

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 14 March, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

I'd like to table an Actuarial Report of The Public Service Group Insurance Fund and an Actuarial Report of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, being the latest reports we have received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to table the Twelfth Annual Report of the Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba for the year ending March 31st, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure tabling the Thirteenth Annual Report for The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the year ending October 31st, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. M. SMITH introduced Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques des l'état civil.

HON. A. ANSTETT introduced Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have 30 students from the Red River Community College under the direction of Mr. Partat, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

There are 100 visitors from various provincial high school basketball teams under the direction of Mr. Glimcher.

There are 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the St. George School under the direction of Mr. Harvey. This school is in the constituency of St. Vital.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Inter-City Gas - relocation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Can the Premier inform the House whether the head office of Inter-City Gas or at least 15 senior executive members of Inter-City Gas are moving from Winnipeg to Toronto?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question should be on matters within the administrative competence of the government. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question?

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the First Minister inform this House as to whether or not he has knowledge of whether or not the head office of Inter-City Gas, or at least 15 senior executive members and support staff of Inter-City Gas, are to be relocated from Winnipeg to Toronto? Has he had any discussions with officials of Inter-City Gas and can he inform the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware or have information to that effect, but I will refer it to the appropriate Minister.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that matter was in the newspaper today so I'm pretty sure that the Member for Fort Richmond (sic) would have been aware of that. Inter-City Gas indeed is retaining its head office in Winnipeg and the Member for Fort Richmond would have known that from the newspaper article as well, but it was a good question to ask — (Interjection) — or St. Norbert - but it would have been a good question to ask anyway, looking for a headline, but he knew that the answer was that they are not relocating their head office, but that they are in fact transferring some people over to Toronto, in view of the fact that they've purchased some natural gas utilities in Ontario. I intend to call Mr. Graham and get full information from him as to this matter.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer. Would he undertake, after he's had those discussions with officials of Inter-City Gas, to inform the House as to the position of Inter-City Gas with respect to possible relocation?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I would expect our discussions with Mr. Graham, the Chairman of Inter-

City Gas, will be quite fruitful. I found that he has always had a lot of confidence in the long-term future of Manitoba. The Inter-City Gas is headquartered in Manitoba and I would expect that it would be continued to be headquartered in Manitoba with a lot of activity emanating out of Winnipeg.

Deer Lodge Hospital - Pharmacare computer

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Pembina asked a question about the Deer Lodge Centre. I'd like to answer it at this time because it left the impression that maybe the committee would not be able to reverse any decision or to make any recommendation.

The Deer Lodge Centre had received approval in principle from the Manitoba Health Services Commission to purchase a computer to meet its own need, that is, its own pharmacy program: inventory, special accounting, preventative maintenance, and so on, and when the decision to centralize the pharmacy at Deer Lodge was made, the centre then expanded the computer, the storage capacity, and that was when the approval to purchase was given. But then, after the meeting that I had with the members of the people in the industry and so on and the statement that I made, they were notified of that and then any other part of the computer that wasn't necessary was deferred. They received the delivery of the computer, only the parts that they had previously ordered. The rest is deferred with the understanding that they should not assume that anything will be done until we've made a final decision.

There were two meetings held so far. I was to receive the recommendation by March 31st. At the unanimous request of the committee, this was deferred to April 30th and therefore I expect to get the report around April 30th.

Thank you.

CEDF loan to Beef N Reef Restaurant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. The Communities Economic Development Fund recently placed the Beef N Reef Restaurant in Lac du Bonnet in receivership. I wonder if the Minister could inform this House how much the Provincial Government stands to lose on that particular operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, there have been some problems with the Beef N Reef in Lac du Bonnet but that will be coming to the Standing Committee, at which time the general manager will be present and he'll be prepared to answer the question and give more details concerning that particular operation.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped the Minister had apprised himself of serious situations.

I wonder if the Minister could confirm the news reports that the Provincial Government has lost \$400,000 in that operation to date and the Federal Government has lost \$210,000 — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I was of the opinion that we could ask Ministers questions in this House.

It was the policy of the Communities Economic Development Fund not to make loans or become involved in businesses south of the Northern Affairs boundaries in the province. Can the Minister explain how the government became involved in the Beef N Reef Restaurant in Lac du Bonnet?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The Communities Economic Development Fund made that loan to that particular operation during your regime, so possibly you could ask the Minister who was responsible for CEDF why they made the decision at that time.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Did he say that that loan was made to the Beef N Reef Restaurant in Lac du Bonnet during our regime? Did he say that?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check my facts on that, but I was under the impression that it was authorized under the previous administration.

Labour dispute - Thompson

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Environment.

Through you, I indicate to the Government House Leader, it's somewhat difficult to ask questions of the Treasury Bench with five or six not being available for the questioning. I was going to ask the question to the Minister of Labour. I'll ask the question to the First Minister then, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the current labour dispute in the City of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . Thompson, it would appear that the Burntwood River may well be the recipient of millions of litres of raw sewage because of the unavailability of a work force to treat the sewage in its normal manner, I wonder if the Minister of Labour, perhaps in consultation with the Minister of Environment, the

Minister of Municipal Affairs, could get together to see that beautiful river is not despoiled in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member and all members of this House that we, on this side, have free contact one with another. There's no difficulty in our talking about issues that arise from time to time. There's no question but there is a possibility that due to that work stoppage, that there could be conditions arise that would give us concern in respect to environmental effects of any dumpage of raw sewage.

Certainly, we expect, Mr. Speaker, that good sense and goodwill will prevail and that in work stoppages, while there may be threats, fears, uncertainties about the effects of work stoppages, these things will not occur. I wouldn't want to indulge in speculation that they will occur. Certainly, there is the potential for difficulties at any time when there is conflict in collective bargaining. We trust that common sense will prevail and these things won't happen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think it's particularly appropriate that I ask this question of this particular Minister, as a former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who a little while ago showed no intimidation at all to take a very strong stand with respect to a labour dispute by advising and tearing up credit cards of a well-known department store. I'm simply asking him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. H. ENNS: . . . My question now is to exercise, take that same kind of biased view to his colleagues within the CUPE organization that are endangering a beautiful Northern river with raw sewage. Will he intervene actively and convince his union colleagues to see that that doesn't happen? I'm not asking him to intervene in the bargaining negotiations, but simply to get enough help there so that the sewage is treated.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to indulge in speculation. I don't believe that I should speculate on when the honourable member is going to get in tune with the rules of this House, and not ask questions that are argumentative, and tend to produce fear in society on groundless base. That member was the Minister of Natural Resources, I believe, when they had plans to flood most of Northern Manitoba, including Thompson.

CEDF loan to Beef N Reef Restaurant

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister has apprised himself of the loan from the Communities Economic Development Fund dated February 19, 1982, signed by Mr. Hugh Jones, General Manager, and Sir, I would table the agreement between the Communities Economic Development Fund and the government and the owners of Beef N Reef at the time, and Sir, it says

it was done on February 19, 1982. I would table this document.

Pollution control in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment and ask him whether he can confirm that Manitoba was given the lowest rating on pollution control in the country, a failing grade, by a national organization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no knowledge as to where the member is getting this information and I will not speculate on information I have not even seen at this point in time, not knowing what the source is. I have no knowledge of the information being passed on to us now.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether he has a program in place to combat pollution in the province, and can he also indicate the price tag of that program?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Province of Manitoba has a program of pollution control for the province that is perhaps as good as, or even better than many other provinces have. If the member is interested in having the detailed figures of the variety of programs that are in place, whether it be to control air pollutants in terms of nitrogen oxides or sulphur oxides, or whether it be to control the tremendous variety of pollutants that could affect our aquatic resources and whether those affect our land resources, Mr. Speaker, we're going into a great number of programs and a great deal of detail.

If the member wishes me to stand here and provide the answers to all of these, I can do so. If he wishes, he can also ask these questions during the Estimates of my department.

McKenzie Seeds Annual Report - tabling of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance advise us when he will be tabling the Annual Report for McKenzie Seeds for the year ending October, 1984?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Soon, Mr. Speaker. I do have it, I'll check back with my office and my House Leader and we'll get back to the honourable member.

MACC loans

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Agriculture has announced a program dealing with lowering interest rates to MACC which will cost the government some \$6 million net. Is the Minister of Finance expecting to introduce the Supplementary Supply Bill to get authorization for borrowing that money or will that be included in the 1985-86 Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take that question as notice. I believe that it was 1984-85 and that it was taken care of, but I'll check.

Youth Business Start

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security. In the fall of 1984 - November to be exact - he announced a program called Youth Business Start, under which young people between the ages of 18 and 24 could start their own businesses. I wonder, could the Minister tell the House what type of businesses have been started under this program? For instance, are they service-oriented or are they manufacturing-oriented?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

The program she refers to is a pilot program, the only one of its kind in Canada, I might add, and I can advise her specifically that any type of business enterprise would be eligible. There is no reason why any particular industry category would be excluded. I might also inform the member that the decision on approval is subject to advice given to us by a business advisory committee of experienced business people.

MRS. C. OLESON: My question to the Minister was, could he tell us what kind of businesses have been approved to date?

HON. L. EVANS: That's a rather detailed question, Mr. Speaker, but as I recall there are some in the retail sector, there are some in the service sector and there are some in the manufacturing sector.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister tell us what assurances he could give this House and the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers, that taxpayers' money is not being used to compete with small businesses in Manitoba which are already under a great financial strain?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the economic system in which we operate, where there is competition among the various firms and I guess it's always a problem when you assist one firm or another, when others who are already established are rather, maybe concerned about that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. EVANS: . . . so surely, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would not object to us somehow or other lessening the degree of competition that exists in the industrial sector of this province.

Dairy farming regulations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Yesterday the Premier was shown to have been placing severe restrictions on the egg producers of this province in the farm community. Today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his government and organizations answering to his government, have placed restrictions on the dairy farmers in Manitoba. Yesterday the Natural Products Marketing Council introduced a regulation restricting the sale of partial dairy herds, or quotas going along with those dairy herds.

Will he, as the Premier of this province, remove the restrictions from the dairy farmers and not impose more?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the restrictions were passed yesterday, and as of yesterday if a farmer wanted to sell a portion of his dairy farm or his dairy herd along with quota to produce milk, that it could in fact force some individuals to go bankrupt in the time that he's taking it as notice. Will he speed the process up so that people can look after themselves in today's agriculture community?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I indicated that I would be taking that question as notice.

ManOil-Inter-City Gas pipeline

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. It stems from an agreement that was entered into last year, I believe, between ManOil and Inter-City Gas to build a pipeline from Waskada to Cromer to service the Waskada oil patch.

Can the Minister indicate whether that line has been completed and all of the interested parties involved in that have been serviced to the completion of that contract? Has all the **work** been done to complete that contract?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in order to be precise in my answer, I'll take the question as notice.

MACC loans

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, further to my reply to the second question from the Member for Turtle Mountain, the funding for the MACC write down of loans to 8 percent was from 1984-85 by way of Special Warrant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance.

That announcement of the write down was made in the House on Monday afternoon, obviously following the opening of the Legislature. Is the Minister of Finance telling us that Special Warrant was passed prior to the opening of the Legislature and that program was then not announced in the Throne Speech?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Of course it was passed prior to the opening of the Legislature. My recollection of the Throne Speech is that there was some mention of activity on behalf of farmers. I'm not exactly sure as to even when the announcement was made.

Big game damage - compensation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Due to delays while the former Minister of Natural Resources was in office, money was not available under the Big Game Damage Compensation Fund. Only now are cheques going out to farmers who were eligible for compensation under that program as long ago as last October. Given that this delay has occurred because of the government's handling of the situation, will the Minister undertake to see that interest is paid to those farmers who are obviously hard-pressed? Will he undertake to see that interest is paid on any of those bills that have been outstanding for more than 30 days?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I'm prepared to review the procedures that have been used in order to qualify payments and to make the payments themselves, but I don't think that we would want to consider going back and redressing that particular issue, that is the matter of interest on the time between the time the application was received and when the payment was made.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the First Minister that since the government has undertaken to pay interest on money that was due by way of rebate to employers under the payroll tax - which I believe the Minister of Finance did in response to a question from this side of the House - will the First Minister examine very carefully the advisability of taking a similar sort of action with respect to these bills? One of my constituents has had a payment of over \$8,000 due since last October and he is having to pay interest on that money because of incompetence on the part of the government.

