

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 19 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 Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the National Energy Board of Canada announced its decision to grant Manitoba Hydro a licence to export 500 megawatts of electricity to Northern States Power of Minneapolis. We welcome this decision, for it will bring tremendous benefits to all Manitobans.

Yesterday, in response to the National Energy Board decision, my Premier, the Premier of Manitoba, delighted all Manitobans when he said that Limestone is a go.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table in the House today the complete text of the National Energy Board's decision on the Manitoba Hydro application. Manitoba put forward a strong case to the board, clearly showing the benefits that would flow to the province as a result of the sale, as well as the protection for Manitoba that was negotiated into the contract with NSP. As members of the House can see, the board has rigorously reviewed the application and accepted our case.

In considering whether to approve this power export, the National Energy Board had three major tasks:

1. To determine if the power to be exported is needed by Canada, or whether it is surplus to Canada's needs; and
2. To verify that the price being charged for the power recovers its appropriate share of costs incurred in Canada; and
3. To ensure that the power to be exported will not be sold at a price which is less than what other Canadians would pay for equivalent service.

On all these counts, the National Energy Board has confirmed the facts and analysis put forward by Manitoba Hydro. The sale is considered to benefit the provincial and federal economies; and accordingly, the NEB has granted a licence to Manitoba to carry out this export agreement.

The National Energy Board has provided an export licence permitting a maximum annual energy limit of 3,405 gigawatt hours corresponding to an annual capacity factor of 78 percent with a provision for a monthly capacity factor of 100 percent if required. Manitoba Hydro has informed me that this is sufficient to meet the terms of the NSP contract.

The board also commented on suggestions at the NEB hearings that Manitoba Hydro's calculation of costs

was not correct by stating: "In the board's view, since the only change in Manitoba Hydro's generation expansion plans required to make the export is the advancement of the construction of these three stations. The costs associated with their advancement are the appropriate costs to be assessed against the export."

In short, the NEB states that Manitoba Hydro was right - the negative interveners were wrong.

Some interveners expressed concerns that the economic and financial risks associated with the export sale had not been adequately assessed against the export.

In response the board states: "The board recognizes that some level of risk is always present in any major undertaking, and it is satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to show that the risks associated with the proposed export sale were adequately examined by the applicant and found to be within acceptable bounds."

Again those negative interveners were wrong - Manitoba Hydro was right.

In order to verify the reasonableness of Manitoba Hydro's cost-recovery and cost-benefit analysis, the National Energy Board conducted its own analyses based on the information submitted by Manitoba Hydro.

I quote from the report: "The results of the board's analysis for the Sale Sequence - that's a two-year advancement of Limestone - showed that Manitoba Hydro could be expected to derive net revenues of about \$385 million from the two-year advancement case. This compares with the net revenues of \$402 million estimated by Manitoba Hydro."

The figures of \$402 million and \$385 million are in discounted 1984 dollars. In as received dollars over the life of the agreement, these work out to \$1.7 billion and \$1.64 billion respectively.

Furthermore, the board's economic analysis compared the net benefits of a two-year advancement as compared to a one-year advancement of Limestone.

I quote from the report: "A comparison of the results of the Sale Sequence - that's the two-year advancement - and the 500 megawatts Only Sequence - that's the one-year advancement - shows that the additional interruptible sales that would be possible with an additional year of advancement of Limestone would yield an extra \$20 million to Manitoba Hydro. This is the same result as estimated by Manitoba Hydro."

Again Manitoba Hydro figures were right. The negative interveners were wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I have had confidence in the integrity and in the quality of the analysis of Manitoba Hydro in their recommendations to me regarding net benefits to Manitoba from this hydro export sale and from a 1990 in-service date for the first generator. I am pleased that the National Energy Board's independent analysis confirms the integrity and reasonableness of Manitoba Hydro's calculations.

I congratulate the staff of Manitoba Hydro who so ably presented Manitoba's case to the National Energy Board.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans have every right to be proud, every right to be optimistic about the future. The construction of the Limestone Generating Station which will get under way later this year as a result of the sale, will bring important opportunities to Manitoba business and labour. More than \$1.5 billion in contracts will be awarded around the project. Six thousand person years of direct employment, along with 11,000 person years of spinoff employment will be created by the construction of Limestone.

