some understanding that they have to be dragged screaming and kicking into the Cabinet Room because they don't want to deal with the matters that are before this House day after day?

Then again I heard in the halls this last week, Mr. Speaker, these Cabinet Ministers have asked for another \$2,500 reduction in their salary. Now isn't that strange? Is that incompetence, or are these Ministers and this government telling the people of this province they can't deal with the problems or they don't know how to deal with the problems or they are just throwing their hands up in disgust and walking away and leaving it? It says, we'll let some other group come in here some day and deal with these matters.

It's a little matter, Mr. Speaker, that I have been raising here since the day this Session began. Again I stood

in my place today, Mr. Speaker, and tried to find out if, in fact, this government and any one of its Ministers, but more especially the Minister of Natural Resources, would come out and listen to the problems of the people that I have in regard to my constituency with this crazy bear-baiting philosophy that's going on in this province. It is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, today the Minister had to screw up his courage. He alleged that I was not being fair. He said I was not telling the truth when I said the staff were laid off. Well, I don't know what the reason is that they can't deal with it. I don't. But when you pick up the editorial pages of the Brandon Sun and see some of the horror stories that are written there; when you look at the letters - and I've got copies here that are directed to the Minister of Agriculture by a gentleman who said, "I have been a supporter of an NDP Government for 32 years, but in the last six months your government has convinced me it's time to cross the road."

CJOB again today brings out the matter of this problem, and the Minister has the courage to stand up today and ask me, what is the solution. I gave him the solution in about two seconds. Change the bear-baiting practice in this province from these infected dead animals that have scattered all over that constituency and let them use bear bait. Use fish. That is all I have been trying to find out for weeks. I don't know the reason, Mr. Speaker, and I can't possibly understand why this incompetent government is not prepared to deal with these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about it in the Throne Speech. I talked about it in the Budget. Still nothing has been done. Certainly the Cabinet Ministers have taken a reduction in their salary last year and again this year. That scares me. That scares a lot of people because, not only do we know that they sit in this House every day of their incompetence and their inability to deal with the problems of this province, but when I tell the people in my constituency and across this province that these Cabinet Ministers all have recognized they don't deserve the pay that they're getting. They are asking already for a reduction in pay.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know who is to blame for it all. Is the First Minister to blame? Is it this manifesto that they sent around the province during the election campaign, making all these pledges and promises of all the things that they were going to do for the people? Sure, they may deliver some of them but they certainly are not delivering the ones that I would like to address today.

It was pointed out in this House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the week before, that the farmers in this province have enough problems, serious economic problems, without having to go out and chase these people that are scattering illegal bait around their farms and on Crown lands and their pastures and things like that. With the staff that the Minister of Natural Resources has in his office and scattered around this province, surely they can deal with that problem.

It annoys me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Natural Resources, even after the question period today, hasn't got the guts and courage to come and stay here and listen to what I have to say. He has taken off. That's fair ball. I don't mind. Let him be wherever - he may have calls in his office. He may have people that he has to deal with, but that is again another example of the way that these . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The honourable member knows that he should not comment on the presence or absence of other members in the House.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for drawing my attention to the Rules of the House, but again it is an example to me, Mr. Speaker, maybe not to a lot of people, how serious these Ministers are when you bring matters like this before the House, that they don't want to stick around because they don't have to. I know he doesn't have to stay here and listen to me. Maybe I am one of the poorest orators in this Chamber and maybe I don't express myself the way that others do, but I tell you, I'm serious and the people that I represent are serious about this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes blame the First Minister because if anybody's going to make this Cabinet carry out the duties and responsibilities that are assigned to them, it's got to be the First Minister. I know his incompetence and I know his inability to handle, first of all, that Cabinet. I also know his inability to stand up in this Legislature and defend his Cabinet because we've seen it happen time and time again. When Ministers of his government are in trouble, does he come to the rescue? No, Mr. Speaker, he ducks out the side door. I've tried to appeal to him; I've tried to appeal in the question period; I've tried every method at my disposal to try and resolve this problem and it's still not resolved today.

That is a tragedy because this area that I represent, Mr. Speaker, this is their centennial year for a lot of those municipalities. They are celebrating their 100th anniversary this year, which is great for Manitoba, great for Canada, great for them, great for everybody across this great nation of ours - and yet they're wrestling with this problem out there for over a year now.

A farmer whose herd was infested with tuberculosis, he lost 25 animals over this infected bait in the area. They still haven't cleaned it up. They still haven't even attempted to resolve what was the cause of the problem. I've pleaded with the Federal Government, the Health of Animals Division, and so have those people that I represent out there. They have written, they have phoned, they have gone and seen all these bureaucracies and these people that are supposed to be looking after the needs of our people. The problem has not gone away, Mr. Speaker. It's still there today.

That gives you an example of the anxiety and the unhappiness of people across this province with this government and Federal Government as well in this particular case, because the disease of animals comes under federal jurisdiction, but it's certainly up to this Minister of Natural Resources and this Minister of Agriculture to make sure that act is enforced in this province. What does this gentleman talk about here who sent a letter on June 10th to the Minister of Agriculture? This is the man that said, "I have supported the NDP for some 32 years, but in the last six months your government has convinced me it's time to cross the road."

There are thousands and thousands of people across this province who maybe have gotten that opinion from earlier debates we've had in this Legislature. But this

is over the simple matter of this government's negligence and its inability to deal with the bad practice of people bringing dead animals, carcasses and scattering them across farm land to lure bears so they can trap them or hunt them. That shouldn't be a big problem. Mr. Speaker, would you think that would be a big problem if you were the Minister? I don't think you would, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it would be a big problem if I was Minister because you and I, we'd just send two or three of our top staff people out there to clean up the problem. That's simple and it's not an expensive problem. We're not asking for the expenditure of large sums of money. No, but it is a gut issue.

These people expect, from the taxes that they pay, that they should get some service in return for those dollars and they're not getting them from this First Minister and they're not getting them from this government. I don't know why. Is it because of me? Do I not frame my questions properly? Are my letters not right? Are my phone calls not being directed to the right people? Mr. Speaker, I can see by the expression on your face that you're puzzled just like me about the incompetence of these people.

This honourable gentleman from the Rosburn area refers to these articles in the Brandon Sun which shows, since the last time I rose in my place on this matter in the House, here are scattered carcasses of dead horses being left on farm land and on Crown lands in that area, dead carcasses of beavers being scattered around on farm land and on Crown lands occupied by my constituents and they're being allowed to lie there and this government sits there and does nothing about it. Read the Brandon Sun, the editorial of the Brandon Sun on June 8th and read the front page story in the Brandon Sun on January 7th. It's all there.

Mr. Speaker, the Brandon Sun, on June 8th, says, "Bear Bait Repulsive." Certainly it's repulsive, Mr. Speaker. Would you want to have a dead horse thrown in your back lot or if you owned a quarter section of land would you like to have some guy drag a dead horse in and leave it on your property or some beaver carcasses or other dead animals? As the Brandon Sun editorial says, "Farmers are having a tough enough time as it is without the need to worry about their livestock being infected with whatever diseases are to be found in these carcasses." That's what my people are afraid about; that's what they're alarmed about, Mr. Speaker. That's what they're phoning about; that's what they're writing the Minister of Agriculture about; that's what they're writing the Minister of Natural Resources about - to see if we can't get it cleaned up.

I suspect they're not going to do anything about it because they've already taken a reduction of salary. We can't maybe demand that they go out and carry out the full duties that are assigned to them when they accept these portfolios because they've already taken a \$2,500 salary reduction, so maybe they're only going to work six hours a day now, rather than the normal eight, because when they're not getting fully paid, I suspect that they have a legitimate excuse; but that excuse isn't good enough for the people in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me the regulations which I referred to in question period today, the new regulations that the Minister and his staff passed some months ago pertaining to the hunting of bears, and

bait. In each case, the baits are not legal. He says, "The sites that we view," this is from his home, "shows one site, dead horses; one site, dead beaver carcasses; one site, two dead calves; one site was in such a state that it was not distinguishable," again with no name or no address.

When I raised this some weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources stood in his place and said, we've changed the regulations. We're going to deal with it. Anybody that spreads bait around for bears in this province has to put a little tag on that bait. It's got to have his telephone number; it's got to have his name and his address on the bait. This honourable gentleman from Rosburn community says there were no telephone numbers, there were no names and no addresses on that bait; there were none.

So these people are flouting the new regulations that the Minister has introduced just weeks ago. Maybe I didn't phrase my question accurately today about whether in fact he had staff to look after this problem, but I was sincere. I can't see any other reason why he can't send staff in there to deal with this matter. It's either because he is mad because he had to take a \$2,500 salary cut, or else he's not directing his staff to deal with the problem. I wonder if maybe it's not political, Mr. Speaker, because it has been known from time to time that some members, especially from the socialist governments, don't like to go into constituencies where members on our benches are the MLAs and deal with problems. They'd much sooner let them lie, rather than look after the rights of those people, because those people have the same God-given rights of the legislation and the protection that this province and this government is supposed to protect as any member that's sitting over there. They have those rights.

I don't know the reasons, but the Minister of Natural Resources rose in his place today and said, "You, the Member for Roblin Constituency, you tell me how to deal with this matter." I gave him an answer today. Let's change the regulations to use only fish for bear bait, and that would eliminate all the possibilities and the problems of the tuberculosis outbreak. It will eliminate all the problems that bring the Department of Health in there again to try and find out how far that infection has gone because, Mr. Speaker, that constituent that I raised the matter of, this Rodney Checkowski, weeks ago in this place, he will never forget his experience with this government forever, or with the feds, because he lost 25 head of cattle due to a T.B. outbreak on his farm.

Those cattle were on his farm for months, infected with tuberculosis, allowed to roam around that property day after day. The Minister across the way, the Minister of the Crown cancelled his lease that he had to raise these cattle on Crown land, so they were removed from that area. The government recognized then that the infection was serious because they made sure he wasn't allowed to graze his cattle any farther on that parcel of Crown land. That is too bad that I have to continually rise in my place day after day after day and try and get a little simple problem like this matter of the bear bait and the concerns of a tuberculosis outbreak in that area, get it resolved and quietly put away once and for all.

So I suspect today the only alternative I have, as I am taking that liberty today, is to rise on this motion,

Mr. Speaker, and try once again, although I gather from the tenor of the Honourable Minister today I might just as well have gone out in the caucus room and had a cup of coffee because I don't think he is going to deal with it.