Will the First Minister not look therefore at the suggestion of paying interest to those farmers when the bill has been outstanding for more than 30 days? It's no more than what the government expects from people who owe it money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some question as to the validity of the facts that the honourable member is including in his question and I want to check that out personally and take the question as notice to ensure myself that the facts as alleged by the honourable member are indeed correct.

Witness fees

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General.

Could the Attorney-General inform the House as to how much money the government will be saving by not paying witness fees effective March 1st of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: That, of course, is a question which will arise during the consideration of my Estimates and I would prefer to deal with the question then when I have the precise information; but it's in the neighbourhood of \$125,000 to \$150,000 - something like that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Attorney-General how, at a time when there is, I think, great concern in the community for the maintenance of law and order, asking people to become involved in the justice system, etc. through various programs, how could the Attorney-General and the government justify not paying witness fees?

HON. R. PENNER: Unlike the Member for St. Norbert, what may have been his experience, it may say something for his tenure in office, we find indeed that the ordinary people of Manitoba are ready, willing and able participate in the justice system in Manitoba and don't expect to do it for hire. They know what their duty is and indeed very many people, when they're proffered the token payment that was available before, have said, what is this for? I came as a witness because I was called as a witness. We do pay expenses and we find indeed that most people who come, the majority

of people who come, who have taken time off from work, are covered by their employer who also, as a matter of their contribution as public citizens to the administration of justice, accept that as a duty.

That is the way it is throughout Canada and that is the way it is now in Manitoba. We find that the ordinary people of Manitoba accept their duty; they don't have to be bought.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, obviously the situations of individuals will vary considerably from one person to the other. For a person who loses pay at work to come and appear as a witness, will the government reimburse him for that lost pay as an expense or are the expenses he is referring to just for transportation and meals?

HON. R. PENNER: The expenses which we pay are for things like babysitters, transportation, out-of-pocket expenses, reimbursements of that kind.

Pollution Control in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question again to the Minister of the Environment concerning the adverse effects of pollution on the environment and on our wildlife.

Does the Minister have a copy of the report by the Canadian Nature Federation in which Manitoba was rated dead last in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd asked, in reply to the last question, where the member was getting that information. Now I know, and it is very possible that I have that report, have not yet looked at it and will do so.

Certainly, I would not necessarily concur with that type of information.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he accepts that judgment and whether he intends to reply or respond to that heavy criticism of his government?

HON. G. LECUYER: Obviously I don't.

Senate - powers of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: A question to the First Minister. Regarding a report in today's Globe and Mail that Justice Minister John Crosbie has the support of more than seven provinces in his quest for an amendment to curtail the powers of the Senate, could the Honourable First Minister tell this House whether or not Manitoba is one of those provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to inform all honourable members of this House - I assume that we all want to make our position very clear in relationship to the Senate - that Manitoba is not one of those seven provinces; that it is the desire of the Government of the Province of Manitoba - I would indeed welcome some indications where the opposition members stand on this point - it's our position the Senate ought to be abolished; that this House of pork barrelling and patronage which has been used for so long by Conservative and Liberal administrations federally ought to be eliminated . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . in the interests of government constraint, in the interests of saving some \$35 million annually at the federal level. I think it would be an excellent start, Mr. Speaker, to find \$35 million. In fact, maybe honourable members could agree that would be much more usefully spent in the Province of Manitoba making up for some of that transfer payment that we haven't received yet.

Saskeram, bridge - funding of

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government have provided some \$125,000, I believe, to build a bridge across the river to the Saskeram area of The Pas, and some additional 20,000 has been put in place by the local farmers of that area. Is the Provincial Government going to provide sufficient funds for them to finish that bridge, or are they going to just leave them with half a bridge?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Would you repeat the question please?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. The question to the Minister of Northern Affairs was, will the province be providing sufficient funds for the people of The Pas area to finish the bridge to get into the Saskeram area? Will the province be providing sufficient funds or will they be left with half a bridge as they do with most of the other projects in this province?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is referring to a project that was funded under the Manitoba Community Assets Program. I would like

to have an opportunity to look into those details and, therefore, will take that question as notice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. Are all bridges in the province now going to be built from the Community Assets Program or will the Department of Highways be building the bridges?

A further question, Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is taking under advisement, will those farmers who have forfeited or put forward some \$20,000 of their own money to that project, will they be refunded as well?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that there were many, many municipalities in Manitoba that obtained assistance under the Community Assets Program, and together the Manitoba Government and those municipalities improved and built many, many bridges in the Province of Manitoba thanks to the Manitoba Community Assets Program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the question. Will the farmers who put some \$20,000 of their own money into that bridge be reimbursed for the money they put in?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is repeating a question that I previously had taken notice thereof. I simply repeat, I'll take the question as notice, look into the matter, and report back to the House.

Boissevain Land Titles Office - closing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General and his department have evidently made a decision to close the land titles office in Boissevain. That decision was taken without consultation. The Attorney-General has since had an opportunity to meet with many people from the area concerned about that decision. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General whether he is reconsidering that original decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not. What I said to the delegation of citizens from that area who called upon me was that their concerns would be communicated by me to the Premier. I haven't had a chance to meet with the Premier, but the decision is one that has been made on very sound grounds and at this moment continues to be the decision.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister then. I personally wrote a letter to the First Minister on the 5th of February pointing out that this decision flew in the face of many principles that the First Minister has himself fought for over the years, and has indeed campaigned upon. I would ask the First Minister whether he has yet had the opportunity to acquaint himself with the details of this decision, and whether or not he can now advise us of what his view is of that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, these are always matters that require careful scrutiny. Honourable members constantly seek additional spending in different areas, and we've heard over the last few days where indeed members have objected; even today we've heard some requests that certain proposals not be proceeded with in regard to spending.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very, very nice if we were in a situation where we could deal with every problem by simply throwing some additional funds at that problem. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that originates with the department is to the effect that there are sound, good reasons as to why the Boissevain Land Titles Office ought to be closed in the interests of economy. We have heard the Attorney-General indicate that he's received submissions from the residents of Boissevain. Certainly the Attorney-General will be discussing that with me. Subsequent to that meeting, a decision will be made based upon the concrete material that is there in respect to department material, resident recommendations and briefs as to whether or not there is any sound reason for not proceeding with what is an economy measure.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. The land titles office system in the province is indeed making money for the taxpayers. Is it the government's policy that they will be attempting to save money in their own expenditures by offloading costs on to the users of services that have hitherto been provided in that area or in other areas of the province as well?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General will deal with the specifics in respect to the land titles office situation.

Mr. Speaker, in the process of Estimates review, the honourable member ought to be fully aware that some difficult, and at times, unpopular decisions have to be made to deal with matters of economy, and the Boissevain Land Titles Office is that type of example. Is the honourable member suggesting that we should establish a series of land titles offices throughout the Province of Manitoba in order to ensure more decentralized service in regard to land titles in the Province of Manitoba? I think not. I think the honourable member would be the first honourable member, if he did not represent in fact the area - I understand his concerns - to say yes, there must indeed be economy measures exercised in given circumstances where they are warranted. The Attorney-General will deal with the specifics of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Two particulars, Mr. Speaker. One is that the revenue which is earned by the Boissevain Land Titles Office will, of course, continue to be earned, but will be earned through the Brandon Land Titles Office.

Mr. Speaker, outside of Winnipeg, there are six land titles offices. Five of those six are virtually within about a 100-mile radius in the whole Province of Manitoba, Portage la Prairie, Neepawa, Boissevain, Brandon, Morden, and there have been others in the southwestern part of Manitoba that have been closed in earlier years. In Virden, for a whole number of reasons, not the least of which in terms of today, is the fact that we are now in a program to computerize and much better service will be provided through the implementation of that program, which will take several years to fulfill, and this is one stage in that program.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: And if I might direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 45 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Ralph Maybank School under the direction of Mr. Verstraete. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

HOUSE BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: If I may, before you call Orders of the Day, make a brief statement with regard to House business, discussed with the Opposition House Leader, our agenda over the next several weeks.

Members have all received an invitation to the Royal Winter Fair in Brandon for Wednesday, March 27th. The Minister of Agriculture will be advising each caucus of the travel arrangements that will be made through his office for those wishing to avail themselves of those travel arrangements within the next couple of days. The House, in respect to that invitation, as has been done in past years, will not be sitting on Wednesday, March 27th.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance announced yesterday that he will be presenting the Budget for fiscal 1985-86 next Thursday, a week tonight, at 8:00 p.m., that's March 21st. Since the Throne Speech will finish on the 19th of March, there will be two intervening days in which it would be my intention, Sir, to call several second readings and proceed, as far as is amenable to members, with the Interim Supply.

In discussion with the Opposition House Leader, it was agreed that we would count the non-sitting day, Wednesday, March 27th, as a Budget Debate day, so that the actual Budget Debate would then finish on April 1st, at the normal time of 9:30 p.m.

So that's basically a brief outline of what will be happening for most of the next three weeks, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment

thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert has 14 minutes remaining.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think during the question period, we can see clearly now where the priorities of this government lie. When we were in office, with respect to a small item like witness fees, we increased those witness fees significantly in terms of percentage fees. It's a small amount of money. The Attorney-General refers to a \$120,000 saving, as a result of the action that the government has taken effective March 1st of this year to do away with witness fees except for experts and except for transportation expenses and meals.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General acknowledged that this will mean that some of our citizens who lose their pay to attend criminal court as witnesses will not be paid anything. At least under our government, they received a small amount: \$10 for one-half day; \$20 for a full day. But where is this money going, this saving that the government is implementing? It's going to hire a \$50,000-a-year assistant deputy minister in charge of communications and it's going to pay for a 250 percent increase in advertising, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where are the true priorities of a government that wishes to serve the people of Manitoba? They're here to serve the people, but these people here now have the No. 1 priority of doing whatever they feel they have to, with the taxpayers' money, to get re-elected.

Mr. Speaker, two small examples, during question period, very important to the people who receive those funds or the people who receive that service in Boissevain, \$160,000 or \$180,000 apparently is the saving from closing the land titles office in Boissevan. The land titles system itself earns a profit of some \$3 million, and with this government a year ago, it nearly doubled the registration fees in the land titles office system. Now they are reducing service in a small community in Manitoba, a community that certainly we would have - and I think even a past NDP Government might have - had a much different perspective on, and would have attempted to do something to maintain that community.

Mr. Speaker, with the few moments left to me I wanted to recapitulate some of the comments I had made earlier, particularly in response to the Minister of Finance, by pointing out in regard to his comments about the labour situation and the Jobs Fund, that there are presently 48,000 unemployed people in Manitoba, 20,000 more than when they took office. The most recent labour bulletin demonstrates using annual averages that from 1977 to 1981, when the labour force grew by 35,000 people under our government, the number of employed persons grew by 33,000, and under this government, in three years the employment force has grown by 25,000, but the number of employed persons has only grown by 11,000, one-third of the number of increases in employment that took place under our government, Mr. Speaker.

There is an extremely disturbing trend taking place. During the past year, unemployment has increased in Manitoba while it's decreased in Canada, and the number of unemployed persons in Manitoba has

increased during the past year. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba, at the lowest rate of employment growth between December 1983 and December 1984, when you look at January 1984 to January 1985, it was the eighth lowest in employment creation and the Conference Board predicts that Manitoba will have the lowest increase in employment growth of all the provinces in 1986. I just say, Mr. Speaker, that the effects of what this has done in their various fields of activity, is now taking shape and the trend has been established and is extremely disturbing for the future of Manitoba.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in examining the record of the NDP, what would the Manitoba public have to look forward to under four more years of NDP Government? In three years they've doubled the debt load in the province for direct government spending. They've doubled it in three years, Mr. Speaker. What would they do, given more years? Plus the Budget we're going to be presented with next week. What would happen to the sales tax? They've put it up 1 percent already. Will it go up again, given another four years?