Already the government has begun to implement policies to ensure that Manitobans can take first advantage of Limestone opportunities. Hydro's new Manitoba first tendering and purchasing policy, the establishment of comprehensive job training programs around Limestone, and the negotiation of a collective agreement giving employment preference to Northern Natives and other Northern people, so that all Manitobans will have a fair share of employment at Limestone are now in place. We will continue to work with Manitobans to develop policies like these which ensures that the Limestone project serves as a cornerstone for this province's future economic growth. We will do this because this government cares for Manitobans. It wants Manitobans to be able to work, to be able to have a future.

In closing, this government believes in the future of Manitoba. We believe in its potentials for development like the Limestone project and the NSP sale. The National Energy Board has now told us that they too believe that we have struck a good deal for Manitobans and a good deal for Canadians.

And now with the permission of the members of the House, I would like to table the National Energy Board Report.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the Minister's and the government's statements, I would want to initially say it would be my hope that the roses the honourable members opposite are wearing are not part of that massive \$600,000 to \$700,000 advertising campaign that is about to be hurled at Manitobans with respect to this project, that they at least have had the integrity to buy their own roses for this occasion, Mr. Speaker, and I do so by serving notice to Manitobans of the kind of advertising campaign that will be met; and certainly nobody from that government has to tell anybody on this side about the economic benefits of a major building project like Limestone. That has always been understood by all Manitobans and most specifically understood by Conservatives in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud and privileged to be part of a government that had that initial vision in the '60s, part of that Duff Roblin Government that started the development on the Nelson River and foresaw the vision, the future that that kind of government could have for the Province of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague for Turtle Mountain indicated the other day, this government has an expertise in doublespeak.

So let me read to you directly from the report which I understand has not received any wide circulation even

to the media up until today, so let's establish that nothing the Minister has said and nothing that's contained in this report allays the continuing and the real concerns of the opposition and every Manitoban about the future of his hydro rates, the continual rise of his hydro rates, the doubling of his hydro rates and who is going to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I read from the report. "The board has no regulatory jurisdiction over the Manitoba Hydro's generating stations per se. However, some may argue that the board's approval of the subject export would be tantamount to approval of the advancement of the in-service dates for several generating stations. The board notes that without the advancement of Limestone Station from 1991 to 1990, there would only be a small capacity deficiency in 1993 when supplying the domestic and export requirements, including a reasonable reserve. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what the board is saying is that meeting the export requirements would be quite possible without the advancement.

It appears to the board that several options would be available to cover the small deficiency, including the option of advancing Limestone by one year. Whether or not Manitoba Hydro in choosing the latter option has selected the best one is not a question which the board is called upon to decide. In the circumstances, the board would not accept any contention - I want you to listen - the board will not accept any contention that approval of this export licence application is tantamount to approval of the advancement of the in-service dates of Limestone, and that says it all, Mr. Speaker. So let's understand that nothing that is tabled today changes the most legitimate concerns of the opposition, the real concerns of those who will have to pay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the board specifically did not deal with the question of two-year advancement. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a two-year advancement was not put forward in this application. We were dealing with one-year advancement.

Mr. Speaker, what we have said consistently on this side, and will continue to say consistently on this side, is who is going to pay for the cost of advancement? The mathematics is fairly straightforward - fairly straightforward. Ten percent on a massive building project of \$3 billion runs to about \$300 million.

What I am also thankful for, Mr. Speaker, about the report that the National Energy Board has come down with is, that we have at least finally brought down the profit figure to realistic 1984 terms. The profit figure is \$402 million if everything falls into place, Mr. Speaker. If everything falls into place, the multinational private corporation that we have made a contract with, Mr. Speaker, for 12 years, that recorded \$183 million profit on power sales last year in 1983, I want to ask the Minister and want to ask the government, how much profit do they intend to make on the block of power that we are selling them? They are secure in the knowledge that they have that power at 80 percent of their cost.

The Minneapolis Hydro user knows that in the year 2000, he can get power, he can switch on his lights at a cost that will cost him 80 percent less than it normally would have cost him, Mr. Speaker. No such assurance is given to the Manitoba user. Had we had that assurance today, then we would be applauding with

them, Mr. Speaker. We might even be wearing roses, perhaps of a different colour, Mr. Speaker. No such assurance has been given today, no such assurance will be given.