Is it incompetence? No, I can't class it as being incompetence. Could it be carelessness? Possibly carelessness. It is not a shortage of money, I am not asking for money, because he said today the staff is already there. He said he is not laying anybody off in this field. So is it a staff problem? I don't know. Do you know, Mr. Speaker? We can't figure it out. But he is not going to deal. I think I am basically wasting my time, but by jinx, Mr. Speaker, I think that I must rise in my place at any time a Minister of the Crown, even though their salaries have been reduced twice in the last year and they are not getting paid what they figure they should get and there may be some backlash from that, but they can't blame us for that one, Mr. Speaker. I can't recall anybody in our bench asking them to take a pay cut. I don't think any of our colleagues did. — (Interjection) — Oh yes, yes, we did.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister today, he said I misinformed him, he said I misconstrued the issue. He can call it whatever he likes. I apologize for my limitations, but I ask him again on this grievance motion to once and for all let us go into that area especially and see if we can't clean up that continual problem, that nagging problem about the infestation of bad bear bait, dead animals scattered all over the country, and plaguing the hearts of those people there who have better things to do than go and chase these kind of problems down.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, you must understand what I am trying to get across for these many times I have rose in my place on this issue and addressed it to you. Surely, the Minister of Natural Resources must be reading these letters. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture must have read this June 10th letter he got from this long-time NDP supporter who said, "I have supported an NDP Government for 32 years, but this matter of the bear bait, I tell you, in the last six months your government has convinced me it is time to cross the road." He's dead on; I agree. Mr. Speaker, I have never even solicited this honourable gentleman's vote but he is dead on because his opinion of this government is the same opinion that I have and the same opinion of this government that we on this side of the House have as to their inability and their incompetence to deal with problems.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that by our little conversation here this afternoon that this Minister will react, will take the time to direct some of his staff to Roblin-Russell Constituency, especially the Rossburn community, to deal with this problem. I can further tell him, Mr. Speaker, that a long-time friend of mine was in touch with me yesterday from the Camperville area when I was their MLA for some 10 years, who has been using fish for bear bait for many many years and said, "Wally, give me a buzz. If you will tell Al Mackling about me and how I have been able to be a guide and hunt bears in this area for years and years using fish as bait, I would be more than pleased to help Mr. Mackling and his staff to bring that principle to bear in the area that I am concerned about and help these people out of those serious problems."

Well, Mr. Speaker, as if that isn't enough problems for our No. 1 industry in this province, agriculture, where

they could be out looking after some of the other economic problems they have there rather than wrestling with bait, let's get back to the simple matter of where this government is going to lead us in the last few months of their term in the field of agriculture, the No. 1 industry that we have in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest to all the array of talent and skills and intelligence that sits across the way to see how they are going to deal with this problem. It became especially prevalent and of great concern to me when I saw the operation of the Minister of Agriculture yesterday when dealing with the grievance that was raised by my colleague, the Member for Arthur, and then when the matter of the milk prices surfaced in the House yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I don't basically think that they have the intelligence over there to deal with agricultural matters. I know when they go to Cabinet, I can see how the Member for Ste. Rose, what little help he could gather at the Cabinet table to deal with agricultural matters in this province. He might get three to support him but if he is getting four to five to deal with agricultural matters around that Cabinet table, he is a much more brilliant politician and negotiator than I suspect because I watch this government very very carefully. I watch their priorities, I watch the way they operate, Mr. Speaker. I think agriculture is a way down on the list of the priorities as far as this government is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to walk away and leave this No. 1 industry in this province, agriculture, and leave these problems hanging in mid air. As long as I can get an opportunity to stand in my place in this House and raise these matters, I am going to continually do my best to try and see if we can't find at least a majority of the members of this Pawley government to screw up their courage and switch their priorities around and see if we can't save this No. 1 industry that has been historic in this province for 100 years.

As I say, we are celebrating, I think, four municipal centennials in Roblin-Russell Constituency this year. That is a pretty sad day for them, Mr. Speaker, on their first one-hundredth anniversary to be standing up and dealing and trying to face some of these economic problems that everyone has across this province today in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be maybe raising this matter today had it not been for the election promises that were made by the First Minister of this province and a lot of his colleagues. I don't blame them all for going around this province and espousing the programs and the things that they were going to do, but I sure am going to lay it on the lap of the First Minister because he said during the election campaign, "Manitoba farm families are being squeezed off the land they have developed, cultivated and sweated over for generations." I just ask him, what have they done about it? What have they done about it?

The Minister stood in his place yesterday and gave us a laundry list of programs in the hog industry and the beef industry which have been a long-standing problems in this province, and certainly maybe that facet of the industry is at least stable. But that is only a small portion of agriculture in this province, Mr. Speaker.

I know the Minister of Finance is sitting there with his hand on his . . . and he knows that he ploughed

X numbers of dollars that were mentioned in the Budget into that factor and said, these are the biggest sums of money that the agricultural community in this province has ever gained from any government. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, maybe he said that and maybe he thought that, how come these problems haven't gone away? Is throwing money at them going to solve these problems, Mr. Speaker?

I ask the Minister of Finance, what kind of agricultural staff have you got in your office to deal with the agricultural problems of this province? Have you brought anybody in? I doubt if he has. I note that the banks are certainly bringing in people to help them resolve some of these difficult problems. Certainly they are not easy problems but - by Jinks! - Mr. Speaker, that is the guts, that is the No. 1 industry of this province. I don't think this government has even thought of dealing with it because they have other priorities that are much higher than agriculture. I don't know who is going to pay the bills for this government and future governments in this province if we don't create some stability, and give agriculture a chance in this province to produce the way it should.

The First Minister, he said, and I quote again from this manifesto, "Message from Howard Pawley: A Clear Choice for Manitobans, Policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party." And it says: "Manitoba farm families are being squeezed off the land they have developed, cultivated and sweated over for generations."

The Member for Ste. Rose, the Maguet family, that I raise here - my gosh! That broke my heart to see that family go under. — (Interjection) — He says, my time! It only happened a couple of months ago. He said, that's my time. Somebody's at fault. There is somebody that has to take the blame for that, because that is one of the most stable, agricultural families in this province, the Maguet family. They are. And why this Minister walking out the door - is he going right now? - who represents those people didn't intervene, didn't come here. He is a Minister of the Crown. He's got all the authority he needs to try and see if we could save that long, historic family farm.

**A MEMBER:** He's a do-nothing Minister.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** The First Minister goes on in this manifesto, Mr. Speaker, and he says: "Rising costs and punishing interest rates are leaving many farmers with staggering debts." Certainly. He put his finger right on the problem, the First Minister. That's what? - three years ago. The Premier said: "Rising costs and punishing interest rates are leaving many farmers with staggering debt loads."

He goes on and said: "While the Conservatives sat on their hands, almost 40 percent of the hog producers left production." And here comes the hooker, Mr. Speaker. Here is the hooker. This is the First Minister of this province, and I quote the Honourable Howard Pawley, Premier of this province. He says: "Unless decisive action is taken now, Manitoba's farm families and rural communities that service them are simply going to vanish." And that's what's happening right before our very eyes as I stand here today, Mr. Speaker.

Longstanding family farms that have gone through three and four generations are vanishing as the First

Minister predicted three years ago when he spread this manifesto across this province. I ask him again today. I ask this Minister of Agriculture. I ask his Minister of Finance. What are you going to do about it? What programs have you got? What plans have you made? I ask the Minister of Finance: is he prepared to bring in an agricultural sector in his department to try and help and deal with the problem? He turns his chair to the side, Mr. Speaker, so I suspect that he is not going to take that alternative.

Well, what are the New Democrats going to do? What are they going to do? The Deputy Premier when the matter was raised here the other day, Mr. Speaker, she says, blame the Federal Government and high interest rates. Blame the feds. Mr. Speaker, that may be part of the problem but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's not the solution to the problem.

What is a government put in office for, Mr. Speaker? Why do the people send them in here to take over the affairs and run this province? The people, Mr. Speaker, send them in because they believe what they promise. The people of this province have great integrity, and the Premier Howard Pawley went out across this province and he said, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it again: "Unless decisive action is taken now . . ." - and that was three years ago - ". . . Manitoba's family farms and the rural communities that service them are going to vanish." And, Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is happening right before our eyes.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know. I'm still waiting for somebody across the way to say that, sure, we'll form a Cabinet Committee. We'll set up a Committee of the House to try and deal with it. We tried to raise that the other day. We got a negative answer, set up the Agricultural Committee. They're not prepared to do that, and I think the reason is quite simple. They don't have enough people interested in agriculture to form a committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has sent Dear John letters around this province saying - and I've got one of them in my hand here - he says here: "The reason for Manitoba success is simple, the tremendous determination of hard-working Manitobans." Mr. Speaker, I support that statement most wholeheartedly. There are no group of people in this province, and I dare say across Canada, who are more determined and more hard working than the farmer.

I was born on a farm. I was raised on a farm. I know what it was like to get up at four o'clock in the morning and harness horses and work in the fields. I know what it was like to get up at four o'clock in the morning and milk cows. I've been through that in my lifetime, Mr. Speaker. I can vouch and I'm satisfied that it is not the people, it's not the farmers that are at fault at this particular time in this sector of our life.

The First Minister goes on, Mr. Speaker, and says: "Farmers, business people, ordinary men and women working together can build this province." Mr. Speaker, that's where the Premier's argument falls apart, because he's not doing anything. Sure, there are some of us that are trying to help save agriculture in this province, but I don't see that the First Minister is putting on a pair of overalls and getting his hands dirty and trying to deal with this matter. At least, I haven't seen it as yet. Sure, he'll go out and maybe run around a few fields and do a lot of talking, but I am waiting for his

government to come up with a solution to this problem, Mr. Speaker.

He said, Mr. Speaker: "There are challenges facing us that will shape our lives for years to come." Man alive! He sure said a true statement there. But what happens to a challenge when the farmer's bankrupt and he's long gone down the road, like the Maguet farming family that I raised a minute ago, great friends of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose? What? Four generations gone.

Now what kind of a memory have they got of their livelihood in this province? What kind of a government do they figure they have over here, whether it's the Provincial or Federal Government, or are they blaming the government? They are blaming the government, Mr. Speaker, because of the simple reason that the government's taking 35 cents out of every dollar that they earn either at the provincial, federal or municipal level. There's 35 cents out of every dollar they've got in their pocket that's either going to go to one of those three levels of government. So they have a God-given right, Mr. Speaker, to blame government for a lot of their problems.