Mr. Speaker, they imposed the payroll tax, the tax on employment of 1.5 percent. Given another four years, what will happen to that? Will they go up to 3 percent as in Quebec? What will happen to the credit rating of this province given another four years? It's been reduced already. The Minister of Finance, in response to Member for Turtle Mountain the other day certainly didn't give any assurances that the credit rating wouldn't be lowered any further, Mr. Speaker. Given another four years, Mr. Speaker, we could probably rest assured it will drop further.

What will happen to labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, and the so-called balance that at one time we had in this province between management and labour?

What will happen to manufacturing? The Conference Board points out that manufacturing has not recovered as it has in other provinces and it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker, given the increases in taxes and legislation that this government has passed.

What will happen to hydro rates, given another four years of NDP Government in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? They took off the hydro rate freeze that we imposed; they've raised hydro rates over 22 percent. What will they do in another four years, Mr. Speaker?

What will happen to the Workers' Compensation Board assessments, Mr. Speaker? They've gone up 60 percent in three years. Even then, they acknowledge that another 70 percent or so is required in order to balance revenues and expenditures, Mr. Speaker. What will happen in another four years, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, when one examines that record, certainly those are not the matters that the members of the government have spoken about in this House or have put out in their lavish advertising program at taxpayers' expense, but those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. That's what they've done to Manitoba. That's what they've done. When you go back to the employment record, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to justify. No other province supposedly has had this great Jobs Fund, but these are now the job statistics in Manitoba and the effect of their socialist policies on employment growth are putting Manitoba last in that extremely important area. That's the area that the Minister of Finance said is the No. 1 priority, jobs. And we're last in job creation, Mr. Speaker, predicted to continue last for all of 1985 by the Conference Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans should be well aware of these facts, and what has occurred under the New Democratic Party. They should be extremely concerned about what would happen under another four years of this government, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier often talks about the fact that he has confidence in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We should have confidence in Manitoba. We do have confidence in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, but not under this government. Elect a new government and there will be confidence in Manitoba, but not under this government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker with those remarks, I would indicate to you, Sir, that I have no hesitation in voting for the amendment proposed by my Leader and more importantly the sooner the public of Manitoba get an opportunity to voice their position, Mr. Speaker, and to decide on who will form the next government of Manitoba, is the most important decision that will be made in Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think someone is having some air let out of their tire.

A MEMBER: You're about to have it let out, Willy.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am pleased to take part in the Throne Speech Debate. I certainly wish you continued health, Mr. Speaker, and would like to take some note of the changes that have taken place in the Legislature and government over the last year.

I certainly want to welcome to the Legislature the newly elected Member for Fort Garry. I think he'll find that the House probably has some differences from the City Council, not the least of which is the requirement or responsibility and accountability which, I think, is more clearly defined in the Legislature, and I certainly believe that he'll be part of that process.

I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, who has served the province and the government very well. I'm pleased he's still with us and I wish him well in his retirement. I certainly intend to congratulate the Member for The Pas, the newly appointed Cabinet Minister for Northern Affairs. I've had the opportunity to work closely with the Member for The Pas since he was my legislative assistant and I believe that he certainly has the background, the experience, and the compassion knowledge necessary to fulfill this post well.

I want to take a second to pay tribute to the Member for Kildonan who, as Minister of Labour and Minister responsible for the Status of Women, carried out her functions in a very diligent way with a lot of soul and a lot of effort, while at the same time having to fight a major personal battle. She decided, and I think rightly so, that she had to give her first priority to trying to lick the illness that she has and I think all of us, on both sides of the House, commend her for her dedication in the past and realize with her courage and

with her willpower that she will indeed succeed in her battle.

In a related connection, we had Steve Fonyo come through Manitoba just recently, and here's a young man who I think is succeeding despite a fair amount of initial cynicism and skepticism. He is a young man with incredible willpower and incredible determination and I believe he is winning over the skeptics. Certainly his response in Manitoba showed that Manitobans care for that type of effort and are willing to pull together collectively, behind some vision, behind some determination. I think there were a few negative comments made about him and I felt really sad about that, because people didn't realize that he's only 19 years old, not that used to media exposure and will act the way a very genuine, sincere 19-year-old might act from time-to-time. We shouldn't try to compare him to seasoned public figures who have had a lot of experience in the media and I think he was unfairly treated.

I listened to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition. He did indicate one area that I agree with him on and that's a concern for preventative health care. I disagreed with him, however, when he said that this government isn't doing a lot in this respect. I believe this government is breaking a lot of paths in the area of preventative health care and it's doing so anta very difficult time. Trying to bring about prevention while you're dealing with a whole set of medical and health crises is a difficult thing to do at the best of times and it's especially difficult when you're going through a period of national and international recession which limits our revenue growth. So it's difficult trying to, in a sense, get over the hump of putting the extra money in for preventative care, while at the same time trying to deal with the immediate crises that are upon us. I do believe it's an effort that we have to continue and although I don't have and I won't have time in my present Throne Speech Debate to get into it, I do serve notice that in future opportunities, I would like to talk about the various solitudes that I believe exist within the medical and health care areas.

I was away last week when there was a controversy about whether, in fact, the College of Physicians and Surgeons put pressure on a physician not to appear at a conference of CHOM and I want to get more detail about that and more facts about it, but from a personal perspective. I've had an opportunity to look at this from a personal vantage point over the last year. I do believe that there are far too many solitudes in this area, and I do want to take the opportunity from time to time, probably from some anecdotal personal evidence, to talk about why I think these solitudes have to be broken down and why I think people have to be willing to listen to each other in the whole medical and health care areas; but I'm going to focus my remarks on Hydro. Hydro does play a prominent part in the Throne Speech and I think it's important that I do take some time to give the House some facts about Manitoba Hydro and about our comparative advantage with respect to hydro sales versus other markets.

There are some people, especially some people in this House, who don't want facts to get in the way of their opinions, but facts are facts and I think it's important that everyone start off with the same base level of facts. I've had the opportunity over the course

of the last six months to meet with at least 30 organizations to present the facts to them about hydro, asked for their comments, asked for their questions, had the opportunity of presenting the facts of the matter with respect to hydro and hydro development to business and financial organizations in Montreal, Toronto, Washington and New York and asked them to ask questions as well, as well as look to their comments. I think it's important for everyone, as I've said, to start off with the same base level of facts.

Manitoba Hydro, the government-owned electrical utility for the Province of Manitoba is about to embark upon a decade of hydro-electric development and this development, which is very exciting, is necessary not only to meet anticipated domestic electrical demands, because that's taking place, but also to provide power exports to the United States and other parts of Canada.

More and more utilities are looking to Manitoba as a source of electrical energy, because in many cases we can provide electricity more cheaply than they can and that's our bargaining position, it's from a position of strength. In many respects, when we have to bargain with other entities, we aren't bargaining from as strong a position as we are when we're talking about hydro.

In particular, American utilities which have to depend on nuclear and coal-fired electrical generation facilities for anticipated electrical demand growth have been faced with enormous cost increases. These cost increases are the result of a number of factors - higher financing costs, construction delays, rising fuel costs and especially pollution control requirements, have all contributed, in many cases, to massive cost overruns over what they had projected.

Over the past two or three years, the construction of some 200 power plants in the U.S. has been delayed or cancelled because of rising costs or unpredictable costs or uncontrollable costs and in some areas of the United States, not all areas, because of lower than anticipated load growth, nevertheless new sources of electricity will still be needed.

Older generation facilities will have to be replaced. The age of over 10 percent of the northeast midwest region's capacity is 30 years or older, and that's the area that is our prime area market area in the United States; and most thermal plants have a life of between 35 and 40 years, so we're talking about a situation where, in the near future, a number of these lands which in many respects are obsolete right now, will indeed be de-commissioned.

In addition, new sources of supply will be needed to meet projected load growth. In 1981, the midwest region of the United States had about 140 gigawatts of capacity and projections of additional generation capacity, with a 25 percent reserve - and they needed 25 percent reserve - needed in the midwest by the year 2000 ranged from an additional 43 gigawatts, based on estimates from the Congressional Research Service, to 62 gigawatts, based on estimates from the American Electricity Reliability Council.

These needs were confirmed by the financial institutions that we met with in New York and by various people that we met with within the administration in the United States. The question is, how will these needs be met? One very attractive alternative to costly nuclear or coal-fired electrical generation is to import electricity from Canada, and especially non-polluting, renewable

hydro-electricity from provinces such as Manitoba. It makes economic sense for American utilities to consider purchasing our electricity.

Manitoba is a province with a well established hydro-electric system and it has vast potential for more hydraulic power development. It is the policy of the Government of Manitoba to pursue vigorously the export of electric power that is presently surplus to our needs or anticipated to be surplus to our needs in the future.

In the northern region of the province there exists great hydro-electric potential, especially on the Nelson River, which flows into Hudson's Bay. The Nelson and the Churchill River basins comprise one of the main watersheds in North America - over half-a-million square miles. Our northern rivers have more than twice the hydro-electric potential than that of Niagara Falls and to date only 30 percent of this power has been harnessed; so we have a market; we have comparative advantage; we've got a proven system and we've got a great deal of potential here in Manitoba.

That situation was foreseen in the past. In 1966, after extensive investigation, a commitment was made to go North to develop the Nelson River. Control works over the past years have been built to regulate and divert water flows. Generation stations have been built and others have been planned and a 560-mile, 450 kilovolt direct current transmission system has been constructed to link the area to the southern part of the province. It has had a proven record of success, one that is the envy of electrical systems right around the world.

Since most of the ground work has already been completed, further hydro development has the advantage of having a rather benign environmental effect on the area of future development. Now as we proceed, the first step is to work on the development of the Limestone Generating Station on the Nelson River.

The early construction of Limestone is predicated upon the recently negotiated firm power sale to the Northern States Power Company of Minnesota. American utilities are willing to do business with us because of our long history as a reliable supplier of hydro-electric power and because of our favourable electricity rates. Just how attractive our rates are can be seen from the following example:

Manitoba Hydro sells electricity at cost to Manitobans. We do that by law. Sound planning in our investment in clean, renewable hydro power has resulted in Manitobans paying, as a large jurisdiction, not in terms of isolated instances that one can dig out - and I know the Member for Lakeside, he's probably spent a lot of time trying to dig out some isolated instances of contrast or contradictions. When we look at any type of larger jurisdiction, we find that Manitoba does pay the lowest electricity rates in North America if one looks at all the types of rates.

For example, monthly residential electric bills for a thousand kilowatt hours, as of July, 1984, for New York City - that's where a lot of the utility analysis takes place, a lot of the power projections take place - their costs for that would be in the order of \$157 a month U.S. For the same amount of power in Winnipeg, Winnipeggers pay \$27 U.S. That's quite an incredible difference. It provides the basis of solid, comparative

advantage in dealing with the United States with respect to export sales.

Manitoba has been exporting electricity to the United States for the past 20 years. In 1984, we exported over 5.4 billion kilowatt hours or 25 percent of our total generation to the United States. Our sales to the U.S. have risen almost fourfold over the past decade. We have a proven track record of liability of supply, as our customers can attest. Our customers are the people who get up at conferences in the United States and say to people who may have some concerns about buying from Canada that Manitoba is a reliable partner in these fields.

Given our vast hydro resources, we are interested in finding new opportunities for exports in which both buyer and seller can benefit from the sale of this non-polluting renewable energy. We've always taken the approach that the best deal is a deal that's fair to both sides. It's good in its own right and also it provides a firm foundation for future deals. That's why we've been careful with people. We tell them, do your homework. We'll do our homework, let's compare our notes. We don't want to fool each other. We want us to wind up with an agreement that both sides feel comfortable with and both sides feel satisfied with.