I call on the Minister, and I call on the government today, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the National Energy Board studiously avoided the question of advancement, will this government provide a forum; will this government call together the Standing Committee on Public Utilities; or will this government submit these potential rate problems to our own Public Utilities Board for some consideration? Because that's fine and dandy, Mr. Speaker, for the National Energy Board to have made some consideration, that perhaps they, with the better computers, and they, with the greater resources than admittedly we have in opposition, have satisfied themselves that this may indeed be an overall global good deal for Canadians.

I'm a little concerned about the use of that word "Canadians," in the Minister's comments today and in the Premier's comments the other night on radio or on TV. What does he mean by a good deal for Canadians? We have always prided ourselves as Manitobans, as having among the best rates in the country. Are we now anticipating that we, in Manitoba, will rise to the national Canadian level, and that only if seen in that context that it's a good deal, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, then we're looking at a massive increase in hydro rates; and Mr. Speaker, that's the bottom line. My hydro users in Lakeside, the hydro users throughout the Province of Manitoba, are concerned about what this is going to cost them. I tell you, and I tell the users of Manitoba, it's going to cost them a lot.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of reports that I would like to table for this House:

The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation Act for the year ending March 31, 1984 - this report was sent earlier several months ago to all the honourable members of the House; as well the Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation ending March 1984; the Milk Prices Review Commission for the year ending March 31, 1984; the Tenth Annual Report of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984; and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Beef Commission for the year ending March 31, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

I have a number of reports to table: The Manitoba Civil Superannuation Fund, the Forty-Fifth Annual Report, for the year ended December 31, 1983; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Labour Pension Commission for 1984; and the Manitoba Telephone System Annual Report for 1983-84.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report for the Rent Regulation Bureau for the year ended March 31, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Service.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling the Annual Report of The Department of Government Services for the year 1983-84.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

We have 28 students of Grade 11 standing from the Neepawa Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Wayne Hollier. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

There are 23 students from the Gabrielle Roy School under the direction of Mr. Andre Gubunville. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

There are 26 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Governor Semple School. They are under the direction of Miss Arvanitidis. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Criterion Research Poll - government spending

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Education and it comes from the report of the polling that was done by Criterion Research regarding government expenditures. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to me if the government and her department are considering using lotteries revenues for funding of education in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, further to that topic, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not funding decisions by her department in future will be based on the information that was received from that Criterion Research poll that was done by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to say a few words about the polling that was done. The members of the House will remember that we not only did polling last year in education, but I released the results of the poll in this House. When I made major speeches at the trustees convention and the teachers convention, I used the information in the poll for the purpose in which the information had been gathered, and that was to give us information on what the public knew and understood about our education programs, what their position and their feelings were in important areas, and in fact to raise the level of debate and open

up discussion in critical areas where we have to make decisions in education.

So I have no apologies for doing polling that is absolutely necessary for the education system to have a better understanding of where the public is at and how they feel about such an important area. In terms of how we will use it, we will use it in the same way, to raise the visibility of critical education matters, to help us make decisions on both policy and funding issues and to provide information to the field about how the public feels because sometimes they don't know. I'm telling the members opposite how we intend to use the information, Mr. Speaker.

Lotteries Foundation - advertising campaign

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Lotteries Foundation, and I wonder if he could confirm that the government has just committed a \$95,000 advertising campaign to "inform the public how lotteries dollars benefit Manitobans."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice in the absence of the Minister. I think there is a will to inform the public where the money is going. As per the details of the campaign, I couldn't give this information at this time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. I wonder if he could indicate . . .

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

MR. G. FILMON: I just want to know if he's spending \$95,000 on advertising, Larry, it's as simple as that.

MGEA agreement re holiday increases

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. It follows upon the agreement signed with the MGEA yesterday. I wonder if he could confirm that the figures that are contained with respect to the new provisions for holidays, beginning with three weeks in the first year and extending to six weeks of holidays in the 20th year, plus an additional one-week of bonus in the first year, that those holiday provisions are the best of any public service group in North America.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who is the lead Minister in respect to negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition refers to the first year of the contract and the bonus provision which provides an extra one week of holidays for all employees who work a whole year. After that, of course, you wind up having a different rate altogether, at a cost in the second year of .025 percent of payroll. In the first year, there is a cost of .06 percent of payroll. After the first year, that cost is taken away because that's a one-time only arrangement which is in exchange for a zero increase in salary for the full 12-month period from September of 1984 through to September of 1985. I know of no other public sector employer who has been able to negotiate that kind of an arrangement for that year.