They also don't have all of these expertise that the governments have out on these farm operations to help them solve their problems. In most cases, they're alone, and they are trusting people that make these kinds of statements like the First Minister said, Howard Pawley: "Unless decisive action is taken now . . ." That's what Pawley said. That's what our Premier said when he was running for office, when this government and these members opposite were touring this province looking for support, led by the great Howard Pawley.

They said and they told the people, there's the problem: "Unless decisive action is taken now, Manitoba's family farms and the rural communities that service them are going to simply vanish." Mr. Speaker, they are vanishing right before the eyes of this First Minister. They're vanishing right before the eyes of this big Cabinet, the biggest Cabinet we have ever had in this province even though they have taken a salary reduction. Mr. Speaker, this is a sick government. This is a sick Premier, and they don't have the courage nor the audacity nor the strength to deal with the agricultural problems in this province and I think the sooner they call an election, the better.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Minister of Natural Resources has already spoken on a grievance and isn't entitled to answer, but he has asked me pass along to the House the statement, the particular complaints about the bears, the bees, the fish and so on are just as much humbug as was the report from the Legislature which the member who just spoke recently gave to his constituents - full of complete inaccuracies. The statement that, according to an NDP Government pamphlet - this is from that member's report to his local people who would expect the truth from him - and it deals with church fowl suppers. Which government produced that pamphlet? The Tory

Government of which he was a part, not the NDP Government. That's the kind of truth those people tell.

Mr. Speaker, here he is, he stands up . . . it's no big deal for him to tell a statement that is not the truth in his local newspaper, no big deal for him. He can get up and say any of those things, it doesn't matter. He gets up in the House today and he makes a big deal of the fact that there's a former New Democrat who has decided to become a Tory. That happens. He said, cross the road.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister to withdraw that, I never said that statement. I want the Minister to withdraw that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, you made a quote if the individual isn't coming over to your side - there's not that much other room in Manitoba. That happens all the time. People move to both sides of the road. That's why there are changes in government.

In my last membership renewal in Rossmere, we had a whole number of people join the New Democratic Party for the first time. Those things happen. Indeed, it's not that long ago that I was a Conservative, and I thought - it's a little better than 20 years ago - that they were right. I saw the error of my ways and I came over to the other side, so that's not something that's the biggest deal in the world. That happens all the time.

What are they talking about on the day that we announced the biggest, most profitable sale in the history of Manitoba? They're talking about beavers on land owned by farmers in Western Manitoba and they don't know what to do with them. I say bury them. If they're dead, bury them and don't come here and waste our time which we could be using debating serious things, talking about things like that.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . the member . . .

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

If other members have opinions they wish to put before the House, they will have every opportunity to join the debate.

In the meantime, the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you. It seems, as our House Leader says, the stone hit one or two dogs in the pack.

The member talks about what we did with agriculture and read some of the statements of the First Minister who is concerned about farmers. He doesn't talk about the fact that since we've taken office, we've increased the funds available to farms by over 50 percent from where they were when we took office. He doesn't talk about the fact that when they were in office, that good bunch were giving mortgages to farmers at 17 percent



- the 17 percent solution. That was what the Sterling Lyon Government was giving the farmers of Manitoba and it was the Howard Pawley Government that negotiated those mortgages down so farmers had a better chance of making it through.

Do they want to talk about the thousands of farmers that have been helped by various new programs that we brought in? No, they just want to talk about the fact that there is still not enough. We don't deny that there's not enough, we do not deny that there are still problems, but we have increased funding by 50 percent to the farms, far more than the average that we have increased funding to other areas in our economy.

We've done better than any sector in this society would have expected in terms of providing aid, and even the Member for Roblin-Russell acknowledged that now there are not the same kind of problems in the pork industry. One of the reasons for that is the program that was brought in by the Howard Pawley Government. We brought in the Beef Stabilization, we brought in the Interest Rate Relief. Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to fund those kinds of programs. Those people did nothing.

**A MEMBER:** The man is a stranger to the truth.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** On this particular day, one would think that they would be talking a little bit about Hydro. We have provided an agreement, we tabled the agreement in the House. We asked you to talk about it, but you don't want to talk about it, they don't want to talk about it. They have now, through their House Leader in the last few days, put the suggestion on the record that we are somehow going to be subsidizing the Americans, that this somehow isn't a good deal.

What they don't want to talk about is how this deal compares to the agreement they made with Saskatchewan and Alberta. We took 500 of that 1,200 megawatt deal - I think it was about 1,200 megawatt deal - 500 of that and see what we would have gotten for those 500 over a 12-year period from 1993-2005, how much would we have gotten for that? How much would it have cost us to build the new transmission line? What would our profit have been compared to what our profit will be here? Why are they not asking those questions? Because they're embarrassed about them; because they made a bad deal. We didn't like the deal at the time. We said we didn't like it. We tried to change it. They criticized us for changing it. We're coming in with a new deal that's better. We demonstrated that a government that has the guts to negotiate an agreement that is fair to both sides can do it. They were doing it under desperation. They were too interested in re-election to be concerned about the long-term interests of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, in the past weeks there have been some comments occasionally from the opposition that when I was in opposition, I suggested that all these agreements had to be negotiated in the public eye.

I have a document here which I can table later on dated June 16, 1981 - it's a press release that I issued, and I want to read a part of it. This very clearly clarifies what I was saying about the concerns we had about

the potash agreement. There, again, is something that we will compare agreements, we will compare. I quote from that document:

"Notwithstanding all the obvious advantages of the Saskatchewan system, we would not be requesting that the agreement be held up pending clarification, were it not for the fact that between Craik's statements and the agreement entered into on May 15, 1981, it is our understanding that the taxation of potash will be tied into the taxation of metallic minerals for the full lifetime of the proposed mines. It appears that by agreement one government is binding future Legislatures with respect to the manner in which resources will be taxed into the future in this province.

"If this is a fact, there will be no possibility to deal with possible future windfall profits in either specific metallic mineral operations such as nickel or copper or in the potash field.

"For instance, should the world price of nickel quadruple in a matter of a year, we might wish to look at changes in taxation to recover a part of the windfall, just as Alberta has done with respect to oil-price increases. If, at that time, potash and nickel are tied together in one tax and potash is not in a position to pay that kind of tax, we may have to forego the increase in taxation on nickel.

"On the other hand, if nickel prices remain at depressed levels and potash prices continue to shoot up as they have from \$20 to \$150 per ton since 1969, we will be unable to raise the potash tax because by so doing we might close down our nickel mines."

I could go on with that document, but that was the issue on which we were very concerned that they were tying our taxes into the lowest common denominator, that there was no difference to be made between one metallic mineral and another, that there was no way in which we could change the tax regime on potash over the whole course of that agreement without changing other taxation legislation which we might not want to change. That was the basis on which we said we want to take a look at it.

We had other specific concerns, and the Tories have raised the concern of marketing of potash in the last few weeks. What did they agree to? They were talking about sizeable sales in the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of sales. What did they give to IMC for being their sales agents? They were prepared to give to IMC, 5 percent. If it's 5 percent on a house of \$60,000 that's not that bad maybe, but when you're talking about a sale from a Canadian subsidiary down to Chicago for a simple \$100 million entry, taking \$5 million off the top, we had some serious questions.

We're not saying that would have held up the agreement from our perspective; we are saying that we thought it was a trifle rich. But they are now questioning our marketing, and I can assure them that when we sign an agreement it's not going to be any worse, we will try to make sure that it is better with respect to marketing; we will try to make sure that it is better with respect to assured sales, that they're not putting us in a position where they will first mine out their own mines in other parts of the world before they come here and mine here; that they will not use the Manitoba mine as the flywheel; that they not attempt to complete, possibly, the mining of the much more expensive to mine potash up at Carlsbad and so on.

There were a whole host of areas that we had some serious concerns about, but the one kicker was the one tying in, having this agreement stating that the Government of Manitoba, not just the Sterling Lyon Government, but governments for decades to come would not be able to change the tax regime in this province with respect to metallic minerals without changing it for all metallic minerals - no distinction to be made - so that we were always on the lowest common denominator. That's what they would have had, had that agreement been completed.

I would have expected the House Leader to get up and tell the House today how much a 500 megawatt sale to Saskatchewan, Alberta for the first 12 years would have provided. Would it have been \$3.5 billion? Would it have been \$4 billion? They're such great business people, would it have been \$6 billion, or would it have been \$3 billion, or would it have been less? They surely had some numbers; they surely know approximately how much they would be receiving per megawatt per year. Surely those kinds of calculations had been made by them before they signed it.

Our calculations are that this particular sale, over the 12 years, is one that is at approximately \$6,400,000 per megawatt. What was theirs? We've got a number out there; what was theirs? That, it seems to me, is the crux of the matter. They said that we couldn't do a better deal than they did. We said, you're wrong. We said, why is it that you're calling an election before you've got all these things finalized if you're so sure that you've got something going? Why don't you get some of these things on paper? Or is it because your Minister of Finance has told your Premier that your preliminary estimates show that your deficit for '82-83 is going to be at \$500 million? Is that why the election was called in November of 1981 and they were too embarrassed to come back to the people?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Wrong.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The Member for Lakeside says, wrong. Even the former Minister of Finance has never denied that statement and that statement is a statement of fact, and I think I still have the black book in my office to prove that. Let's not say that there were not preliminary estimates at a deficit of \$500 million when we took office; and let's not say, either, that there weren't some experienced politicians in the Tory party who believe that kind of a budget that would be produced as a result of that in an election year, either putting out \$500 million in deficit, or trimming spending, or increasing taxes would have been something that they wanted to do before an election; and don't tell me that didn't have something to do with the call of the election in November of 1981.

Let us keep in mind, as well, that at the time they had these proposals which they could have had signed, if we were to believe what they said, with Alcan. There's another one that I would have hoped they would talk about today. Here we've had the Minister of Energy and Mines standing in his place announcing that, because we have kept the integrity of our hydro-electric resource we have been able to make a significant sale of power; we have been able to probably move forward the date of resumption of Limestone to have 17,000

Manitobans working, and the tremendous spinoffs from that, which are in addition to the \$3.2 billion sale, and they talk about bear traps. Incredible! They talk about bear traps on the day that we make the most profitable sale in the history of the Province of Manitoba.

**A MEMBER:** In Canada.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'm not going to say in Canada, because I haven't researched that. — (Interjection) — There we have the Member for Morris saying "Joey Smallwood said that in 1969, dummy." That's the brilliance of the Member for Morris who doesn't want to stand up and talk in defence of his government's proposal before the election although he ran on that; and if he can't tell this House that was a better deal, then he should not be talking in those terms, and I don't believe he can and I know that if he's honest and he reads these agreements he will discover that we have made a much much better deal than the Tories.