That's in stark contrast to what exists right now between Newfoundland and Quebec. I believe there could be a lot more development of hydro in that area if they weren't saddled with this past deal that both sides or one side in particular feels short changed. So, it is important to try and establish these types of deals that are fair to both sides.

While we shall continue to sell interruptible power, Manitoba has now moved into the area of firm exports of electricity. As you know, on June 14 of 1984, our government concluded an export sales agreement with Northern States Power Company in Minneapolis. Beginning May 1, 1993, Manitoba Hydro will sell NSP 500 megawatts of firm power at a 75 percent capacity factor for 12 years. The price NSP will pay Manitoba is based on 80 percent of the cost NSP would have to pay for electricity generated by a new coal fired plant.

The reference plant that we're using is Sherco 3 which is being built now. It'll be completed in 1988, but for price-setting purposes, Sherco 3's capital costs will be escalated to May 1, 1993; the date the sale commences. The beauty of this particular sale is that no new transmission lines are required, so the benefits are even greater. The sale will generate an estimated \$3.2 billion, as received, Canadian dollars in revenue for Manitoba. It'll also generate a profit of approximately \$1.7 billion over the length of the contract. Economic studies of the sale have shown that it has a revenue cost-ratio of 2.3 to 1.

Now, we can offer an advantageous price to NSP from their perspective and still make a profit for the people of Manitoba, because Manitoba Hydro is a low-cost producer of electricity in our overall region. Again, that's the basis of the deal - comparative advantage; one that we often don't have in relations with the United States entities.

Also, in June of last year, the Government of Manitoba signed a Letter of Intent with the Western Area Power Administration of Golden, Colorado for the sale of up to 1,200 megawatts of firm power per year for 35 years.

WAPA, as it's called, is a very large agency of the Federal Department of Energy. When we met with the Federal Energy officials in the United States, they were very interested in this development.

We're also involved in discussions with other groups of utilities. We have one group, the Minnesota Wisconsin Power Group which is taking to us about the possibility of buying up to 1,100 megawatts of power over a 15-35 year period. There's also discussions under way with a group called Wis-mintoba, a group of eight utilities which are talking about buying up to 1,000 megawatts for 20-30 years. Ontario Hydro and Saskatchewan Power have also expressed an interest in purchasing Manitoba's electric power and discussions are under way.

We can't meet all of these export demands, but the realization of any one of them, any one of the larger power sales, would mean the prebuilding of Conawapa generating station which is some 20 kilometres downstream from Limestone.

There is, therefore, the potential, I think it's a realistic potential, for at least a decade of continuous hydro development in Manitoba; a decade which I think would provide a lot of economic spinoff and jobs in its own right, but at the same time, I think provide a focal point for business and workers in the overall community, in a time when we are as an economy at the world level, international level, national level, provincial level, going through changes; changes which I believe over the next 15 years will be quite dramatic. We can't avoid that. We can't hold back those waves of change, but it is good to have some reference points of certainty when that change is taking place.

Now, the sale of power to NSP has advanced the construction start of Limestone generating station. Hearings into the proposed firm power sale to NSP have been held by Canada's National Energy Board and we expect their decision shortly. We have indeed called tenders for the Limestone general civil contract. We expect that those tenders will be awarded some time in July 1985.

Limestone will house 10 massive turbine generators for the combined generating capacity of 1,200 megawatts. Limestone will take eight years to complete, but it will be producing electricity six years after construction begins. In a previous stage of construction, a huge coffer dam was extended from the north bank across two-thirds of the width of the Nelson River. Within this stage, one coffer dam is where the north dam, power house and spillway will be constructed. When the spillway is partially completed, water will be diverted through it, while the coffer dam is extended all the way to the south bank. Within this stage two coffer dam, the south dam will be constructed. After six years of construction, and this by about November of 1990, the first two turbines and generators will be beginning to produce electricity, toward the end of 1990. By 1992, it'll take that much time, two more years, we will have in place the other eight turbines and generators. Through that period, we'll pick up our own need. We'll pick up our export requirements in the NSP contract.

The estimated cost of Limestone hydro-generating station is, at this time, \$2.5-2.6 billion for a late 1990 in-service date, Canadian dollars. These are as spent dollars which include both inflation and interest during construction. To date, \$166.3 million has been spent

on the coffer dam and townsite development and interest charges to date. The remaining costs will be spread over some eight years of major construction.

That's the basic factual situation regarding Limestone. I'd like now to deal with some of the arguments that have been put forward, some of the questions that have been raised, some of the comments that have been made, most of which, Mr. Speaker, when you look closely at this, are the type of Doubting Thomas, Chicken Little comments, that take place when people don't want to hear the answer, but rather want to raise the question and then run.

You know, they say that some people who are in the dark, complain about the dark and are afraid to turn on the light because they'll find when they turn on the light, that all is safe. Frankly, most of the people who have raised concerns about hydro are in that category. Unfortunately, virtually all of them are Conservatives.

Let's look at the Conservative arguments. It's a decreasing number because of the position that the Conservatives are taking. It is a decreasing number. I can recall when Izzy Asper was against the hydro development. I think his position made that party virtually extinct in Manitoba. It's interesting to see what the Conservative position against Limestone will do to the Conservative Party in the future. I can see the signs of erosion right in there. Just like the water washing away, just like the wind this spring, blowing away the sand.

Now, let's deal with some of the claims put forward. One of these is that there's no disclosure by the NDP; the NDP are keeping this all private and secret. That's what he says. We don't know anything about this. We don't know anything about it. We've got all these concerns. I've just gone through the facts. I'll be giving more. We have public disclosure on the Manitoba and Northern States Power contract with complete details shortly after contract signing in June of 1984. I presented it and tabled it right here. We had the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature, hearings with the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Hydro officials. I think we had four days of hearings, at least three hours each time. Officials gave testimony on NSP and Limestone and responded to questions.

Then we had the submission of three lengthy volumes to the National Energy Board. This was our National Energy Board application and, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take the liberty of tabling this in the Legislature. I wasn't able to table it when the application was made, but I certainly did send over a copy, as requested, to the Leader of the Opposition.

I deposited a copy of this application, which is a large one, in the Manitoba Legislative Library. I couldn't give it to the Clerk at that time, we weren't sitting, but I now table it with the Clerk and I, again, contradict any claims that people have about lack of disclosure. We had 11 days of hearings before the National Energy Board in November of 1984, and I must say that, granted the hearings were long hearings, there were a lot of issues raised at the National Energy Board which were quite extraneous, but they were raised because people wanted to try and raise these doubts, but then not stick around for the questions, or not ask the questions in a precise enough manner, to be troubled with the answers.

A MEMBER: That's true.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Now let's see what the Tory position on the NSP sale in Limestone development is. It's clear from statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, by the present House Leader, Energy Critic, and by the former Minister responsible for hydro under the Tory administration, who is now advising the Saskatchewan Government. Before, during and after the NEB hearings . . .

A MEMBER: They went for the best.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . they went for the best, Mr. Speaker. The interesting thing is that they are now asking us for hydro.

But these people, their representative, their spokesmen, before, during and after the NEB hearings, said that they were really against the NSP sale and against Limestone development starting in 1990, and that indeed is in fact correct. Which means then, having taken that position, they have to say that they do not want Limestone to happen. They are clearly against Limestone happening . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . and the joke about their position about Limestone happening in 1982, is that they would then have to go to Edmonton right now . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . and ask the Edmonton authorities why have they mothballed two thermal generating stations being built in Alberta? And the reason for that is that the demand isn't there. Imagine if we had put all of the eggs . . .

A MEMBER: In one basket.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . had they started it and undertaken all the financial commitments - there are 2,000 homes in new subdivisions in Calgary that are empty and that is their house of cards. Alcan spent \$52 million in B.C. and pulled out last year because the price for aluminum is 50 cents rather than 80 cents.

But those are the facts and they don't want the facts to get in the way of their opinions, so I don't mind them putting their opinions forward, because the people of Canada and the people of Manitoba know the facts and know that when they go and rehash all their tired and untrue statements about the past, they know that there is a party with its eyes looking backward, when they want a party looking forward; and when they look that way, they see it's the NDP that are the forward-looking party and the Conservatives, true to name, looking backwards.

They criticize these spokesmen of the Conservatives, criticize the economics of the NSP sale and they make up, I believe, factitious figures and make-believe facts and they intervene in the NEB hearings. They intervene

saying, "Our purpose in appearing here is to ensure that we have an opportunity to cross-examine and request further clarification on items presented." That's a quote from the submission of the Leader of the Opposition. And yet contrary to the other interveners, having raised all these questions, they're saying that they want to ask questions; they refused when given the opportunity at the NEB hearings to question the analysis presented by Manitoba Hydro professionals and other expert witnesses that were used by the Conservatives when they were in office. Imagine saying, "I want the opportunity," and never taking the opportunity because they might get an answer that they wouldn't like. That is Chicken Little in the worst respect.

A MEMBER: Chicken Little's sister, anyway.

HON. W. PARASIUK: They state in their motion on the Throne Speech that the government has abandoned the orderly financial development of our hydro electric resources for the benefit of all Manitobans in favour of a wilful rush into an election-motivated development time schedule. That is the basic charge that they put forward, all being done by the politicians. Right? It has to be.

Now it is true that the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Hydro, with the Government of Manitoba's concurrence, successfully negotiated a contract for the Northern States Power for 500 megawatts. It's also true - this is fact and again, they wouldn't want fact to get in the way of opinion - that senior Hydro management recommended approval of the NSP sale and that they recommended that the most economic time to start Limestone operation is 1990, because of the sale and because of their economic analysis, two years earlier than required to meet Manitoba's own electricity needs, and this is a recommendation of Manitoba Hydro staff.

It is also true, as Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, I received last August, in August of 1984, a letter from the then Chairperson of Manitoba Hydro, on behalf of the board, the entire board of Manitoba Hydro, a recommendation to the government that the start-up of Limestone be for 1990 in-service date. Last August of 1984.

A MEMBER: They're all New Democrats, eh?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Saul Cherniack is the Chairman. And to say then that somehow - that's a snicker on their part - I see that the Conservative Government of Brian Mulroney has decided to appoint Saul Cherniack to a very senior position. I'm surprised because I believed they thought that they had people on their side of the House that might warrant consideration for some senior appointment. In fact I believe some of them are holding their breath. Some of them are turning purple holding their breath, but as yet, no appointment. But who is appointed from this House, as a former member of this House? Obviously a person that they have respect and confidence in, as we did, and there are other people on the board of Manitoba Hydro. There's a chairman, the head of the engineering faculty at the University of Manitoba; there is the former vice-

president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association who sits on the board of Manitoba Hydro.

A MEMBER: Oh, he must be a New Democrat.

HON. W. PARASIUK: And they try and pooh-pooh this type of expert advice because, "They have experts who ask questions but are afraid of the answers". They aren't even asking good questions, and notwithstanding the three massive volumes of evidence submitted by Manitoba Hydro professional staff to the National Energy Board, providing the facts, figures and analysis for a 1990 in-service date, the Conservatives charge - charge, that's all they can do, charge and hide - that somehow this is a politically-motivated development time schedule.

Now let's look at some of the other areas mentioned by the Conservatives. They say, and it was both the Leader of the Conservative Party and Don Craik, who said that the construction period for Limestone has been stretched. Craik said that instead of the current six-year schedule to bring in first in-service, that it was five years when he was Minister. Manitoba Hydro professionals stated at the hearings that the six-year construction period is the lowest cost construction date for Manitoba Hydro. Who is not being factual in that respect? Obviously . . .

A MEMBER: Sounds like old Donny.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . the fellow who in fact claimed he didn't burn the Hydro reports. He's got a pretty good record in this House in Hydro . . .

A MEMBER: Willy, he didn't - he shredded them.

HON. W. PARASIUK: He shredded them. The Conservatives have also said, over and over, that the NSP sale in the Limestone development will mean higher rates for than need be and that's the position they take.

At the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature, Manitoba Hydro presented detailed material showing how Manitoba ratepayers will be better off with the sale than without the sale and this and other material was included in the NDP submission by Manitoba Hydro.