So in exchange, there is a .06 percent payroll cost which will go, not to existing employees, but rather to the creation of more employment in this province, because people will be taking the places of some civil servants at those holiday times. That means more employment, as opposed to some other jurisdictions in this province that are providing less employment because of their settlements and we're proud of our settlement. We think it's a fair settlement to the people and to our workers.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, leaving aside the one-week special additional provision for this coming year, can the Minister confirm that the provisions for three weeks holiday in the first year, rising up to six weeks in the 20th year are better than any other Provincial Government employees' settlement in this country right now?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, that first year, three weeks, I'd have to take as notice. You have to keep in mind that this year and last year and the year before that, people with one year of service with the Provincial Government were entitled to three weeks holidays. So there's no change there next year, no change whatsoever.

In terms of six weeks, it is true that people with, I believe it's 20 years, will have six weeks, but people in the Civil Service previously in Manitoba had six weeks. I'll check to see whether there are other people — (Interjection) — well, in the health care service, I believe they are in approximately that level right now, maybe even better. But I tell you that it is at a payroll cost of a .025 percent, and I think you have to look at the overall contract and the overall notion that maybe we should be sharing our employment a little more. Rather than paying more money to existing people, pay a little less and have other people working. I think that the people in this province agree with that philosophical approach.

MR. G. FILMON: It sounds as though the Minister is saying that, if we gave them six months off, we'd be even better off, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not the Civil Service Commission recommended this contract to him.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission certainly does not do the bargaining for the Province of Manitoba, and I'm shocked to hear the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that the Civil Service Commission would be giving us a mandate for negotiation. That's absolute patent nonsense.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, did the professional negotiators for the Provincial Government recommend this to the Minister?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, to have the Leader of the Opposition suggest that I'm going to discuss with him the internal negotiations that took place, don't be silly. Don't be silly, Gary! Don't you try to suggest that it isn't a good agreement.

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

MR. G. FILMON: On a point of order, I wonder if the Minister would show a little decorum and use proper method of addressing the Chamber, please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: When the Leader of the Opposition suggests that it is civil servants who are supposed to be running the government and making the decisions for the government, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that silly season has started.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not in the final year of the agreement, where the settlement entitles the employees to the cost-of-living increase plus some additional benefits, whether there is any cap on that cost-of-living increase.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The additional benefits that kick in, in that third year of the agreement, work out to .020 percent, so let's not suggest that there are large amounts of benefits in that year. The COLA is a similar COLA to the one that had been previously worded with the MGEA back in 1982, and does not have any cap on it.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is then indicating that, regardless of what the increase is in the cost of living, that there's no way it can be controlled; that regardless of what it is, there is no cap on it.

What is the best estimate that the Minister has at the present time of that cost-of-living increase for that particular year?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The federal statistics and the Federal Government are indicating that inflation should be remaining at approximately where it is right now. Of course, we're lower than where we generally are in the country. We would expect to have reasonable inflation rates. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition as well that the Post Office just negotiated a settlement where there was over 3 percent in each of two years with a COLA clause attached in addition that kicks in above 5 percent.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the cost of living was projected to increase in that particular year, 1985-86, by the Financial Post last week at 5.2 percent, and the government has given up any flexibility in terms of the numbers of employees that it has on staff, what flexibility does the government have to control its staff costs when it has no cap on the increase and no flexibility with respect to employee positions?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition misunderstands the contract. It is not a contract that provides us with inflexibility in terms of the level of employment. There is not job security in the sense that once there is a job in place, that anyone is entitled to retain that particular job. What there is, is employment security and that means where jobs are determined to be redundant, and there will be many, people can be moved.

For instance, the year before last and last year, we managed to take 370 people out of existing positions approximately, and move them into other positions in government. We're a large employer, Mr. Speaker. We have 15,000 and more civil servants and if we are not able to move them from department to department without giving them that kind of security, then I don't know who possibly could.