**A MEMBER:** Give him time to stand up and say this is a better deal.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I certainly would give him time to stand up and tell the people of Manitoba that their arrangement was a better arrangement for the taxpayers. I would give the Member for Lakeside that opportunity immediately. I would give any member opposite the opportunity to stand up and say that their arrangement with Saskatchewan and Alberta would be better for the people of Manitoba, more profitable for us. If they won't do that, Mr. Speaker - and we are prepared to do that - if they won't do that, how do they have the gall to criticize us for this sale that's better than the one that they would have entered into?

**A MEMBER:** They didn't.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I said, would have entered into. Here they have an opportunity to talk a bit about the affairs of the province. Do they talk about the fact that today in the Province of Manitoba we have the lowest unemployment rate in the country of Canada? Not a bit; not once. A few weeks ago we had an announcement by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology who announced some numbers with respect to the Jobs Fund and he did it in front of the Legislature. You may recall there was a newspaper article about that. That was at a time when - actually, I was talking to my House Leader, I'm just going to refresh his memory - a few weeks ago, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology had a news conference out in front of the Legislative Building to explain to people some statistics with respect to the Jobs Fund which was quite impressive.

It was done on the very same day, a couple of months ago it is, that Employment Canada statistics came out showing that we had the lowest unemployment rate in the country, as a province; but the newspaper article that came out in the editorial page, Under the Dome, referred to Mr. Kostyra not being prepared to say what our unemployment statistics were because Winnipeg's was fifth lowest in the country. She didn't talk about the fact that Manitoba, overall, was No. 1; she referred

to that one. Now that Winnipeg is No. 1, as well as Manitoba being No. 1 in the country, I haven't seen any articles in the Free Press saying, hey, these guys moved from No. 5 to No. 1 in Winnipeg and, of course, they're still No. 1 out in the country.

Did the Member for Roblin-Russell refer to the unemployment rate when he was talking about economic statistics in his constituency? Not a bit, not a bit. They don't want to deal with good news. They would love us to be in the position they were in when they were in government, No. 3, No. 4 in the country and so on.

**A MEMBER:** But they tried harder.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Oh, they certainly tried harder. They aren't talking about the people, their children and grandchildren coming back to Manitoba because of an NDP Government that cares and is providing employment. They don't talk about that. They don't talk about the fact that last year was the first time since 1919 that we've had a greater population increase in Manitoba than Canada has as a whole, percentage-wise. They don't talk about those kinds of things.

They don't talk about the fact that the housing program last year initiated by the Government of Manitoba was said to be, by the house-building industry in Manitoba, the best in the country. They don't talk about that.

They don't talk about the fact that when the Investment Dealers' Association came to town the other day, they said things are very good in Manitoba. You've got a good government and so on.

They don't talk about the fact that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association says that investment opportunities in Manitoba have never been better. They didn't say, under Sterling Lyon they were good. They certainly didn't. They said, they have never been better than under Howard Pawley's NDP Government. That's what they said. Do we hear those people talk about that? No, no, they talk about bear traps and fish. Well I say, fish or cut bait. Mr. Speaker, we announced major new economic initiatives in the province. They talk about those kinds of things.

I want to say another thing about that meeting we had with the CMA. I want to talk about what Mr. Wagner said, the fellow from Alberta. He used to be the Chairman of the Manitoba section of the CMA, so he understands Manitoba. In fact, he just moved away less than a year ago. He was transferred by his company. When he was talking to us about investment, he made the interesting observation that, you know, one of the problems we have in Alberta that you don't have here in Manitoba is that we are so close to British Columbia that people associate us and our labour situation with the Province of British Columbia. That's right. Investors view British Columbia like the plague, because of the right-wing, reactionary government they have there and their behaviour toward labour.

You know, the other day we had some people from Japan coming through here, people from some of the largest corporations in that country. I wasn't asking for this. They were telling me that they certainly would not want to be investing in the Province of British Columbia with the kind of labour climate that they have there.

The kind of government that does those kinds of things is not a government that is going to improve the economy of a province.

We said that for the four years that the Sterling Lyon people were in office. We said, give us a chance. We'll bring our children back. Give us a chance. We will improve conditions in this province. And even though we've had the worst recession since the depression, we have done far better in our first two years economically than those people ever did. Compare their last two years to our first two. Even though we had the recession, we did better because we are a government that cares. We're a government that believes that government can do something. We are a government that believes in the function of government.

While we're talking about the CMA, I just want to bring out one other interesting point that was made at that meeting. We were told by the CMA . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'm going to say this anyway, Frank. We were told by the CMA that we have the best labour/management climate in the country. I thought that was a bit interesting, because one of our members reminded the CMA that 12 years ago when the late Russ Pauley introduced the new Labour Code, that very same gentleman had been to see the Schreyer Government and had told that government that we were going down the tube in a hand basket. Everything is going to go wrong if you introduce that Labour Code. This is going to go bad. That's going to go bad. You're not going to have employment. You're going to have strikes. You're going to have all those things. All of those things were told to us. The Tories said it in here. We can pull out Hansard and read what they said would happen after we wound up putting in the new Labour Code, the Buzz Pauley Labour Code.

Twelve years later, they're saying . . .

**MR. P. FOX:** They said the same thing about Autopac.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Of course, they said the same thing about Autopac. It's not that history I am into today, Peter. And they didn't change either — (Interjection) — well, the Member for Sturgeon Creek mumbles. What he doesn't want to acknowledge is that when he was in government, he didn't change that Labour Code that he fought so hard against because he knew that it had been proven by then.

So when those people on that side start screaming doom and gloom every time we make changes to modernize and improve, we have to take that at its historical value. We have to look at what other criticism they made — (Interjection) — the Member for Sturgeon Creek says that what we are doing is communism. Now, that's really regrettable. Maybe I should spend a minute on that. I would like to spend a minute on that. It's a personal thing.

They don't want to look at world history. They don't want to look at the fact that every communist government on this planet that came in as a result of

an internal revolution came in as a result of a fascist or right-wing government, every single one of them. Every one came in as a result of repression. Cuba, do you want to stand up and defend Batista? Do you want to defend the Tzar? Do you want to defend - there's just a whole host of them - Sterling Lyon? Each of them was repressive, right-wing, and brought in a government that I don't want to defend any more than that.

But I'll tell you, the way to avoid it is not to go into the reaction that is happening in the Province of British Columbia, was happening in the Province of Manitoba, and did happen in those other countries that unfortunately got communism.

One of my best supporters in my part of the city is a very successful businessman, grew up in the Soviet Union, was fortunate enough to escape, went to Paraguay, lived in a right-wing dictatorship, came here. He has seen the dictatorship of the left, the dictatorship of the right. He doesn't want either and he frequently says, you know, the thing about the NDP is, they will make sure that we will not in the long term have communism. People with life experience would never make a fool statement like that, the statement that the Member for Sturgeon Creek just made.

But here they are. We've got a larger group now. Maybe I should throw that challenge out again, because I think that's the most important issue of the day. Is there one Tory member in this House who can stand up and tell the people of Manitoba that the Intertie they were working on with Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the pricing arrangement was fixed, was as good as . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** There's another untruth spoken by the Member for Roblin-Russell. I thought he had spoken enough of those in his speech and in his report to his constituents in his local newspaper.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Is there one member present in the opposition who's going to tell the people of Manitoba today that their agreement would have provided as good a return to the Province of Manitoba as the one that we have now entered into? I don't believe so.

**A MEMBER:** Send me a copy over here.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** You can get one from your House Leader; you can get one from the Clerk. You don't have to interrupt my speech to get a copy of the agreement which has been tabled.

Again, it appears that nobody's prepared to stand up and tell us that it is as good as what we had done. If they're going to say that we should have a discount, as the Member for Roblin-Russell is suggesting now, that because it was a sale to another province we should discount it, then tell us by how much.

**A MEMBER:** I didn't say discount.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** If you didn't say "discount," then don't say there's a difference between selling in Canada and selling in the United States. Either there is a discount or there isn't. If there is a discount, tell us how much; if there isn't, then that's fine.

We're going to have some fun with this.

**A MEMBER:** I'm a Canadian.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, you're a Canadian. The member now says he's a Canadian and yet he doesn't want to sell power to Saskatchewan and Alberta cheaper than he would sell to the United States. He's got to make up his mind where he's going. Again, fish or cut bait; do one or the other. You can't stand on this hocus-pocus. If you're saying, if it's the same I'd rather sell to Saskatchewan and Alberta, then I would agree with you. I would have no problem with that kind of a statement. If the agreement is the same, I'd rather sell to Saskatchewan and Alberta than south of the border.

This agreement is not the same; this agreement is far better for Manitobans, and I would ask again anybody who disagrees with that statement to stand up and be counted, because that issue is going to come back to you time after time during this Session.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** How come he wrote and asked them if they wanted to continue?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek says how come he wrote and asked them whether they wanted to continue? Mr. Speaker, we have such a thing as . . .

**A MEMBER:** How come you offered the same deal?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek forgets that we have a National Energy Board and forgets that we have to demonstrate to the National Energy Board that there is a surplus of power and we are doing that. We're doing that in the best way possible and if he is saying . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, if you think for one second that we would have gone on our hands and knees and on our noses to Saskatchewan and Alberta the way they did, he can think again. We were the ones who didn't like that arrangement; we said that it was so marginal we could lose our shirts on that agreement; we believed that, but we certainly did not say and our Minister did not say, that he was prepared to enter into the same agreement at this time. We asked whether they needed power; we didn't talk about price. We don't have an agreement with Saskatchewan and Alberta and if we're going to talk about price with them now we're going to talk 1984, not 1982. That is very clear.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** You're slithering snakes with no principles.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Are you crazy? Are you absolutely gone out of your skull man? Are you telling us that we should sell it at half the price, at little more than half the price to Saskatchewan and Alberta? Mr. Speaker, once a deal is terminated the deal is terminated, and when we talk about a new deal we talk about a new deal. It may be a different number of years, it may be a different price.

I would be shocked if that group would now turn around and say that if they were in office they would offer the same deal as they had previously to Saskatchewan and Alberta; and if that's what they would do, let them stand up and say it because we will spend some time . . .