The President of Manitoba Hydro, John Arnason, and his senior management financial personnel, all maintain that ratepayers in the province will still have the lowest rate structure in North America and that Manitoba Hydro is better off with the sale than without it; and that is what they've said consistently, but that is nicely swept under the carpet by the Conservatives who don't want the truthful answers.

The Leader of the Conservative Party has also said that I don't believe that any evidence has been presented by Northern States Power regarding the urgency of an export licence; but an NSP official, a fellow called Tony Benkusky, stated at the hearings that it requires at least 10 years for building additional generating capacity and that had this contract not been signed, NSP would have to start the process of constructing a lignite coal plant already; so therefore they require the decision on that now, again, completely contradicting the position put forward by the Leader of the Conservative Party.

Manitoba Hydro analysts say that the sale gives us revenue of \$3.2 billion, as cost of \$1.5 billion, and estimated profits of \$1.7 billion and the Tories question this and refer to possible fluctuations and interest rates inflation, exchange rates, coal prices, load growth and the costs of Limestone - anything that they give. What if? What if? That is their question - What if?

Now, when in fact we present all of the sensitivity analysis that shows that's taken into account, they quietly melt away and don't want to deal with the answers because that would be dealing with the truth and they don't ask questions when given the opportunity.

The Leader of the Conservative Party also says that Manitoba bears all the risk. Well, we do bear risk, but we also bear so much more of the benefits; and it's clear that NSP is committed to purchasing the 500 megawatts; and it's clear that we indeed are in a very good position because we have a fairly good idea of what our costs of Limestone will be, especially since there is not an overheated economy at present.

Mr. Speaker, we have so much more to say and I'm sorry I'm running out of time, but I intend to take more time when we get into — (Interjection) — I'd be quite willing to take the time if I could get the leave to get through this but, Mr. Speaker, I have time in the Budget Debate, I have time to go through a number of other instances to show that the Conservative position is clearly against this development.

I had, the other day, a very interesting experience. I came across someone who is very close to Don Stevens, who I think is a legendary figure when it comes to Manitoba Hydro, the first chairman. A person came up to me and said, I knew Don Stevens very very well and if he were alive today he would be doing what you are doing. He had vision; I'm glad you and the party and the government have vision as well. This person is by no means a supporter and the interesting thing about that is it points out the contrast. It is the New Democratic Party Government that has vision; it is the New Democratic Party Government that will achieve the development of Limestone; it is the New Democratic Party Government that is forward looking and what we have in contrast is a backward looking bunch of Chicken Littles, Mr. Speaker. We'll have a lot more to say on this in the future.

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

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the Throne Speech Debate dealing with the amendment proposed by my Leader on Monday.

At the outset I'd like to say that I very much appreciated and listened very attentively to the Minister of Energy dealing with the proposed Hydro sale and the Limestone development. I'd like to get into that a little bit later on, but first of all I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, who just recently was elected and I look forward to working with him in this Legislature for many years to come.

I would also take this opportunity to congratulate the Deputy Clerk, and so to congratulate the Member

for The Pas who has been elevated to the status of Minister of Northern Affairs. I wasn't going to mention anything about the present members who have indicated that they will be retiring, because I thought there might be an opportunity at another Throne Speech to do that; but after listening to the Member for Ste. Rose yesterday, he indicated to us that he was thanking the constituents of Ste. Rose for sending him to the Legislature since 1971, I believe, or something like that, and I did want to congratulate the Member for Ste. Rose on his contribution to this Legislature.

In view of the fact that we may not have an opportunity in the Throne Speech Debate to do it, I will take this opportunity to wish him well in his retirement. I believe that the member has worked hard in his constituency.

A MEMBER: Ha, ha, ha, ha. Back off. Let's not get carried away here.

MR. D. GOURLAY: No, I would like to congratulate the Member for Ste. Rose because his brother-in-law happens to be my barber.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: But he's still the enemy, he's still the enemy.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Anyway, he has worked hard to get elected and I congratulate him for the contribution he has made.

Of course, we have a number of sitting MLAs that have indicated they will not be back after the next election - on their own will. There's many others I'm sure that won't be back either, even though they want to come back.

The Member for Roblin-Russell, who is a next door neighbour colleague in the northwest part of the province, has indicated that he will be retiring and we all know that the member has worked extremely hard since he has been here in 1966. I'm sure that I don't know any member that I have been associated with that has worked harder than the Member for Robin-Russell. We're going to miss him after the next election, but we wish him well on his retirement.

Of course, I could go on. There's the Member for Charleswood, who served as Premier, who has indicated that he will be retiring and we know that this member has made a tremendous contribution to the politics and to the life and welfare of the people of this province.

We also have the Member for Virden, who has indicated that he will not be coming back after the next election. I believe he entered this House about the same time as the Member for Ste. Rose - I'm not sure, but around that time I believe or maybe even before. So I think those are the ones that have indicated they will be retiring and I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to wish the Member for Kildonan, the former Minister of Labour, best wishes in the future. I know that she has a very major personal fight on her hands with a health problem and I know that I speak for all members on this side, as well as the government's side, in wishing her well in her fight.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the task undertaken by the Mover and the Seconder of the

Throne Speech Debate. Let's face it - they had a real challenge because there really wasn't that much in the Throne Speech. I'm sure that we were all surprised in not what it said, but what it didn't say. There's very little substance on which the government can project the future year, at least from the contents of the speech. As has already been said by my colleagues on this side of the House, the government is obviously bankrupt, not only of financial resources, but bankrupt of ideas, and the sooner they call an election and be turfed out and let someone else govern this province, the sooner the better.

Well, that really says it all, but, you know, I came in here with the opinion that this government has no intention of calling an election this year, and I'm still of the opinion that we will not see the people of Manitoba going to a provincial election for some time yet. It's possible we could be back for another Session before an election is called, but after hearing some of the comments this week, I am not so sure that we will have another Session, but certainly there's no doubt that the government is not going to rush into an election at this time, because they really don't. — (Interjection) — That's right.

The Member for Ste. Rose says there's work to be done. The polls would say, for my information, that the government doesn't stand a chance in getting re-elected at this time. Their popularity with the people is not good at all. The members on the government side say that the gap is narrowing, but that's not the message that I'm hearing. The people say that you just can't trust the bunch that are in government right now, because back in 1981 when they were in the opposition and running in the provincial election, they never told us they would be bringing in a constitutional change. No way. There was the big pamphlet called "Clear Choice for Manitobans," but nowhere in that brochure did it say that if they got elected, would they be bringing in a proposed constitutional change dealing with French language issue. And I would say that Manitobans are not about to forget you very soon on this issue. — (Interjection) — The Minister of Municipal Affairs says, "Who knew it was happening?" Well, it was the deal you cooked up. It was the deal you cooked up with the Franco-Manitoba Society, the Federal Government, and you brought it in without any consultation with anybody else and you brought this in.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs is saying that this was never discussed during the election.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: You hit a soft spot there, Doug. They're pretty tender.

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

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I didn't realize that I was hitting a nerve there, but I don't recall anytime during the election that this issue was going to be brought in by the New Democrats if they were elected and formed the government. This was a secret kind of a deal that they discussed with the SFM and the Federal Government and brought this into the House back in 1982. — (Interjection) — The Minister of Municipal Affairs says that this is fraud. There's nowhere in the literature — (Interjection) — You produce a copy of your literature or pamphlets that say that the Indian people are going to bring in a constitutional change to change the French language issue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order!

The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Well, I know the Minister of Municipal Affairs is anxious to get up on his feet and I'm sure that he'll have his chance to speak on this debate and I would be very pleased to hear his comments about this, because it's for sure that nowhere that I recall that this government proposal that they would be bringing in a constitutional change went to the people with this in mind, certainly not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Progressive Party is absolutely right when he was quoted as saying many on the government side are unemployable and they'll hang on to the government reins as long as possible if they feel they can't get re-elected. The government is not, in my opinion, mentally ready for an election, obviously looking at them across there, and also they're not physically ready. I don't believe they have held any nomination meetings in the province to date, so unfortunately, I don't see us going to the polls very soon. I hope I'm wrong in my projections, but if they call this election sooner, rather than later, we'll be happy, because we're ready.

I believe that I represent a constituency that has a fairly even distribution of both parties represented in this Chamber, even distribution of support for both the NDP and the PCs especially in the last two elections, and I am really thankful that the PCs have represented the Swan River constituency for the last 63 years, or back in 1922. I believe, was when the PCs first came to power in that constituency. I say the distribution of support is fairly even between the two parties at the present time, but I sense that a lot of the support that the government had in the 1981 election is certainly diminishing in the Swan River area.

Why would this be? One of the reasons is that many of the constituents believe that labour unions have too much influence on this government and this is coming from a lot of long-time supporters of the ND Party in that area and you don't have to go too far to find this view from some of those people that supported NDP in the past. Also, people are saying they can't be trusted because of the situation I just dealt with a few minutes ago with the changes to our Constitution.

Another area is my constituents do not like the idea of having to come with cap in hand to the Premier and

Cabinet in order to qualify for Job Funds payola. In my opinion, we have lost little of any support that we had back in '81, and as I mentioned earlier, I know of many NDPers that will be supporting us in the next provincial election in the Swan River area.

Mr. Speaker, I'm of the opinion that this Throne Speech is really a cop-out on the part of the government. Whatever happened to the NDP's gospel, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans"? Remember this document? It says, "We can turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years." Well, so much for "A Clear Choice for Manitobans."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm just looking for my copy of the Throne Speech. I have it here somewhere.

On Page 1 it says, "Our distinguished guests found the province experiencing a year of strong economic expansion that brought improved opportunities and greater security for many Manitobans and Manitoba businesses."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have just seen a record number of bankruptcies, not only in 1984, but in 1983 and in 1982, as well. And look at the number of businesses that have closed their doors in Manitoba in the past two or three years. Look at the businesses that have left Manitoba, and the businesses that decided not to locate in Manitoba. The number of businesses that have closed, well there's a list that goes on and on, and certainly this all has contributed to a disastrous situation for our province.

The Throne Speech says that it intends to devote itself in 1985 and the years to come to a continuance of its effort to build a province where young Manitoban men and women can have hope for their future. Well I ask the question, what hope?

Even the Minister of Health says that health service is heading for difficult times, and I believe the Minister of Health is sincere in what he's saying, because of the tremendous costs involved with adequate health care, not only in Manitoba, but of course throughout Canada. But how soon the people that are now on the government side forget.

Remember the two strips of bacon versus the three strips of bacon? Remember the big episode in the House here about changing the bed sheets once a week instead of twice a week? Remember the Federal Minister of Health accusing our Minister of the Day, that we were diverting health dollars into highway construction. But I don't recall the members opposite, who were in opposition at that time, really coming to the assistance of our Minister of Health and defending what was being done in this province because absolutely we were providing excellent health care in Manitoba and there has been . . . — (Interjection) —

Agriculture is still our most important industry in this province. Agriculture has been struggling for a number of years lately, and particularly ever since this government has taken office, agriculture has been on very shaky ground. And of course we all know that when agriculture is in a shaky position, all Manitobans feel the tremor from that.

Members on this side of the House have constantly, particularly our Agriculture Critic, requested the Minister of Agriculture to do something to reduce or to stop the number of bankruptcies that were occurring and still are occurring in this province. The Minister has replied that he has directed more assistance for

agriculture than any other government in the past decade or more, and I believe him when he says that he has spent a lot of money, but what's gone wrong? Why is agriculture still in such bad shape and why are so many young people declaring bankruptcy and others that have not declared bankruptcy but have decided to get out of business because they couldn't finance their operations any longer?

Well, I believe that the Minister of Agriculture, although he is probably right in that he spent a lot of taxpayers' money propping up agriculture, he's done it in a crisis bandaid situation, and that hasn't been good enough to provide the long-term planning to support agriculture and to make it a continuing viable operation for the farmers.