I think it is an appropriate clause where an employer can do it, where you know that basically you need a certain amount of services to be provided, to have that kind of job security for your employees. Philosophically, we think it is fair to have that kind of protection, and the employees have paid for it in terms of a zero increase in the first year of that contract, coming off - and keep in mind - a 1.5 percent increase in a six-month period prior to that when nobody was settling in this country at less than 6 and 5. So our employees have been fair and we, in turn, think the people of Manitoba should be fair with our employees.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it's evident that the employees have taken some short-term pain for some long-term gain. If the provincial economy in that last year is growing at only 2 percent and the cost of living goes up by 5.5 percent, how is the government going to make up the differential?

A MEMBER: More taxes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question is hypothetical.

National Energy Board hearing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines with regard to his statement this afternoon which I enjoyed tremendously and I think Manitobans should be proud of. Can the Minister indicate who were some of the negative interveners at the National Energy Board hearing?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I don't believe that refers to a subject which is within the ministerial competence of the Minister. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hearings were held in Manitoba and it would be of interest to all Manitobans to know what took place. I understand that the - what Manitobans intervened in respect to the National Energy Board Hearings?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is the same question.

Limestone - cost of advancement

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

The board in its report specifically states on Page 26, "However, it is not clear that the costs and benefits associated with the second year of advancement from 1990 to 1991 are directly related to the proposed firm export since Manitoba Hydro took the position that only one-year advancement of Limestone was necessary."

My question to the Minister of Energy is quite simple. Is the government planning any forum, any occasion, for Manitobans and the opposition to examine more fully what the costs of the two-year advancement will be?

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

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome that question in that before the House reconvened, before the Session started, the Conservatives were going around saying that they weren't having the opportunity to ask questions about Hydro. I have been sitting in this House now for seven question periods - there was one that I was missing - for a total of eight question periods, and the day that I announce a statement on Hydro is the first time that they screw up enough courage to ask one question about Hydro. That isn't argumentative; that's the facts.

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I simply asked the Minister whether or not he will consider calling a Standing Committee of the Public Utilities or indeed whether he plans to refer the question of advancement to the Public Utilities Board. I am not looking for a speech and a lecture, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

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

I note that the Member for Lakeside always tries to rise on a false point of order when he is being embarrassed by an answer because of the foolishness of his questions.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to debating this matter as I did in the Throne Speech, I certainly look forward to debating it in the Budget Debate, I look forward to debating it in my Estimates because if one has to deal with a group of people who have been so consistently wrong about Hydro, as was the Leader of the Opposition when he went before the National Energy Board and

was proved consistently wrong with every one of his Chicken Little statements, then I welcome the opportunity of debate with that group of Chicken Littles.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question - which given his premise, there wasn't a follow-up to because if he continued on with the premise he would have found that the next paragraph indicates that Manitoba Hydro analysis does show a net benefit over a two-year advancement and the people of Manitoba have had an opportunity of seeing what the submission to the National Energy Board was - the National Energy Board found, and I quote directly here, that although they were in no position to comment about the sequence, that the board noted, however, in its assessment of the export licence agreement, had not revealed anything wrong with Manitoba Hydro generation expansion plan, Mr. Speaker. That's what they concluded. They also concluded, Mr. Speaker, that they agreed in their independent analysis with the \$20 million net benefit to Manitoba that Manitoba Hydro derived in its analysis. So we'll give people the opportunity in due course to do the analysis.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we gave the opposition, I think, four sessions of the Public Utilities Committee. They ran into instances where they were trying to stall, but we'll give them the opportunity, Mr. Speaker. We will give them the opportunity to ask those questions because we have proved our case. We have proved the case consistently and I think that we'll use that opportunity and debate to ask the Conservatives why they have put forward a whole set of false premises over and over again, many of which have been repudiated by the National Energy Board, Mr. Speaker.

Limestone - benefits to NSP

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the large multinational corporation, Northern States Power, which, as I indicated, recorded a \$183 million profit in the fiscal year '83, has the government or Manitoba Hydro made any analysis of the projected profit that this multinational corporation will enjoy from this sale of block power, Manitoba power?

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite delighted to deal with the question because again it shows the ignorance of the Member for Lakeside.

To begin with, Northern States Power is self-contained within the country of the United States. It is not a multinational corporation, although I can know how the Member for Lakeside would like to stretch the truth and give it power beyond the boundaries of the United States and I can appreciate his trying to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out to the member - and this is on Page 28 of the report - that the board is satisfied that in the circumstances of this case the export price is the best price that could be negotiated by the applicant in this particular United States market, Mr. Speaker. So what this shows, Mr. Speaker, is that the National Energy Board has confirmed that this is indeed the best price that Manitobans can derive.