**A MEMBER:** You did it.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Oh, come on. Will you shut up for a minute. They can't have it both ways. They've been saying we tried to change the deal, which we did; we tried to change that deal. They accuse us of trying to change it; now they're saying we have the same deal. — (Interjection) — No, I'm sorry. They negotiated the Saskatchewan-Alberta deal; we negotiated the NSP deal, that is the fact. There is no Saskatchewan-Alberta deal. There was one with those two people; there was one with those old governments, no signed agreements. What were you saying at the election campaign - "we're sitting on a gold mine." You were saying that at public expense, you were telling people there was a deal.

You people misled the people of Manitoba if you're saying there was no agreement. You totally are misleading the people of Manitoba. There was an agreement, we all know that. That's the problem you have this time. In the 1970s - and I said this the other day - we made an agreement with Japan to sell hogs and you people continuously criticized and criticized although that was not a bad deal; you had never made one. The problem you have with potash and Alcoa and with the hydro-electric deal is that in each case you have made an arrangement, you have shown on paper, signed, what you would be prepared to sell natural resources from the Province of Manitoba at and, in each of those cases, we will do better.

**A MEMBER:** Each of them?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Each of them, and it may not be in our first term; it may be in our second or third term that some of those things come to pass, but we will do them, we will not jump, just before an election, and in desperation sell off, give away the resources of this province. This is no giveaway. We're making a profit of \$1.7 billion on this sale. What would you have made on yours had you been re-elected in 1981, when you say you would not have tried to change the deal. You say that deal would have gone ahead at that time. What kind of profit would you have made on that? Tell us, tell the taxpayers of Manitoba, they're interested. If there's anything they're interested in they're interested in that.

That works out to about, what? Nine years of Highways expenditures.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell on a point of order.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

**MR. SPEAKER, J. Waiding:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, if there's time left at the end of my speech. The Member for Roblin-Russell, while he was on his feet, that reminded me of another brilliant statement he made. He was quoted in *Le Devoir*, I'll read the whole thing.

"Mr. Filmon notes: 'To get involved with separatism and new political parties and regional parties only has the effect of diluting your impact.' However there are Conservatives who believe that the rules of the game could change if the Liberals should once again win the next federal election".

"In this event," says Mr. Wally McKenzie, Provincial Conservative MLA, whose opinion carries some weight, "Western Canada will separate so quickly from the rest of the country that everyone's head will spin because in the West we have had it up to here." That's another one of the brilliant statements of Chairman Wally. Those are the kinds of things that are acknowledged, and the Member for Roblin-Russell acknowledges the accuracy of that quotation from *Le Devoir*.

That's the rule of democracy they have. If we win, we're all in this as a great democracy, we're all in it together; if we lose, we'll pick up our ball and bat and go home. That's the kind of democracy that we have from some of the members over there and I think that's really shameful.

Again, I understand that members opposite have this urge today, to stay in the grievance area and possibly not go into committee so that they can talk to the Minister of Energy and Mines and get some details on the hydro sale, get some details on how much better a deal this is than the one they negotiated and demanded that we not change by one comma, not one whit and just go ahead with.

They've chosen instead to go into grievances today and I find that a little bit surprising, but it's certainly their right to go into this kind of thing rather than into those committees. I'm sure the taxpayers would be quite interested in hearing about the \$1.7 billion profit on a sale is pretty important.

So again, I would just prove to members opposite to tell us how they see this sale as compared to theirs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister's time has expired. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to exercise the opportunity to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. C. MANNES:** . . . use my grievance at this particular time.

My main points of my grievance, Mr. Speaker, were going to be directed towards some educational matters and also to some general economic matters. However, in listening to the Minister of Finance, I feel compelled

to rise to some of the challenges that he puts before us.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say in trying to capsulize the member's remarks, I can only say one thing. The Minister - and, it's becoming evident from almost every spokesperson over across the way - they are pleading for respect. You can see it almost in every attempt and every utterance on their behalf, Mr. Speaker. They seem to believe that the press is totally against them. They know, I'm sure, by their own polls that the people are against them and they believe that it's all because they are not understood.

Mr. Speaker, we have the First Minister of our great province, he laughs in jest at my statement. I dare say when you hear the ramblings of the Minister of Finance, you realize how desperate they are and how upset they are, and they believe that the due amount of respect that should be coming their way is not.

Well, there's good reason for that, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to use all the time in my grievance to indicate why. Let me say that we can see all their statements and all their utterances for what they are.

The Minister of Finance if you notice, Mr. Speaker, tried to justify some of the comments that he made in 1980. He's already pulling out from Hansard some of his comments. He's already so worried as to some of the criticisms that we are now levying, some of the techniques that we are going to be using in an attempt to find out specifically what is involved in the new agreements that have been signed over the last few weeks. We will be using some of the same terminology that he used against some of the development projects that we were prepared to bring forward, Mr. Speaker.

If one had the opportunity for the first time to sit in, either in the gallery or at home, to listen to the Minister of Finance, and if they review Hansard and they wonder why we took so little time in directing questions to him during the Estimates process, they'll understand why after having listened to him for the last 40 minutes. We never received very definitive answers to any degree from that particular Minister. He likes to move onto a tangent and bring up the past. So, let people beware and let it be said again for the record, Mr. Speaker, that is why we decided to move very quickly to that Minister's Estimates.

The Minister of Finance challenged us to talk about Hydro. I suppose he even went a step further and challenged us to say that the deal that we were negotiating under the Grid project was superior to what has been laid before us today. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no real difficulty in saying that in my mind it was superior, and I don't even have the opportunity at this time to have seen what our party formerly — (Interjection) — Well, we have the Minister of Northern Affairs say blind faith. Isn't it odd, Mr. Speaker, that just two days ago we were challenging the Minister of Finance to provide for us the revenues of this province for the next 5, 10, and 15 years, so that all the citizens of this province wouldn't be locked into costs, hydro costs and deficits with the balancing side being revenues which we knew nothing about. They were asking us to go forward in blind faith.

That's why I find so despicable the challenge from the Minister of Finance, talking to us about laying before the House the forecasts of revenue that would have come forward from the Grid project that we had

developed two or three years ago. Yet, that same Minister, Mr. Speaker, would not lay before the House the Estimates of revenue forecast for this province over the years to come.

So, where is his consistency I ask? Well, I say there isn't any at all. You know, Mr. Speaker, he talked about we Tories, he seemed to indicate that we're not at all concerned about our children and our grandchildren coming back and providing for them a better place to live. All we again ask is where is this province going to be? If the Minister now wants to plug in what he considers 1.7 billion in profit, fine, that's his number, I'll accept it, but give us the total picture of what the revenues are, not only of Manitoba Hydro but of the Province of Manitoba 10 years out.

Yes, we realize there are forecasts; 1.7 is a forecast. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, minimum guarantee. Joey Smallwood in 1969 had a guarantee and in his time it was a good guarantee. It guaranteed that province, I believe, 2.5 cents a kilowatt for 50 years. That was the guarantee, Mr. Speaker.

Retrospect tells us it was foolish and what are the people in Manitoba going to be saying about this agreement? We don't know. But the Minister of Finance gets up and challenges us to make comment about it today. I've had just one opportunity to look at it. I saw a formula that's going to take some time to even digest and yet the Minister of Finance is challenging us to put on the record today our views as to what is entailed in that particular program. Well, how ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. They've had two months minimum, maybe a year, developing that formula, and they ask us to comment and give our definitive answer and conclusion on it in one day. How ridiculous.

Well — (Interjection) — here we go again. We have this new House Leader who I'm sure is a mathematical whiz, at least in his mind, who is totally convinced that he has the proper program developed. At least, his Minister of Finance and his Minister of Energy and Mines have convinced him that that is so.

Mr. Speaker, I also find it deplorable that the Minister would choose to chastise my colleague for talking specifically about a problem within his constituency, using the one opportunity that he has to address that particular grievance and yet being chastised by the members opposite. I consider it a great honour to be in the House at this time with such a distinguished gentleman is the Member for Roblin-Russell. I look forward to listening to his great oratory for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, if I have time, I will come back to some general economic matters, matters that are larger than the province as a whole, because I think part of our problems when we get bogged down in these discussions on economic indicators, when we get bogged down on discussions of philosophy, we seem to lose sight at times of the bigger picture. I've come across an article, I'm pretty sure that members opposite have read it too, and I would like to dwell on it for some time, but before I do that I would like to spend a few minutes on educational matters that are of concern to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine suspicion that a large number of people in this province are very concerned as to the quality of education that is being afforded particularly to the students within our secondary school

system, within our high schools. I find, as I travel the province and talk to parents and to students and to educators, that more and more people are expressing those concerns. There seems to be a real feeling that there is a lack of functional literacy skills in high school graduates.

I am not standing today to cast great amounts of blame on this government and the present Minister of Education, but I think the time has come when, as elected people, we all realize that we have a problem within our public school system. I think some of the attempts of the government to begin to deal with one major area or problem are laudable and that is, of course, their attempt to begin to deal with the concerns in the area of increasing technological demands. In the minds of many people, the attempts to educate our children in those areas have been doubtful.

So I believe that, except for that one area, this government and the Department of Education are not spending enough effort in attempting to determine what really are the levels of education being afforded to our children. I would hope that the Minister of Education would take the opportunity to read some of the remarks I will make in the next few minutes and maybe sometime before the Session ends, will address the remarks specifically.

Mr. Speaker, some people estimate that upwards of 40 percent of high school graduates are functionally illiterate. That is, they operate below a Grade 9 level. That is a statement that is not only scary, but I would say is one that has to be looked at by all people involved with education. When we were in Estimates, Mr. Speaker, I used some of the material that was developed by the Research Branch within the Department of Education which indicated that, by way of survey, 60 percent of the people surveyed within this province feel that the quality of education offered within our high schools is not adequate. I use that as a springboard into many areas, Mr. Speaker, because undoubtedly the greatest failing of any system today in the civilized world is to not prepare students adequately for the work world.

I had the opportunity to ask the Minister some specific questions regarding many curriculum matters - the new health curriculum - and it's not my intent to dwell upon that today although, in passing, I should mention that daily more and more Manitobans are wanting to know more about the proposed new health curriculum. They are wanting to see what specifically is going to be presented to their children. I dare say in days to come, Mr. Speaker, that the call that I made for the Minister to bring forward an opt-in procedure rather than an opt-out for students in those school divisions which had made the decision to include the new curriculum, I think will receive a greater emphasis from myself over the next number of days and weeks.

Language training, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the area of literacy skills, is an incredible concern to almost everybody in the work world, and as I talk to young graduates who have been out of school for a period of two or three years, they too are questioning the skills that were imparted to them. I think it's time that this government and the Minister of Education come from under that umbrella of confidence which she seems to exude when she says things to the effect that the people just don't understand what a good job we are doing

and if we have enough money, we will convince them that we are doing a good job.