The Minister just recently announced that there would be an 8 percent write down of existing MACC mortgages and this will help - I believe something like 4,000 farmers, according to his news release. This, I'm sure, is appreciated by those farmers who do hold the mortgages with MACC and I see an article in yesterday's Sun where it mentions that the Minister of Finance will be introducing some further write down measures, perhaps when he announces his Budget next week, and these will be important issues to the agricultural community and I'm sure that they will be very beneficial. But that doesn't help the many dozens of farmers that have already gone out of business because of hard times.

Just recently the province and the Federal Government announced a Disaster Assistance Program for the Bellsite/Birch River area of my constituency, but unfortunately the Minister - and I'm not sure how the designated area was determined - has cut out about half the farmers that got hit by flooding and these farmers petitioned the Premier, as well as the Minister of Agriculture, and in questioning the Premier yesterday he has indicated that they haven't made a final decision on this matter yet.

Hopefully the government will see fit to increase the extent of the area to be provided assistance because it seems unfair that about half of the farmers that really got hit are not going to be covered under this program the way it sits right now. My understanding is the Federal Government is prepared to provide their 50 percent of the cost if the area is extended, and certainly I wouldn't know why the Provincial Government here would not want to take advantage of those 50-cent dollars in providing needed assistance to those farmers in the Birch River area, who, because of no fault of their own, got flooded out in the last two or three years and had very poor crops.

I'm surprised that the government, in determining the designated area, did not contact any of the local municipal officials, and I understand that they didn't contact crop insurance people or even local extension people to have an input into the designated area to be covered. But hopefully, the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture will see fit to extending the flood disaster area.

So the agricultural situation is shaky and I blame a lot of the fault on agriculture on this present Minister of Agriculture. Because we have a situation that came up yesterday in the House where it was pointed out that, for instance, the people that want to keep laying birds, there was a regulation whereby farmers could

keep 499 birds or less on their farms and not need a quota or be part of the Egg Marketing Board. This has now been cut back to 99 birds.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Ninety-nine, that's henocide!

MR. D. GOURLAY: In doing some research on this, I find out that in 1981 there were some 500 egg producers with 499 birds or less, and at the present time this has grown to 1,000 producers who have 499 birds or less. So since 1981, this has doubled to 1,000 producers.

Now I can appreciate the problem where you have some 244 producers that are registered under the egg marketing scheme and they are being assessed now some 6.5 cents a dozen to dispose of the surplus eggs that are being produced by those egg producers that are not part of the marketing board. So, I can sympathize with those producers that are registered.

What has this Minister of Agriculture done with respect to research or increasing the marketing capacity of our eggs in this province? Absolutely nothing and so his route is to cut back on the number of farmers that can keep laying birds on their farm. He's reduced it to 99. All I say is the 500 farmers that have got into laying birds up to 499 birds in the last four years, they would, no doubt, have been in very much more serious difficulty today if they hadn't got into this agriculture enterprise.

Just recently, we hear of the boycotting on the United States-Manitoba border. With respect to American farmers, they are boycotting the import of Manitoba hogs into North Dakota. I'm sure that the flag-burning episode up here and the continual criticism of Americans by members on the government side certainly doesn't help the public relations with the Americans, especially when we want to export our agricultural commodities into the United States.

As I mentioned at the outset, I was particularly pleased to be able to listen to the speech from the Minister of Energy with respect to the hydro development, and particularly the Limestone generating station. I believe that all Manitobans are excited about the possibility of Limestone starting up. This is a tremendous project for Manitoba. It is a tremendous project to provide jobs and economic spinoff, not only to Northern Manitoba, but throughout the whole province. Certainly, all members on this side of the House are very pleased that Limestone could be started, but the questions that we're asking, can we afford Limestone if there isn't a market for this power? — (Interjection) — Well, you see there's the Minister of Energy saying can we afford not to have it? Then we're getting back — (Interjection) — in here in this book, it says, the orderly development of Manitoba Hydro. This is the question that we're asking. I didn't hear the Minister today say anything new about why the Limestone should be advanced by some two years. I know that we'll have lots of opportunity to debate this question and I think that's the only concern that I have, and it's a concern that my constituents bring to my attention, because nowhere has the government proved to Manitobans that the advance startup of Limestone is justified. There's two years there that we are afraid that we're going to have to finance a very major project that we can . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. W. PARASIUK: He doesn't have to take the word of the government, but if, in fact, the professional analysis of Manitoba Hydro, the staff and the board indicate to him that there is a net benefit to Manitoba from proceeding with an early startup of Limestone to have it in service by 1990 - that's the assurance that he said he wants - if that can be provided, will he guarantee that at least he individually will personally support Limestone development at present?

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: . . . I would be happy to congratulate this Minister and this government if it can be justified that Limestone should be started. Because we need it. There's no question about the fact that we need Limestone as a major thrust . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: . . . in all seriousness . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside will have the same opportunity to engage in the debate as other members.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I'm serious on this matter. I listened to the Minister of Energy and I couldn't really detect to my satisfaction that he had clarified the matter with respect to the early startup of Limestone. I think this is a major decision facing all Manitobans, that we can't go back to the situation that happened during the Schreyer administration when we were building hydro plants as a make-work project. We just can't afford that kind of situation to happen in 1985. We are looking at a hydro development project that's going to cost some \$3 billion. If that has to be financed, even for a one-year period, we're looking at some \$300-325 million. That is a cost that will be borne by Manitoba taxpayers and by Manitoba Hydro customers. So, that is the only problem that I have and, I think members on my side here and all Manitobans who express some concern about the startup of Limestone. — (Interjection)

—
Just as a matter of curiosity, we sent out a franking piece recently and asked people to respond to any concerns that they had. It says "I am concerned about the following issues." This is from Ernie Magill at Minitonas. He says, "I am very concerned about the Limestone Project, in starting it sooner than needed

and paying interest on the vast amount of money borrowed. As for the Jobs Fund, well that's another matter." He doesn't like it! And the payroll tax — (Interjection) — He doesn't like that either.

Anyway, I just wanted to mention, there's a lot of people throughout Manitoba who are concerned about Limestone. Regardless of the fact that we really need a project like Limestone right now. — (Interjection) — It may help the government out but it'll help Manitobans, provided we can justify the project starting at this stage. I know that this is something, as I said earlier we will be debating, and I'm looking forward to other speakers, especially from the government side divulging more information, because we are suspicious. I should put that on the record that this has been a politically motivated advancement of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running short and I just wanted to touch on the Jobs Fund. I mentioned that many of my constituents are very nervous about the Jobs Fund becoming a slush fund for the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers because you have to go with cap in hand to the Ministers or the Premier in order to get this project for your area and it becomes so easy for the Premier and the Ministers to use it as a kind of a slush fund account for their own personal use to buy votes. We all know that some \$5 million in government advertising has been spent to date on various government issues, and particularly the Jobs Fund. I don't know how many MLAs have undertaken to check out some of the - it says here, "Twenty ways the Manitoba Jobs Fund is working with Manitobans," and it lists a whole bunch of projects.

I have had a number of people the last few months coming in asking about grants. They heard you could get a grant for pretty well anything you wanted to do and so they come into the MLA office. I don't see a phone number on this ad for the Jobs Fund - that's surprising - but I did find a number and I phoned about three offices and they said, well, that program's over and maybe there'd be another one starting up in the fall. So I phoned another number and they said, oh, that program hasn't started yet but it will be starting soon.

Grads in Business, Youth Business Start, Manitoba Community Assets and, I believe, Jobs in Training - within those areas that I contacted. There's no doubt they have to advertise like crazy on this program because it's such a jungle of bureaucracy with 20 different projects here and some starting and some ending and some not quite ready yet to be announced. It's just a real hodgepodge. Certainly I think that the Jobs Fund has not done the job that the government says it is doing. The Member for St. Norbert just indicated in his speech that there are more unemployed now than there were a year ago in Manitoba. So the Jobs Fund is not taking care of that.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I just want to go on record as supporting my Leader's amendment to the Throne Speech Debate.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to wish you well in the continuance of your role as

Speaker of this House. I know that from time to time I and other members are going to have . . . there will be moments when we will not have recognized the need for decorum or suitable dignity in this House and I want to assure you of my willingness to co-operate with you fully to ensure that the dignity and decorum of this House is maintained.

I want to congratulate the Member for Fort Garry on his election. I'm sure he'll enjoy the House as he has enjoyed civic government and I want to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the new Member from Fort Garry is going to be looking over the shoulder of the Leader. I think the young man from Fort Garry is a man with political ambition that's going to move, so other members in that caucus should be forewarned.

I want to welcome my colleague, Harry Harapiak, to the Cabinet table, the Honourable Member for The Pas to the Minister of Northern Affairs to the Cabinet table. I'm sure that his constituents are going to find him even more effective as Minister of Northern Affairs as he has been as Member for The Pas.

I would also like to indicate my pleasure at seeing a woman grace the table here in the Chamber. That's a bit of affirmative action that I think speaks well for this Chamber - and just not being sexist - but I do want to indicate that a woman here will add further grace and dignity to this Chamber as the women in this House have already demonstrated.

I want also to note with regret the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our colleague, the Member for Kildonan, is not with us. I regret that in more ways than one because as new Minister of Labour I recognize the tremendous tasks that our member was working at. I appreciate the extent of the work that is necessary to be done but I marvel at the energy and the dedication that she has exhibited in this House, in the previous Session particularly, in piloting through this House some very worthwhile legislation in the labour field. We all wish her well and hope that she'll be back soon.

I want also to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, on a job well done. I remember, Mr. Speaker, hearing in this House, very derisive comments about what they called my colleague. They called him "Main Street Pete" but they said it in not a very affectionate way because they always indicated that the Main Street Program was somewhat of a sham. But the Honourable Member for Pembina was one of those that was the loudest in his derisive comments but I'm sure that he was proud to stand in the Town of Carman when that Main Street Program, so effectively introduced and furthered by the Member for Ste. Rose, graced the development in those towns.

I also want to — (Interjection) — Well, I see an interruption.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Member for Pembina have a point of order?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member has indicated that I was proud to stand in Morden at the opening of the Main Street Program.

A MEMBER: Carman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I was even more proud in Morden that we forced this government to spend half a million

dollars upgrading the main street in Morden which they would not have done if it hadn't been for . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. That was not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I trust that that improper interruption has not been recorded against my time.

The Honourable Member for Pembina continues to display his contempt for the Rules of this House and will not face up to the fact that he did deride the program, derided the Minister and now has to face the music that not only was it a good program but we had an excellent Minister in the Member for Ste. Rose.

I also want to compliment the Member for Ste. Rose. The other day I was privileged to be in this House and hear him speak about the plight of agriculture and I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, that there were derisive comments across the aisle, smiles and disinterest, when the Member for Ste. Rose was very eloquently revealing a tale of neglect in the United States that can be said here in Canada, a neglect for agriculture, a casual disregard by members opposite for the plight of farmers in another country.

Now I've touched another sensitive nerve, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of order.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the member who is now speaking would care to name those members that were smiling and laughing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall individuals, but I know that most of the members over there found what my honourable member . . .

A MEMBER: Sit down.

HON. A. MACKLING: Another intervention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the member to withdraw the statement that he just made a few minutes ago.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the irritation that now befits these members, that they realize how wrong they were in not recognizing the plight of farmers elsewhere than in this country.