It does indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there is a benefit to Northern States Power, and when I announced the sale I said that any sale, any deal, should have benefit

to both parties and I indicated that there was a benefit to Northern States Power. I also indicated that, in present value dollars, would have a \$400 million profit and, in as received dollars over the life of the contract, would receive \$1.7 billion in profit, figures which have been confirmed and corroborated by the National Energy Board despite them saying that we would not receive one cent of profit, there would be a break-even proposition at best. Mr. Speaker, those arguments were proven to be completely and totally wrong by the National Energy Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind members that a question should not be a speech, however short; and answers should also not be a speech, however short.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that advice. I simply asked the Minister a simple question. This is a private company that hopes to make money, profit - it's a dirty word with you people - on the sale of power.

I am simply asking - if he doesn't know, stand up and say so - how much profit is Northern States Power going to make on the block of power that we have contracted to sell them for 12 years from the year 1993 to the year 2005?

If he hasn't done the analysis, then just stand up and say so.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I would be very very happy to indicate that in terms of the sharing of the benefits from this particular sale that Manitoba Hydro calculates that it will make some \$1.7 billion in benefits.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the point of order is that there ought to be some relationship of the answer to the question asked. I did not ask the Honourable Minister what Manitoba Hydro's proposed or potential profit will be, I simply asked him what Northern States Power Corporation profit will be. If the Minister does not wish to answer that question, I am quite prepared to accept "no" as an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think I would like to rise on a point of order. I have now tried to answer questions by the Member for Lakeside twice. He didn't like the answers, Mr. Speaker, so he got up on false points of order. Surely, at some stage someone would call that type of irresponsible behaviour to task.

I did indicate that Manitoba makes a significant profit. I indicated that Northern States Power believes that it will make a significant profit. I do not believe it will be nearly as great as Manitoba's, but at the same time consistently I have said that Northern States will derive

a benefit from this deal, as will Manitoba Hydro, and as will the people of Manitoba. I believe that that's the foundation upon which good deals are made, Mr. Speaker, they should be fair to both sides because in the future, since we're dealing with a renewable energy resource; namely, Manitoba Hydro, we'd like in the future to have more deals, and that can be done if they are based on a solid fair foundation. We believe we've established that solid, fair foundation in this particular export sale agreement, Mr. Speaker, and we believe the National Energy Board has in fact confirmed that as well. The only group that isn't happy with this, Mr. Speaker, right now, in all of Manitoba, is the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Minister have a point of order?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't believe that the Federal Conservative Party is against this particular deal.

Limestone - advertising campaign

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House and to Manitobans how much money will be spent on an advertising campaign, and when that advertising campaign will commence with respect to the Limestone project?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, now that Limestone is definitely a go, there is something in the order of 6,000 construction years of employment, something like 11,000 spinoff jobs that are available to Manitobans. We'll be able to have more Manitobans in those jobs, both on the construction side and with the spinoff jobs, if they are properly informed of what those opportunities are.

I have been asked by groups that I have seen over the last six months, make sure that the information is gotten out to us, Mr. Speaker, so we will conduct a fair, honest and informative program, far unlike the Conservative program prior to 1981 when they had no programs under way and were spending literally hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars to tell people that they were sitting on a gold mine, when they had absolutely nothing to offer the people of Manitoba.

We, on the other hand, have something solid to offer, Mr. Speaker, so we'll be quite pleased to inform the public of their opportunities to partake in that development to their benefit.

Limestone - project financing

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

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines as well. Can the Minister advise the House whether he contemplates undertaking project financing for the Limestone station?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: That is more properly a question for the Minister of Finance, in that financing is generally arranged by the Minister of Finance and Department of Finance. I must say there have been people who have come to us saying that there might be possibilities for project financing of all or part of this particular project because of the NSP contract.

At the same time, I believe that the Department of Finance will have to measure whether in fact they can get a better rate doing it the way they've done because they've been very successful over the last three years of getting very very good rates for Manitoba in various markets.

Had they followed the advice of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't have been as successful. So I put my faith in the Minister of Finance and the Department of Finance to get us the best possible deal.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then, either to the Minister of Energy and Mines or to the Minister of Finance. Would project financing preclude the possibility of the government diverting revenues from the sale away from Manitoba Hydro and into the general revenues of the province?