Sir, the time has come when we have to grapple with many of the concerns we have today. Again, in the minds of many new graduates, in the minds of many educators, I am told that they believe that measures which will build up self-esteem and self-confidence are neglected within our school system. Students in too many cases, after they have graduated, realize that there are places for dress codes and discipline codes within our educational system. I think the pendulum is beginning to swing back, Mr. Speaker. Again, I am not trying to make this a political issue. I am just asking the members opposite to realize where we are and to realize the time has come where everybody had better look specifically at what we are trying to do within education.

You know, Mr. Speaker, next year I will have three children in junior high school and I really noticed over the last two years that they bring home now less homework. They have less homework to do than they did during elementary grades, and I question why. I realize that one should never reach a conclusion on the basis of one school, indeed, of one teacher, indeed, of one's own children; but the point is I talked to many people who feel that high school students are not being challenged enough and, if they are, they aren't being presented with enough challenges that will occupy their time. I think it is absolutely irresponsible of the Minister to always rush to the defence of the system as it now exists in so many respects, in the quality of education, as if admitting a weakness is somehow admitting failure on her part. That is what really concerns me in this whole issue.

In the area of teacher competency, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we have to realize that admission to Faculties of Education maybe is not as rigorous as it could be. I am wondering if a graduating teacher should be given certification to teach in every subject even though it is obvious that all of us have strengths and weaknesses in almost every area. We have different talents. I am wondering whether that's the proper way. Of course, the Minister has challenged us on many occasions - not only us - I would say more so than us, she has challenged the school trustees of the province to bring in proper evaluation systems which will weed out those teachers which I would suppose is a very small number but nevertheless a number, are incompetent. Again I challenge her, for the record, to help in that process of bringing forward that type of evaluation system because it's needed and it's needed desperately.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come when we have to expect that teachers will become more involved in the day-to-day activities, not only the activities but performances of their students. Whether that involves the principal making sure that teachers look specifically at notebooks or whatever, I don't know, but the thing is let's address it.

I would like to spend just a moment on support for independent and private schools, Mr. Speaker. Probably everyone has read the article in yesterday's paper where Ontario is now financing Catholic and all separate schools all the way through high school.

Today it was my intention to pose a question to the Minister of Education as to whether, in view of that

particular information and in view of that decision by the Ontario Government, whether or not this government would be reassessing its decision in this regard because I dare say attempting to bury your head in the sand, or attempting to believe that it's a problem that will go away just is not sufficient. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be ever-increasing pressure on any government, regardless of what political stripe it may have, to deal more specifically with the requests for those people who are operating separate schools.

Brandon University, Mr. Speaker, as members opposite know and as the Minister of Education is well aware, has been a concern of ours for many months. I think that we were able to show, during the Estimates process, that the Minister of Education has absolutely no understanding of the situation that is occurring at that university. I suppose not every Minister and certainly, I would dare say, a Minister of Education can be expected to know everything that goes within that large area, but what horrified us is that the Minister seemed to not really care less and seemed not the least bit interested to find out, from either her Deputy or from the Universities Grants Commission Chairman as to what specifically is happening at that university.

Just the other day a report has come down whereby there is — (Interjection) — Yes, I have it right here, Mr. Speaker - where a memorandum was sent to the members of the Brandon University Board of Governors. This came from a group on campus who were looking at an academic administrative review and they were a committee. Sir, I am not going to go through this in detail, other than to say that whoever prepared the report is now advocating that the university do away with its vice-presidents and that university has one.

In the wisdom of this particular committee, they are of the belief that universities would work better if they had "workers' committees" - those are the words; I'm not going to quote it, but those are the words - "workers committees" who would be in charge of major functions of the university.

I am terribly concerned about that, and I would hope that members opposite would be, too. I specifically would hope that the Minister of Education would now succumb to the desire of those people who say that whole university requires a major inquiry. If she wants to do it within her department, that's fine; if she wants to make it public, that's fine also, but it has to be done, Mr. Speaker.

I would like now to move back to some general economic matters, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite probably have had an opportunity to read the article in the Policy Options May/June issue. It's titled, "Agenda for the Economy." It was written by James Gillies. Of course, the members may be a little suspect right in hearing of the author's name, but I believe this article, in my view, probably points out, in the Canadian context, the economic situation of this land better than any I have read. It's very short. I'm certainly not going to quote it, but I am going to draw several remarks from it. That's why I ask the members opposite if they can, if they have the intelligence to do so, to try and take some of the beliefs they have regarding the Manitoba economy, and put it more into a national perspective. The main thrust of this report done by Mr. Gillies probably are three or fourfold, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to give you a brief summary of some of the main conclusions.

One of the conclusions is that, regardless of whether we believe that we should have high interest rates - I don't believe anybody wants that - or whether we believe that we should freeze the border to the fleeing of foreign exchange so as to keep our scarce capital within the nation, or whether one believes that the dollar should float to whatever level it wants, the author reaches the conclusion, that regardless of which of those various policies that one supports, the net result is the same. The standard of living in this nation is going to fall and it's going to fall drastically.

Because when one compares - and the article makes reference - it's time that we realize that we go back again to the situation where we compare relative strengths of nation versus nation, because the world is a small place and it's trading very actively. We are considered to be a very active trader - more about that later. But if we are actively trading, then it behooves the politicians in this land to become very cognizant of what the relative strengths of this nation are relative to strengths of other nations, because if our productivity, Sir, is suffering in any area, and it has been for many years, the net result of any policy that either our party proposes or that party proposes will be the same. The standard of living of the nation is going to fall.

I'm wondering whether members opposite are interested, are concerned, about that at all, because nowhere have they, in any of their discussions, nowhere in any of their criticisms of what they believe our policies to be, nowhere in their beliefs, their policies and their agreements that they are laying before us, have they taken the next step further and indicated, first of all, where the major revenues would be and, forthcoming from that, how it would impact on our standard of living in years to come. I believe that if you pull away from attempting to do that you very quickly lose sight of the reality of Canada in the future and the economic future of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, if I could bring out a few of these remarks, if I could bring them out specifically. Too many people believe that the future of the nation is totally dependent upon trade, without really knowing where Canada is in a trade sense relative to other nations. Yes, Canada is very dependent upon trade. I believe last year some \$90 billion worth of trade was done by this nation. I'm sure most people believe that, even though it represents 25 percent of our gross national product, in effect it is an increasing amount. Our share of world trade is increasing substantially.

Mr. Speaker, it is not. As a matter of fact, it is dropping. It is dropping to those areas where our comparative advantage is beginning to come into doubt, too, so we are in jeopardy in that area also. That's why we find it a little disconcerting when we find laid before us major hydro agreements. That in themselves, fine, is maybe acceptable, but where are the jobs? Where are they going to go? — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, we had a comment from the Member for River East saying the jobs are going to go up North. I'm wondering if he can tell me how long they will stay in the North. Well, of course, he can't — (Interjection) — Well he says, 10 years. You know, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say a lot of things when it comes to talking about the agreements. I heard the Minister of Energy and Mines say, for instance, that all the costs would be recovered in bringing forward Limestone if



it was tied into two or three different agreements. I heard him say that, too.

The Premier of Newfoundland was in the other day and it may be interesting to members opposite that he imparted some words of wisdom to my Leader to tell him that the costs associated with Churchill Falls are also being covered. Those costs are being covered also, but who knew what was going to happen in the future.

I tell you, the Member for River East certainly doesn't know what's going to happen in the future. We're well aware of that, Mr. Speaker. That's why I think it behooves us all to understand where this nation and therefore this province stand in relative terms to the other nations of the world. Sir, I'm told that in the 1950s, Pusan, South Korea, was a fishing community. Today it is the site of the largest, most technologically advanced shipyard in the world. That's in 30 years.

In 1960, Korea produced almost no steel. Today it is the major force in the world market. Japan has become the largest producers of automobiles in the world and we know that. In 1980, there were 86 countries with automobile assembly plants - 86. Thirty years ago, how many nations produced cars? And yet our strongest area of export of manufactured goods is in the area of automobiles because of the U.S.-Canadian Auto Trade Pact. Yet how many members opposite realize that will come to an end and therefore, all of a sudden, we swing back to again being an exporter of raw materials.

These are questions that the members opposite, I think, have to ask instead of always throwing at us figures on economic performance within the province that would seem to indicate that Manitoba, in spite of being the best - and I'm glad it is the best, but I think we could ask the question - the best of what?

Mr. Speaker, one looks at the United States and says they have the same problems we do. Well, not really. We're well aware that they're leading the world in the area of technological growth and their whole industry is swinging southward into the southern states, the sun states. That's where the new industrial heartlands will be, because we have in our mind this fixation that industry is coal and it's steel and it's cars and it's changing very, very rapidly, Mr. Speaker. But where are we as a nation and where are we as a province in the scheme of things?

I believe that the members opposite don't have an understanding of the larger picture. It's from that perspective that I worry very much because they move into areas of great spending and yet feel that they can salvage it all by an agreement which they suggest will present to us \$1.7 billion of profit over a number of years; but with no recourse as to what the costs may be of replacement in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a couple more comments before I finish. It has something to do with Keynesian economics. The author says that Keynesian economics appeared to work up to the mid '70s, but by the mid-'70s it was clear that Keynesian policies were no longer operating effectively. But in 1984, we've got the greatest advocates of Keynesian economics sitting across the floor, the greatest advocates, Mr. Speaker, the believers that you can spend, spend, spend, that you can continue to prime the pump — (Interjection) — The Minister of Municipal Affairs says,

according to whom? All their actions, Mr. Speaker, point to that.

There the ones who have absolutely no answer other than continuing to spend, and when we question them, what do they say to us? What do they say to us? They say, ah, but you're inhumane; you don't care about the disadvantaged. That's always their retort at every occasion. The Minister challenges me as to whether I've read Keynes or not. What a ridiculous statement to make. Of course, it's just like the one he made the other day in reference to some of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think it's crucial that the members opposite realize that this nation and this province have to concentrate on those areas in which we have some comparative advantage, in those areas where we can compete within a world climate. For them to bring resolutions or to talk like the Member for Thompson did yesterday indicating that we should let the dollar float, let us close the border so that foreign exchange does not leave this land, is absolutely ridiculous. His saying that letting our dollar float will be the answer just flies in the face of what history tells us.