The honourable member talked about the conditions in the United States and talked about the farmers there with passion and concern, and opposite there was chattering and laughter and, Mr. Speaker, that is evidence of the kind of attitude of members in this House in respect to farmers in this country and farmers in North America.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's a long-held tradition and rule in this House that when a member is being asked to withdraw a statement that members take offence to, that that would then be carried out. The Minister . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . put an accusation on the record which is being correctly challenged by members. I was in the House when the Member for Ste. Rose was speaking. I listened to him. I know that my seatmate from Morris was in his seat and wasn't laughing or joking at the comments that were made with respect to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, too often a matter like this is allowed to stay on the record for them then to utilize in a way that the Minister is now trying to besmirch members of this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, the request is very simple. Either the Minister names members who did what he alleges they did or he withdraws the general accusation that he made in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind all members that every member of the House is entitled to give his or her opinion, and if another member has a differing opinion, he or she is entitled to give that opinion too. It is an exchange of opinions.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order. I don't dispute that general statement of yours with respect to every member's privilege in stating an opinion. Indeed in a debate like the Throne Speech, that is really one of the privileges that we have, but that's not what I'm challenging. The Honourable Minister made an accusation about an action that he indicated other members of the House took and that is being disputed, heatedly disputed, I might add, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to withdraw that statement or name the names.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of withdrawing what I have said that members opposite, during the course of my colleague's speech, when he was revealing to us the extent of the social misery in the United States, for large numbers of farmers with desperate needs, the fact that farmers were committing

suicide, that opposite there wasn't silence and concern, there was chatter and laughter and I don't . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: That's a lie, that's a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I won't withdraw that at all. I don't withdraw that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: I won't withdraw that, that's the truth.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if there needed to be any clarification of the point of order that I was making, the Minister accommodated us, and you, Sir, by repeating in a more vehement style the accusation he has made about actions taken by members of this House. I ask the honourable member, so that the record be cleared, if he believes that members did what he describes them as doing, then surely he owes us the courtesy of naming them or withdrawing the general statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I don't think it's either fair or reasonable for the member to attempt to characterize the reaction or the behaviour of members on the opposite side of the House; otherwise, we're going to get into a situation where people on this side of the House will then analyze and interpret the reactions of members on that side of the House. There are mixed reactions going on all the time and it's not fair or reasonable for him to attempt to indicate what is going on in the minds or in the behaviour of the members opposite. The record is what counts, not his interpretation of whether or not people are agreeing or disagreeing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina to the same point.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. Mr. Speaker, we do not have the statement of an opinion by a Minister. It is not a statement of what he believed happened. He is making a direct accusation and allegation against members of this House who are members of the opposition. It is not a factual statement he has made, and I would ask you, Sir, that you ask him to withdraw the untruthful statement he has made

twice now. I want you to ask him to withdraw that immediately, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the chagrin spoken by members opposite and what they feel is an inaccurate statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit they do not have a point of order nor a point of privilege. Even if that were to be alleged, I would refer you, Sir, to Page 106 of our Hansard in the first column, which specifically provides that a member at that time and the member speaking, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, made specific reference at that time to the fact that members opposite thought his remarks were funny. In Hansard, on Page 106, Wednesday, the 13th of March.

The fact that the Honourable Minister of Labour is now confirming what appeared in Hansard and went without any objection from members opposite, I find, Sir, not to be a matter of order. If they disputed those remarks then, and did not find the remarks of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose funny, they should have replied at that point. They have not raised this at the first opportunity, Sir, and that's a requirement under our Rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Pembina have another point of order?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. The Government House Leader has indicated that the Speaker yesterday, putting personal opinion on the record, he thought such action or some action was taken. That is entirely different from the accusation and the untruthful statement made by the Minister of Labour today, in which he has said that members in the opposition laughed and chattered and tittered about a given circumstance yesterday. That is an untruthful statement, and I ask him to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa to the same point.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have just sat here and heard the Honourable Minister of Labour indicate that I had taken the statements about human tragedy and misery happening in another part of the world, and suicides as being somewhat funny. I find that disgusting, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to be associated with those remarks in any way, shape or form, and I'm insisting that the Minister withdraw that statement that he made.

Nobody would take that lightly and anybody that's stupid enough to make that statement in this House is not worthy of sitting there and carrying a Cabinet Minister's title.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to the same point.

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, since the discussion that is taking place has to do with myself and my debate

in my speech here on the Throne Speech, if anyone wants to take the time to listen to the tapes, they will find that there was derision and laughter from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, when I got home and I asked my wife, did you hear my speech, and she said, yes, but there was a lot of interruptions from the other side and a lot of noise.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. ADAM: She could hear it right on the tapes. It's available for anyone that wants to see it. They made light of plights of farmers and I reminded them of that yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in attempt to keep it to the matter at hand, as you, yourself, have quite often have had to admonish the House, there are other things going on other than a particular speaker speaking. There may well have been some activity going on that was entirely not connected with what the member was speaking. What we are speaking about is what happened just two or three minutes ago by the Minister of Labour.

The Minister of Labour attributed specific action to members of the House. We're not going back to what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose said before, or what he thought maybe some reaction to that was, because that was a personal expression. The Minister of Labour is not thinking, he is alleging, he is accusing, and we want that withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

We ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the same point?

HON. A. MACKLING: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Honourable members can refer to the record in Hansard. When Mr. Adam was speaking, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I sat here and I was appalled at the continued laughter and chatter when he was talking about the pathetic situation of farmers in another country, a complete disinterest. I don't know what the honourable members were laughing about, but they showed . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . and I never . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I'm trying to hear the Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . the shoe fits because they were laughing at the honourable member's speech. I didn't accuse them of that. I said that they were laughing and chattering and showing no interest in this serious plight of farmers in the United States. That was my charge, Mr. Speaker, and it stands.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

I have heard one member give his opinion from one side and I recognize that other members may have other opinions on the same topic. It has not been made clear which, if any, rule has been breached in this House, so there is no point of order before the House for discussion.

The Honourable Minister for . . .

MR. H. ENNS: I feel I must challenge that non-ruling of yours, Mr. Speaker. We believe a withdrawal is called for and we insist that that be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I have ruled that there is no point of order. Does the honourable member wish to challenge that decision?

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've challenged that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Those in favour of the ruling, please say aye; those opposed please say nay.

In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? Those in favour, please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, McKenzie, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 26; Nays, 18.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

It is indeed a pleasure to be able to stand in this House, proud to be part of a government whose commitment to social and economic justice has remained unshaken. Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech is testimony to the fact that a responsible and concerned government can govern with a dedication to humanity and equality of the human condition within the context of current fiscal restraints. It is testimony to a government committed to responsible management and economic growth. What's more, it's testimony to a government with a clear vision of Manitoba's future; a vision of strength, prosperity, and justice.

It is unfortunate that all members of this House do not share in the confidence or vision expressed in the Throne Speech. I realize it's not easy for the calmity howlers across the way to set aside political opportunism and to join in responsible debate of the legislation and policies outlined in the Throne Speech.

I would ask, Sir, that, just for once, they would look beyond their peculiar vision of Manitoba and its people to see that this is a province with a great future. I'm sure I speak for thousands of Manitobans when I say enough cynicism and enough pessimism. It is time the members opposite had as much confidence in and respect for the people of Manitoba as we do. George Bernard Shaw had an interesting definition of prophets of doom such as the Conservative members opposite. He described them as men who think everybody as nasty as themselves and hate them for it.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere is that Conservative view of the world reflected more than their attitudes toward working people and their freely selected unions.

Sir, as a Minister of Labour, I look forward to bringing to this House a number of items already outlined in the Throne Speech. The initiatives I will be asking this House to consider will be firmly based on this government's respect for working people and our commitment to equality and dignity in work.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House respect the rights of working people. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, has there been a right granted or a humane improvement made that benefited the working people of this province in this country, that has not been opposed by Conservatives like the ones across the way. Sir, the answer is no. The Conservative Party of Manitoba, like Conservatives everywhere, are a party

held hostage by a right-wing ideology that puts profits and privilege ahead of the legitimate rights and aspirations of working people. There is an ideology that is morally bankrupt, intellectually naive, and politically opportunist.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party of Manitoba is perhaps the best living example of the old saying that politics is the gentle art of getting votes from the poor, campaign funds from the rich, by promising to protect each from the other.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are fooling no one. Manitobans know who the Conservatives represent. Mr. Speaker, when Bay Street pays the piper, the tune is predictable. How many times do we have to hear the same old song? We have heard it again this Session, that the fair and just changes to The Labour Relations Act passed last Session are going to result in the demise of Manitoba business, that the moving vans would be lined up to get out of Manitoba to move to other provinces, provinces I might add, that already have labour legislation similar to what we now have in effect in Manitoba.

Well, Sir, when child labour was abolished, the same cries came from the same groups that these members represent. When the 8-hour day was introduced, it was the same tune from the same people. It doesn't seem to matter, Sir. The members opposite are clearly rooted in a history of ideology that says what's good for Bay Street, is good for Canada. And what's good for working people, must be fought at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House know better. We know that there cannot be social and economic justice in this country without the recognition of the legitimate rights and needs of ordinary working men and women. The goals and aspirations of ordinary Manitobans are indivisible from the goals of economic and social justice.

If the members opposite valued work as much as they valued capital, the working people of this province would not be faced by continual attacks on their legitimate rights by those same members opposite and the interests of profit and privilege that they represent.

Perhaps the most significant and fundamental right working people in this country have is the right to organize themselves for the purpose of collective bargaining, the right to unionize. Why? Why have working people fought so hard to first attain and hold that right? And why, Sir, does that right so frighten the members opposite.

The Supreme Court of the United States has given us a clear and simple answer. The Court ruled and I quote, "Unions were essential to give labourers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer." Mr. Speaker, unions are the legitimate representatives of the people they serve. They were created to overcome the imbalance between labour and capital and to do away with the injustice that flowed from that inequality.

Working people and their unions are not to be feared. They are to be encouraged to become full participants in the social and economic development of Manitoba. Co-operation is the key to strong, harmonious labour relations.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to contrast this government's labour relations record with that of the former administration in this province. In the last years of the administration of Sterling Lyon and my colleague,

the member for Turtle Mountain, this province was hit by 85 work stoppages involving 10,000 people. Those are the results of confrontation. By comparison, Sir, in the last two years of this government, there have been 15 work stoppages, involving just over 2,000 workers, 85 as against 15. That, Sir, is what co-operation and respect can do.

They talk about business concern for this province's labour relations' climate. Sir, faced with those statistics, business has to be concerned with the remotest threat that one day, again, that group will be allowed to wreak havoc in this province as a government.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the way that we have worked with business and labour to promote industrial harmony in Manitoba. And, Sir, there is some small measure of hope that the members opposite may finally join us in addressing questions of equity in the workplace in a constructive and co-operative manner.

I'm speaking now of our commitment to introduce measures to address the question of equal pay for work of equal value. My optimism is based on the Leader of the Opposition's comments supporting this initiative and on his federal leader's clear support for equal pay for work of equal value.

My optimism is, however, measured by the fact, first of all, that we on this side, are never quite sure if the opposition leader speaks for his party, or if Manitoba Conservatives ever listen to their federal leader and to that, Sir, the fact that the opposition's biggest cheerleader has called the idea "looney". And one can only wonder how long the women in Manitoba can expect support from that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Leader of the Opposition to once and for all, stand up to his caucus and for his caucus to listen to their national leader and not to cheerleaders. The question of pay equity is too important to take a back seat to political opportunism.

Women in this province continue to earn salaries less than 70 percent of males. They do so, Sir, not because they choose to, not because they don't need the money, and not because their work is unimportant. The dismal statistic, I'm sure the Honourable Member from Gladstone would be anxious to hear this, rather than chattering, that dismal statistic is the result of years of inequity of injustice and of the chauvinistic views of women's contribution to the economy in the workplace. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, as a woman, should be heartened by the statements I'm making rather than chattering. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the problem — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: It has been suggested that the problem is attitudinal, and that we must wait for attitudes to change. We on this side of the House believe it is much more than that. The problem is systemic and deeply entrenched in our economic structure and, therefore, requires direct action. With all due respect to the marketplace and the supply and demand curbs that members opposite place so much faith in, this is a problem that will not be adjusted if left to the forces of free market.

Pay equity requires intervention. The economy didn't collapse when governments intervened to introduce

minimum wages. The economy didn't collapse when governments intervened to introduce minimum working hours. The economy didn't collapse when governments intervened to ban child labour, and the economy will not collapse if the government intervenes to introduce pay equity. Mr. Speaker, fair wages for working women, single mothers, for heads of families, for women who are often the only means of income is not only just, but makes economic sense. Mr. Speaker, there can be only one reason for opposing pay equity and that, Sir, is the protection of profits and privilege.