HON. W. PARASIUK: That's getting fairly close to hypothetical, but I understand the answer to be no.

HERizons - withdrawal

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Given what she said yesterday that she was not familiar and had never seen HERizons magazine, and given that I sent her a sample of its contents yesterday, I would like to ask her whether she has now formed an opinion on it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question seeks an opinion. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could combine that with another question, and say to her that, given it took her only 60 minutes to order the withdrawal of Midcontinental Magazine having seen it, I'd like to ask her whether she has now had an opportunity to examine or look at HERizons magazine and will be ordering its withdrawal from our public libraries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for what I presume to be a gift that he sent over to me. I regret to say that I have had a great deal of material on my desk that I assumed, or believed, was more important to read. I have still not, either seen nor reviewed the magazine that he is suggesting.

I remind the member opposite that what I did say yesterday is the Department of Education does not

review periodicals, newspapers, nor magazines. It is an impossible task that we are absolutely unable to undertake. That clearly is the responsibility of the school divisions. They must review, not only all periodicals that they choose to put on the shelf, but the content of each periodical and magazine that comes through the doors of the school, prior to putting it on the shelves of the libraries. I made that quite clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that this magazine has been around for five years during the regime of the present Minister - and she was able to free herself from her heavy burden for 60 minutes to look at this filthy Midcontinental article - could she not find the time to examine a magazine which some people think is equally bad or worse?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given the urgency of the question, that this is a magazine, that in the judgment of many people is unfit and unsuitable for our students, I simply ask the Minister whether she will take the time to peruse the magazine in the near future and make a decision as she did last week?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, what I did take the time to do, as I said yesterday, was to immediately inform boards of the other periodical and indicate that it should be, if they had it on their shelves - which we haven't had any indication so far that they have - that they should remove it from their shelves. I also in that letter have reminded them of the role that they play and the responsibility they play in perusing magazines and periodicals. So I have asked them to be vigilant; I've asked them to do their job and for them to do the review of content of all magazines, periodicals and newspapers prior to putting it on the shelves. I did take that time to do that very important job.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister received a letter yesterday from the editor of HERizons magazine which the education critic and I also received a copy of, courtesy of that publication. They indicated that magazine is in at least 20 Winnipeg high schools for over two years. Will the Minister take some swift action?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated what my communication is to the school divisions. It is that librarians and teachers have the responsibility to review them all, that they should be taking it very seriously, reviewing every periodical and magazine before they put it on the shelf, and that is where the responsibility should and does lie.

Headingley Jail - Break-in Classified Information storage building

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My questions are because of the break-in at the building where classified information regarding

Headingley jail was stored. Can the Minister tell me why classified and important documents relating to activities at Headingley jail, containing such information as suicidal tendencies, plans for prison breaks supplied by informers, along with names and addresses of the informers, can the Minister tell this House why these important and recently active documents were stored in an old, unsupervised building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to clarify the situation about the files at Headingley. The building where the files were stored was, in fact, a brick building on the property of Headingley. It was secured by bars on the front, or internal bars, double padlocks on the rear doors, individual padlocks on each of the rooms, and it had heavy wire mesh windows. Mr. Speaker, on, or prior to, March 13th these locks were forcibly broken into and forcible entry did occur.

Now the department heard about it via a reporter from The Sun, who called, and they were asked to return the files immediately, because it was probable that they were taken from Crown property in an illegal way, and the files were, in fact, returned later that afternoon.

A police investigation is under way with regard to the forcible entry into the building. In reviewing the handling of files, I assured myself that there were no legal or medical files, or employee files, that were there; but the material that was there, some of it should remain confidential, and although we thought that the building was reasonably secure, events have proven that it was not completely secure, so we are carefully reviewing procedures to ensure that there can be no such breach in future.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell this House whether persons, other than the reporter, obtained information from the prison files which were readily available to anyone over - we don't know how long - over a period of time.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the events that occurred between the forcible entry and the recovery of the files are the subject of police investigation. Obviously, we don't know who had access or what was done with the material, although we do have assurance from the reporter that no copies were made and that all the files were, in fact, returned to us. Until the police complete their report, we aren't in a position to give any more definitive answer.