Every nation in the world that has thought they could be better off by letting their dollar just drop and drop and drop has found out differently. History has told us that many, many times. Of course, the bottom line is productivity and how every group of people, as a nation, produce, compared to other nations of this world. I think once the members opposite realize that, they'll take a little different view to a lot of the labour legislation they bring forward. I think they'll take a little different view as to how they spend and I think they'll take a little different view as to how they put us into deficit, into accumulated debt for years to come.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity of rising and grieving at this time. I just believe that there are two areas that need constant vigilance and those are the areas of education and the fiscal and economic matters of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Morris has a few minutes left. I wonder if he would submit to a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** I wonder if the Member for Morris can tell us whether he thinks that his previous government's proposed 500 megawatt, 25-year sale agreement to the Province of Saskatchewan is better than our signed, sealed and delivered 12-year, 500 megawatt sale to NSP?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, where was the member? I addressed that challenge from the Minister of Finance earlier on. I was very, very explicit. I haven't really seen either one of those programs, just as has been laid before us today, a program and a formula

which is very complicated. I asked the members opposite if they'll give us more than one hour to digest that particular material so that we can make proper remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge and the question from the member opposite is as ridiculous as the Minister of Finance and no doubt they'll continue to flog that question for months to come, I dare say, right into an election campaign which they will lose dismally.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I rise today, Mr. Speaker, not so much to grieve - although I am using the occasion of my grievance to make my speech - but rather to use this opportunity to put on the record some of my thoughts about what I believe has been a very historic occasion with the announcement of the signing of the contract that the Minister of Energy and Mines made to the House today.

It's interesting to listen to the comments of members opposite, not only during the question period, but during the time following and to note that they spend very little time what can be one of the most important economic initiatives that this province has undertaken in many years. I don't know why they neglect to speak about it and perhaps they are waiting for another opportunity and we will be pleased to hear whatever constructive criticism and support that they might want to express in regard to that contract, but it is interesting that today we've heard so very little.

When the Minister of Energy and Mines undertook to make his statement, he began, Mr. Speaker, by saying, today is a great day. Indeed it is a great day, and you might ask yourself why. What significance, what importance does this one particular announcement have that would lead the Minister of Energy and Mines to make such an exuberant statement of confidence and optimism, and lead other members on this side to support him in making it?

Well the fact is that today a contract has been signed that is going to provide for a firm sale of 500 megawatts of hydro-electric power, extending over a period of 12 years, and starting on May 1, 1993. Now what does that mean to the province? It means basically \$3.2 billion in revenue over that period of time with a cost-benefit ratio of more than two to one. That means a profit figure of \$1.7 billion resulting out of that one sale, that one announcement, that one contract that was addressed earlier today. Indeed, it is a great day for the Province of Manitoba when you can provide that sort of initiative and news.

The members opposite have been asking, are we certain that we will not be subsidizing other users of hydro-electric power outside of the province as a result of this contract? They have asked that question day after day after day after day. Indeed it is a legitimate question, and it is a good question. It is one that was addressed. The fact is that \$1.7 billion of profit over that period of time will be subsidizing Manitoba ratepayers in their purchase of hydro-electric power in this province. So the subsidy flows the other way. In fact, they should rejoice at that announcement.

What does it mean to Manitoba, though? Besides that, what does it mean to Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, it means jobs, jobs, jobs and more jobs. It means spinoff benefits for the Province of Manitoba. We're talking about 17,000 work years of jobs in this province to construct that hydro-electric station. We're talking about 6,000 on-site alone in my own constituency which is important to the health of that constituency, and we're talking about 11,000 indirect jobs that will arise out of the construction. So in fact, it is a great day not only for Manitoba as a province, but it's a great day for those who live here and wish to participate in the employment activity that is going to be generated out of this construction.

It's very clear from the announcement today and that this sale will, in fact, effect the start-up date of construction of Limestone Generating Station. The Minister of Mines and Energy announced in his earlier announcement that, if in fact this sale were to go through, it would have that impact. Again today, he reaffirmed that it will have that impact. He further indicated that studies that are going to be undertaken over the course of the summer will result in a decision on Limestone being taken this fall. We can only anticipate and hope that that decision is to move the construction up, because it means not only great benefits to the North but great benefits to the province as a whole.

Churchill constituency, the site of the actual construction of course, will benefit by the immediate jobs, but that is not to say that they will be confined to any one geographic or electoral area in the province. That construction will affect businesses throughout the North, throughout the rural Manitoba and in the City of Winnipeg. That construction will affect employees that are located throughout this province. That construction will mean great benefits to the province as a whole.

It will also mean stability for the industrial community, for the economic fabric of the province, for small businesses, for the heavy construction industry, for large businesses, for community organizations in and about the construction area, for Northern firms. There will be all sorts of economic spinoffs that will bring stability.

We're not only talking about Limestone because, had you listened to the many announcements that the Minister of Energy and Mines has made over the last number of weeks, you'll know that we are talking about Limestone and Conawapa and on downstream until we have a fully-developed, hydro-electric system in this province that will be second to none on this continent and second to none in this world. That is the potential that we have always recognized and we have remained committed to over many years, the potential to develop a hydro-electric system that is second to none and is the pride of this province.

I talked earlier a bit about the benefits to Northerners. I want to substantiate that because, in the past, many governments have talked about the benefits to Northerners that will arise out of Hydro construction, and the fact that they are going to be undertaking activities to ensure that. I don't want to reflect upon either their commitment or their ability to follow through, but I do want to say that over the past number of years we have shown very clearly from the first changes that were made in the preferential hiring clause for the Allied

Hydro Council and Manitoba Hydro contract to the latest statement by the Minister of Energy and Mines that my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, will be undertaking a series of meetings with the Member for Thompson and the Member for The Pas to meet with Northerners to discuss with them ways to maximize the benefit that they will receive from the Hydro construction. So not only have we acted in good faith in the past few years, but we have very clearly charted a direction that will lead us to that increased activity in Northern Manitoba as a result of this construction.

I quote from an article from the Free Press, dated May 11, 1984. The headline says: "Northerners to get first crack at Limestone construction jobs." The first paragraph says: "'Northerners are to have first crack at 6,000 man years of work which construction of Manitoba Hydro Limestone Generating Station would produce,' Energy Minister Wilson Parasiuk told a Northern All-Chiefs Conference yesterday."

I happened to be at that conference along with the Member for Rupertsland, the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Members for Thompson and The Pas. At that time, he very clearly stated, and I quote again: "'On-the-job training and apprenticeship programs are built into the construction plans,' he said, adding 'preparatory training in construction skills could begin when the project's starting date is announced in the fall.'" Jobs, we talked about jobs, and there it is in black and white.

But he goes beyond that, because we also talked about economic spinoffs. What does he say? He says: "'As well, small businesses will be given assistance in competing for contracts resulting from the development. Northerners could also form new businesses or join with neighbours in a co-operative venture to bid on contracts,' the Minister of Energy and Mines says." So we are very clearly on the record that we not only want to make certain that we maximize the employment opportunities in Northern Manitoba for this particular project, but that we also maximize and increase the opportunity for small businesses, community organizations and large businesses alike to participate fully in this development. That has not been done before, but it will be done this time, Mr. Speaker.

So I am optimistic about the announcements; I am optimistic about the direction that we have charted in respect to fulfilling our obligations; I am optimistic that we will, in fact, have in place that sort of system in the very near future. So I don't stand here to grieve today. No, I stand here more to rejoice if one wants to know the absolute truth. I think it is a day that one should be pleased, that one should be happy, that one should have a sense of rejoicing in their heart because, in fact, we have made an announcement which is a good deal for Manitoba.

I've said that and members on this side have said that as well, but what have the members opposite said about this construction potential? I think it's important to put on the record some of their responses. Well, in the first instance, they were questioning.

The Leader of the Opposition in his reply to the Throne Speech said this: "These kinds of negotiations have been particularly, and were particularly . . ."—excuse me, I'm sorry. I am misquoting the Leader of the Opposition. The person sitting next to him, the House Leader of the opposition made this quote when the announcement was first made.

He said: "These kinds of negotiations have been particularly, and were particularly pursued by a former colleague of mine, the then Honourable Don Craik when he was charged with the responsibility of Hydro. It is common knowledge, Sir, and the Hansards of this Legislature are filled with the discussions and the efforts that were being made at that time to forge the kind of south-north link of use of power which makes a lot of eminent sense. They are the heavier users in the summertime; we are the heavier users in the wintertime. These kinds of discussions have taken place on numerous occasions in the past and he applauded the Minister on the efforts that he had undertaken in that regard and the announcement that he had been able to make that day.

But then, shortly thereafter, Mr. Speaker, we start to hear them question very seriously the entire concept. That's fair because they are opposition and in their role as opposition they have a responsibility to question the government to determine if, in fact, the activities of the government are in the best interests of the province, and they see that as their role and perceive it as their duty and, in fact, they did it. I don't know as if they had to do it in quite the way they did. That's always an argument that flows in different ways depending on what side of the House one happens to sit on.

I recall, when we were in opposition, they felt that we should be more constructive in our criticism and they said that; when they are in opposition we feel that they might be more constructive in their criticism and we say that as well. But we do recognize the fact that they are opposition, and they are going to be opposition for a very very long time so they need all the practice they can get to fulfill that role well.

What did they say about the deal? Well, they said whatever deal it's going to be a sweetheart deal. Well, maybe it is a sweetheart deal, sweetheart deal from Manitoba; I don't think that's the way they meant it. But if, in fact, there is any element of this being a sweetheart deal, I would say that it is for this province and that we should be proud of the negotiating skills of this government in bringing this forward. I'll talk to that a bit later.

What else do they say? Well, I have a Brandon Sun article, June 1, where the House Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying that "we must ensure that we do not sell power at a price so low that they are subsidizing American consumers." Now, earlier I said that the role of opposition is to give good advice, and that was good advice, and we took it and we struck a deal where we are being, in fact, subsidized to a significant extent over the length of that deal and the term of that contract.

He also said they're grasping for any and all possible good news and that we should have learned a lesson from the Churchill Falls Power Development. They come back and back and back again harping at the fact that the Churchill Power Falls Agreement was a bad deal for Newfoundland and, therefore, anything that we do will be a bad deal for the Province of Manitoba. I don't believe in any way stretching their remarks when I suggest that has been a consistent theme throughout their response to what has turned out to be a very important and a very productive sale of power for the Province of Manitoba.