Benjamin Harrison once wrote and I quote "I pity the man who wants a coat so cheap that the man or woman who produces the cloth, will starve in the process." Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are fair and just. Manitobans want pay equity. And I pity the man or woman that stands in their way. So again, Sir, I urge the members opposite to listen to their leader and to listen to their federal leader and no matter how difficult, or how unopportunist it may be to say no to their supporters opposing pay equity, and yes to Manitoba women.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister will submit to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to submit to a question at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. Speaker, we've announced in the Throne Speech a number of initiatives designed to bring greater fairness to the workplace. And when one looks to evaluate a society's belief in the dignity of work, one must to a great extent, judge that society by the way it treats its workers in times of extreme difficulty.

Upon examining events in Manitoba, I believe we can do better in this regard. When plants and industries are threatened with closure, I do not believe that the people that work there instantly become a liability on a balance sheet to be removed without consideration. Mr. Speaker, plant closures and group terminations affect us all. Indeed, Sir, there seems to be a growing public consensus in this area.

The Honourable Samuel Freedman said not long ago, and I quote, "Disruptions of the lives of affected workers and their families, the implications for public support through needed welfare and other social services, the added burdens on unemployment insurance, the need for retraining and replacement, the economic implications for the community and lowered revenues take decisions in this area beyond the realm of individual decision-making."

I know the members opposite believe that the supreme marketplace takes care of all and if workers should have the misfortune of working in a plant or an industry that for whatever reason was unable to complete, then that's life in an economic universe unfolding as it should. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that it is a callous and simplistic view of the world. Governments have responsibility, as do workers in companies, to ensure that everything is done to, first

of all, keep the business operating and ensuring that the workers are not simply forgotten or cast aside.

Mr. Speaker, we believe there can be fairness and economic growth. We believe there can be greater humanity in dealing with mass layoffs or displacements due to such things as technological change; but more importantly, Sir, we believe that human tragedy can be prevented.

There has never been a more important or challenging opportunity facing Manitobans than the challenge of technological change. How we meet that challenge will not only determine our economic future, but will in many ways define our humanity and our perceptions of work. This government believes that people mean more than machines and that new technology must serve the needs, goals and aspirations of Manitobans.

We believe in a fair and equitable distribution of the risks and rewards that come with new technology and we believe in working with business, labour and the community as a whole in determining Manitoba's future in this area.

Since this House last sat we have brought business, labour, academics and community interest groups together to work on the challenge of technology, and I'm pleased to say that they have initiatives they want this House to approve. One of them is a Workplace Innovation Centre, a place that business and workers can come to for help and advice on the human implications of introducing new technology; and, Sir, I am pleased to say that this human concern does not just stem from labour, but is supported by business as well. Manitobans are committed to fairness and equity as essential ingredients in technological change.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the kind of initiatives we have taken in the area of labour relations and the kind of initiatives we plan to take are good and fair. Sir, I believe our past record and performance bears that out. In fact, Sir, I would suggest that our record as a government is one of fairness and concern for the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I know that we don't often evoke this rule, but I would ask you to consider evoking Rule No. 29 which states, "A member addressing the House shall not read from a written, previously prepared speech."

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this member, who after all is not a rookie, a former House Leader, a long time Cabinet Minister, knows that rule and it may just be appropriate to ask you to consider that rule, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health to the same point.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we certainly don't deny that rule exists, but I think in the past, during the Throne Speech, there certainly has been much more latitude in that and I think that most of the Ministers sometimes come in with a bunch of books and so on, their notes, and if we evoke that too closely I think it will have repercussion on other members and some of the new members who, probably with the first speech

of the season, are also a little nervous and need to consult their notes quite closely. Fine, we recognize of course we have no other option, that the rules do exist, but I think that we should remember the tradition of this House and be a little lax in the Throne Speech. — (Interjection) — What rule is singing in the House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would expect all members to realize that the best cause of debate is not served by members reading speeches. I do note that the member has some rather full notes there.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the honourable members are so taken with the text of the remarks that I've been delivering that they were troubled enough to try and interrupt me on several occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a written text somewhat inhibits my style and I appreciate the Honourable Member for Lakeside drawing that to my attention, because I think I want to deal more effectively with the opposition.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, having surveyed the area of my concerns in respect to legislation, I do want to address the negativism I hear from opposite. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition - I trust that he will read my remarks - started this Session with that tone, negative criticism. It was a litany of doom, gloom from a leader who is frustrated, who is anxious to return to government but, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba don't respect negative criticism.

Even in his speech - and he set the tone for his colleagues - he sunk to some pretty low depths, but I won't deal in the personal references that he made - he made some personal references to me. I won't stoop to that level; I will resist the temptation to strike back - but what that speech revealed and the speeches that have been made subsequent by members opposite is a profound lack of objectivity, a profound fixation with trying to downplay the positive economic indicators for Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, they are the knockers, they are the wreckers; they're not the builders and the people of Manitoba will recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, laced within that leader's speech were derisive remarks toward organized workers. I want to compliment the Member for Thompson who, in his speech, exposed the hidden agenda of the members opposite very effectively. For those who were not in the House - and I was not in the House to hear that speech - I want to commend members opposite to a reading of that speech, because he quite rightly recognized the hidden agendas, some of the hidden agendas opposite, but I want to add somewhat to what the Honourable Member for Thompson revealed.

In just a little bit I want to criticize the Member for Thompson because he was giving the opposition an opportunity to become positive. Now I know that a former member of this House, the former Member for Inkster, when he was giving good advice to the opposition, but he knew that the opposition wouldn't take it, he would indicate so and that was very effective.

He would say, I know members opposite are not going to take this advice because they can't believe it is true,

but he gave that good advice. The Honourable Member for Thompson gave members opposite good advice, but I'm sure they weren't listening.

Part of the hidden agenda of the Conservative Party in this House, Mr. Speaker, is to destroy the public will for government to be effective in our economy, because they don't believe in government. They don't believe that the government should be involved in a positive way in the economy of this province. They don't believe that. Their ideological blinkers prevents them from seeing that modern government should be involved, involved in encouraging - as a catalyst and as a partner - economic growth in this province.

They see the role of Crown operations in government merely as feed stock for private enterprise and that was their attitude toward Hydro, Mr. Speaker. What did they do? They froze the hydro rates. What's the effect of that, Mr. Speaker? Make Hydro slowly sink into a precarious financial situation, shrink their revenues, while all the time, through those lower rates, subsidizing private enterprise. That's their attitude.

Do you remember the attitude, Mr. Speaker, when they went to the polls in 1977? What were they going to do with MPIC, the Public Insurance Corporation? They told all their friends in the insurance industry, give them power and they will fix that automobile insurance industry. Well, they got in government and they appointed a group to look at it, but they did some polling too. They've learned from Bill Davis and the "blues" elsewhere that you don't do things without doing some polling and their polling told them, don't touch it, the people of Manitoba think this is pretty good. So they had to tell their friends in the insurance industry, we're sorry; we took your money; we took your pledges; we took your workers, but we're not going to deliver because we can't do it. What we've got to do, and it will take us time, is gradually erode the effectiveness of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, then maybe we'll be able to get rid of it. That's their attitude, Mr. Speaker.

They don't believe in a positive role of government. They have an attitude towards labour too. What did that sterling - no, I wouldn't use that expression - what did that present leader of the Conservative Party in Manitoba, the Leader of the Official Opposition, say in his speech? You know, he started talking about Superior Bus, trying to imply that it was a labour problem in Morris that drove that company out. Do you know what he said, Mr. Speaker? I quote from his remarks: "Superior Bus was driven out of this province because of the labour legislation that was passed last year by this administration," and he was pointing over here. That's what he put on the record, Mr. Speaker.

Well, what are the facts? The labour legislation that was effective in respect to Superior Bus was the labour legislation that was in being when the honourable members were in government. That labour legislation did not change until January 1st, 1985, so the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was condemning the labour legislation which he had sustained, and yet he says that we drove that bus company out of the province. That's the kind of distortion that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that's the kind of example he's setting for his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, in that red, white and blue missive that was sent throughout the province, one of the first things

they do was attack health care in this province and say there's no planning.

A MEMBER: What a joke.

HON. A. MACKLING: What a joke is right, because as the Honourable Minister of Health revealed, when we took office what did we find? The planning cupboard was bare. The Tories had destroyed any planning capacity in respect to health care and then he has the gall . . .

A MEMBER: I'm glad your time is almost up.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, your time is up, I believe soon, over there. It's up in another way though, Mr. Speaker.

They have the gall to suggest that we haven't been effectively planning in respect to health. Mr. Speaker, the kind of distortion and half-truth that is typical of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and typical of the kind of propaganda they want to put out through the Province of Manitoba will not be accepted by the people of Manitoba. They know that this government, despite the difficult economic times, is committed to fairness, justice in the working place, and to developing an atmosphere of co-operation in this province.

Yes, we're prepared to work with business; yes, we're prepared to offer business loans; yes, we're prepared to sit down and see what their work force should be. We're prepared to look at our training programs; we're prepared to work with business and labour to develop an atmosphere of co-operation that will effectively create the best economy in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, members opposite continue to snipe, continue to criticize. Yes, they are difficult times; yes, we have changes in the economy when a plant decides to close, but we do our utmost to ensure that if it's possible, that business will stay in Manitoba.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology must be complimented on the successful efforts of that department, where it is possible, to convince business not only to stay in Manitoba, but to expand in Manitoba, and he has given reports of the success of his department in this House and I didn't see smiles opposite, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear encouragement; I didn't hear any words of praise - only knocking and criticism.

The negative attitude of members opposite will not help them. They must, Mr. Speaker, and I trust I'm giving them the best advice I can, the same kind of advice that the Member for Thompson gave. Start thinking in a positive way about this province. Start recognizing that when Ministers on this side do a good job, you can say so. Take a sincere look at what we're doing. Give us justified criticism, but don't try to confuse the people with half-truths because they'll see through it. You have a very limited time to redress some of the mistakes you've made.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: You have less.

HON. A. MACKLING: You have an opportunity - Well, the Honourable Member for says we have less. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba

recognize in this government a contrast to what's happened across the country. This government hasn't attacked its health programs, hasn't slashed social services, hasn't attacked educational programs, hasn't brought in legislation to attack trade unions. It has acted in a positive, constructive, co-operative manner. — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is . . .

A MEMBER: From Virden.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . from Virden, pardon me, is concerned about business. I don't know where we've attacked business. He'll have an opportunity to tell me about that in the Throne Speech. We have not attacked business. We have gone out of our way to try and develop an atmosphere of understanding and co-operation and that won't be eroded by the nay saying and the carping criticism opposite, because the positive message that we give to the people of Manitoba is being understood, and the people of Manitoba will remember the kinds of statements that were made in this House about the Jobs Fund.

A MEMBER: I hope so, because they were right.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, just as they remember the carping criticism about the Main Street Program; the carping criticism that turns around on itself when they're found out that it's not true. The Jobs Fund has been an effective catalyst in Manitoba, such that Manitoba stood out as a contrast to provinces elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, people in Manitoba recognize that kind of effort and they will recognize the kind of positive effort this government brings in respect to labour legislation. Mr. Speaker, I know that in the past, the former Minister of Labour, loved comrade, Buzz Pauley, when he stood up in this House and debated labour legislation, I know some of the members opposite said the sky was going to fall in; everyone would leave Manitoba; it would be a catastrophe; don't change these laws; don't increase the minimum wage; you'll drive everyone out of the province; it was all going to be a catastrophe. The people are voting with their feet in returning to Manitoba, because here is a climate of co-operation, understanding and goodwill. Business recognizes that's the important thing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust that honourable members will recognize that this is the kind of labour relations business climate we want, one where workers and management are prepared to work together, committed to a better Manitoba.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. B. RANSOM: I just have a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, may we call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No objection to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would just like to know if the Points of Order that were raised during the Minister of Labour's speech were deducted from his 40 minute time allotment?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member should know that the Minister of Labour, as with all members, gets the same time to speak on a debate.

The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 o'clock when the Honourable Member for Niakwa will have the floor.