So, one can understand that their initial reaction is skepticism; one can understand the initial reaction of being opposed and being somewhat negative about it. I think perhaps they misunderstood the magnitude of the negotiations and the benefits that would be provided to the province in the North, but that can almost be forgiven, given the fact that they did not have the opportunity to see the way the negotiations were unfolding, and that they did not have the trust in us as negotiators to take at face value the fact that we said we were going to come forward with exactly the same type of sale that we have; one that is good for the province. So, we can understand that.

Then they grew inquisitive and curious, they wanted the details. Headline: "NDP Refuses To Release Details Of U.S. Hydro Sale; Pawley Guarded On Details Of Fact." We have the Leader of the Opposition being quoted as Manitobans would like to know more about the details of the sale. The House Leader, his seat mate, yelling across the House what is the First Minister hiding, claiming the opposition could offer no constructive criticism without basic information?

What did we say at that time? We said they would get the information and they would have it available to them for the Estimates review to be able to have that opportunity, as well the question period, to talk about the details. We gave them that information today and we're still waiting to hear them talk. Their final response, and we saw it today, was one of silence, shocked, stone-faced silence. They didn't . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** Would the member permit a question?

**MR. J. COWAN:** Certainly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I do this constructively, Sir. I simply ask him how, in all fairness, I can judge and make a comment or response to the announcement made today when, for instance, it says that the monthly capacity bill will be  $112 \times 008 \times 500,000 \times CIX \times LARR \times ADG$ . It does explain what ADG is; ADG is  $33 \text{ over } 1 + D - 1 \text{ over } 12; 1 + D - 1 \times 1D + D \times 12 - 1 \dots$

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . + E x 12 over 331 + D(-1 + E). I have a little trouble with . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. H. ENNS:** No, that's what the Minister says. I think the Minister will acknowledge that before I, or any other spokesperson, makes any . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . comment about that, I think we need to be able to run it through our number crunchers and get to understand what the language is all about and then comment constructively about the bill.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question by telling him that it means quite simply \$1.7

billion profit to the people of . . . It means over \$3 billion worth of revenue. It means jobs, jobs, jobs, economic spinoff, employment, jobs for Northerners, jobs for Southerners. It means economic activity for Northern community organizations and small businesses. It means it's a great day for Manitoba and it's a great future.

If he has questions, what better opportunity is there than to have the Minister appear in his Estimates where all the detailed type of questioning can take place. They have foregone that opportunity through use of the grievance procedure this day, which is their right and certainly a tactic on their part. However, if they do have those questions we're prepared to answer them, we're prepared to explain it to them, and we're even more prepared to explain to them why this is a much better deal than they were talking about when they were in government.

So, we stand ready to answer the questions that the members may have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** They suggested, over the past number of weeks, that what we had was a bad deal because of the secrecy. Well, there's no more cause for them to be concerned about not having the detail because they have more detail in their hands right now than we ever did when we were in opposition and asking many of the same questions. This open government has provided them with that sort of detail and will continue to do so.

Today, their response was silence. The thin veneer of even some sort of positive response, no matter how cautious it was worded, was stripped away as they sat stonefaced reflecting, I think, not upon the future of Manitoba which is so important in this agreement, but reflecting more upon their own future and the fact that they're going to be opposition for a very long long time. They were unable to speak because they didn't know what to say and they still don't know what to say.

Mr. Speaker, what have other people said about the negotiations and the contract which is signed today. Well, we know more what they said about the negotiations, let's hear what the Thompson Citizen had to say in an editorial that was in the paper shortly after the announcement that we were negotiating the agreement: It says, "New Democrats firm power sale a big boost for province". This is from the editorial writer of the Thompson Citizen who does not want to congratulate us all that often, although I do admit . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Has he ever done it before.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, he has done it before to answer the question from my colleague, but it is rare and it's, therefore, most appreciated when it does happen.

What does he say? He says: "We have to congratulate the NDP Government for making a very strong effort to export a Manitoba product and thereby turn around our sluggish economy. It is time we got away from the recession."

What else did they say? It says, "We must give the government credit, however, for making the massive efforts to try and heal the economic woes of Manitoba.

They are doing it by every means possible." It goes on to talk about other activities as well. So the fact is the Thompson citizen understands much better than the opposition the value of this agreement to Manitoba.

What do we have here? We have a Free Press article from one of the columnists saying, "NDP outmatch Tory negotiating skills." What does that columnist say? That columnist says, and she is quoting a former colleague of ours, Mr. Don Craik, when he says, "'I guess we conceded the equity point when we let Alcan have an undivided minority interest in Limestone. We recognized and extended the same principle to Inco in view of our dealings with Alcan. Inco had asked for a power rate discount and we had refused.' Craik said he was not fearful. 'The government had set a precedent which could lead to the wholesale privatization of Manitoba Hydro.'"

Well, we were fearful of that precedent and we were committed, and said during the election that we would not allow that kind of wholesale sale of the resources of this province to take place. We have undertaken to stand by that commitment, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the announcement that was made today very clearly demonstrates that we will not let that happen.

They would still do that; let there be no doubt. They would still offer that same sort of deal to Alcan or to any other large producer of power in this province if they were asked for it. They have never reneged on what they consider to be their philosophy of how to develop hydro, and that is to privatize it as much as possible.

What do other people say to them? Let's talk about the economy as a whole, Mr. Speaker. The Winnipeg Free Press, May 18th editorial, and again it's not one to offer all that much by way of congratulations, but what it says is, "The good news is that the Conference Board of Canada predicts a relatively healthy economy for Manitoba during the rest of the year."

What do we have here? A Free Press article, May 17th, a month ago. What do they say about the recovery that the members opposite were suggesting was going to pass us by? What does the Free Press say about the economy? They say it's relatively healthy. What does the Conference Board say? "Manitoba is expected to post the third highest economic growth rate in Canada this year for the province's best showing in a decade," the Conference Board of Canada says. What does that say about what they did when they were in office?

The Free Press, the Conference Board - let's see what other people have to say. The Canadian Manufacturing Association, again, along with the Thompson Citizen, the Free Press, they are not ones to congratulate us all that much.

We have here an article from The Winnipeg Sun, May 30, 1984, not that long ago. What does it say? It says, "Among other things, the national chairman of the Canadian Manufacturing Association, a group that would normally have New Democrats well down on its Christmas card list." I can't recall having received a lot of Christmas cards from them but that's neither here nor there. I think the intent of that statement is to suggest that they are not necessarily those that would in fact congratulate us that often.

It talks about a Mr. Vern German, who had a meeting with the Premier of the province. What did he say? I quote everything from the article in direct quote. He

commended the government for policy he describes as "impressive," "very very impressive," "very attractive," "very encouraging," and "more impressive." He said, "It was a case of accentuating the positive." Well, he might have even over done it but we certainly welcome that sort of encouragement for the activity of the government and the future economy of the province.

What did he say as well? He said "We commended the government on most elements of the last budget. It was very, very encouraging to hear the Premier describe some of his plans for the province. The association is pleased because it sees Manitoba's 'return to stability and growth' as more impressive than other provinces." So that's what the Canadian Manufacturing Association had to say.

On the economy as well — (Interjection) — Well, the member will have an opportunity to stand up and quote those whom he wishes to quote as a matter of the record, rather than yelling across the Chamber from his seat, but I would like to just provide one more series of quotes, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to read it out as it is written in the paper, although I don't want my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to get a swelled head from it.

What it says is that, "Manitoba Finance Minister Vic Schroeder gets top marks from the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada for a Provincial Budget, which the I.D.A. believes could speed up the flow of money into Manitoba." The Investment Dealers' Association of Canada make statements about our Budget and our work as a Provincial Government that far exceed any compliments that they had to pay the members opposite when they had four years to provide similar sorts of benefits through budgetary practices. What do they say? They say it was excellent and an appropriate one for Manitoba at this point. What do they say? They said that it was constructive and showed useful levels of restraint. What do they say? They said that the province's investment opportunities "have never looked better."

That means they didn't look better when they were government; that means they had never looked better, according to the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada. The Leader of the Opposition knows that their word is worth taking. He even took the time to quote him in his own reply to the Throne Speech when he gave it this Session, so he substantiates them as an authoritative source.

What else do they say? He said he had even met privately with Schroeder earlier that day and was impressed with the Finance Minister's explanation of the economic strategy. That's not the Leader of the Opposition saying that; that's the Chairman of the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada. He says, "Schroeder said that in the depth of the recession, the public sector had to take a larger role, but that he sees an increasing role for the private sector now for the economic recovery is fairly satisfactory. It's been some time since I've heard that said so clearly."

In fact, that's exactly the type of economic activity that we've been undertaking for two years, that the Conservative opposition have been so disparaging about. We said there was a time to invest that sort of public monies into the economy to make certain that it could make its way through the worst sufferings of

the recession. We did that and we would do it again if we had to do it again, but we're now on a road to recovery and a different way of dealing with the economy is appropriate this time and that's exactly what the Investment Dealers' say.

Remember earlier, I said that it was excellent and an appropriate one for Manitoba at this point. What did he say? He was pleased and encouraged and he said that Manitoba's investment prospects are very encouraging for the next several years. There's a lot of catch up involved, since the province has had a low rate of real investment for some time. Well, we certainly had to undo what the Conservatives had managed to do during four years, but I think we've caught up and now I think we're going beyond that and moving ahead; and I think the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada would in fact agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, there's a whole series of other quotes regarding the construction activity and the investment activity in this province, which I think very clearly demonstrate that we are on a road to recovery, that we are doing the right thing, but I want to use the last few minutes of the afternoon to just talk a bit more about the Hydro agreement because it is so important to the future of the province.

We're speaking to a signed contract today, a major economic initiative that provides substantial and significant benefits just as it stands today, alone. Without any embellishment, without any improvement it provides those sorts of benefits to the province and I'm certain, that as the members opposite have the time to read it and understand it and question it, they will come to

that same conclusion as well. I think they will also come to the conclusion that the activity that arises out of it can be made more substantive and more substantial. By working together, I believe we can meet the challenge, which is contained within that signed contract, to ensure that the effort and the activity that goes on around the construction of Limestone and Conawapa and others after it maximizes the many benefits that it can accrue to the province as a whole and to the North in specific.

We are committed to that goal. We are committed with whomever wants to work with us towards that goal, and we will, I believe, be as successful in those efforts as we have been in negotiating a good deal for Manitoba that we have to date. I think it is through the commitment to that goal and the development of policies and programs that we will accomplish that very important objective.

So we have a signed contract which is important and stands on its own, but we also have a challenge which we are prepared to meet and a challenge which we hope other Manitobans will work with us toward achieving.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.