Headingley Jail - Break-in Classified Information Storage - protection of informers

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell me whether extra protection will be given to persons who acted as informers and whose names and addresses were listed in the classified document?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the question does jump to many conclusions. The summary of the

documents that were there has been given to me and I've asked the department to review them and see whether there is, in fact, any risk. To date, we don't believe there is, but I am assured that they will take extra precautions if they think that would be necessary.

MR. A. BROWN: What plans does the Minister have to protect those inmates and guards who acted as informers and whose lives could be in jeopardy as a result of information readily available because of this break-in?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite has access to information beyond what I have, perhaps he will let me know and I'll follow it up but, to my knowledge, that sort of information is not freely available.

MR. A. BROWN: I can tell the Minister that I have no information on this, I'm trying to gather information. Can the Minister assure this House that no persons, other than her staff and the reporter, had access to those classified documents?

HON. M. SMITH: I think I've already answered that question that, to our knowledge, the break-in occurred probably a day before the actual recovery of the files. We're not in a position to know what was done with them. We don't have any information that would lead us to conclude one thing or the other. What we do know is that we appear to have all the files back in our possession.

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

HANSARD CORRECTIONS

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

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, on the Throne Speech Debate which took place on Thursday, March 14, 1985, 8:00 p.m., on Page 144, in the third paragraph where I was stating numbers of population for various countries, there is a printing error in number. It should read East Germany, instead of 70 million, it should be 17 million; Czechoslovakia instead of 60 million - I wish they had that many people - should be 16 million. Mr. Speaker, I'm not putting the blame on anyone, due to an error in my own pronunciation problem.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the member for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Yes, I, too, want to make a Hansard correction. The spelling is incorrect in yesterday's Throne Speech Debate. On Page 213, March 18th, of the Hansard, the third paragraph from the bottom, on the first column, where I said "last week I was with the Premier in Weskachmik" and Wasagamack is spelled incorrectly. The correct spelling is W-a-s-a-g-a-m-a-c-k.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development has 22 minutes remaining.

HON. J. COWAN: Last evening, Mr. Speaker, when I was concluding my remarks, I was on the subject of how the Conservatives are going around and around in circles trying to catch their "federal tail" to apologize and, at the same time, justifies and at the same time, seek to protect what they believe are the political interests of their provincial party against the cutbacks at the federal level, and we've gone through a whole series of those. Before going on to talk a bit more about what New Democrats have been working toward over the past number of years and outlining in the Throne Speech, I'd like to comment briefly on Hydro, because I think it is a topic of some interest to us in this Chamber.

You know, to listen to what was said here today one would have to reflect back upon the remarks of previous days and wonder just what it is that the Conservative party in this province intends to do regarding Limestone, because we hear the Member for Turtle Mountain making some sort of generalizations as to how they might think about stopping the project if they had that opportunity, and in talking about how the project will cost tens of billions of dollars for Manitobans. And those inconsistencies, as confusing as they are, are beginning to betray the real strategy of the opposition in respect to Limestone; and that's to say so many different things then nobody can figure out what they're saying and what they're going to do and, through confusion, try to gloss over their lack of any policy whatsoever and any planning whatsoever. Well, they may talk about stopping it if they get the chance, but let it be very clear they will never have that chance.

We talked a bit about unemployment and the tragedy of it for the individual Manitoban, and how this government is committed to doing everything in its power to ensure that we are able to provide the economic opportunities and the jobs for Manitobans that will pull them from that tragedy. The work that the Minister of Energy and Mines has done over the past number of years, in respect to hydro development and other developments, shows very clearly that, not only do we want to build an economic base in this province, but we want to build an economic base that serves the needs of Manitobans and provides them with jobs and meaningful employment.

So we talked, and New Democrats do, put together programs toward a more humane workers compensation system. We've talked about that. We talk about and we put in place programs for fairer labour-management legislation. We put in programs for better pensions for older workers. We put in programs and legislation to bring about safer and healthier workplaces. We put in programs to provide real opportunity through affirmative action and pay equity; that's what New Democrats do. You recall last night that we were talking about what we do and what the Conservatives say.

What do they talk about? What do the Conservatives talk about when we do all that? They talk about big unions and union bosses. They don't talk about the workers who are being injured on the job; they don't talk about the pensioners who need a better deal and a fairer deal; they don't talk about the women and the other minorities in our society that deserve affirmative action and pay equity; they don't talk about the type of legislation that allows people to have rights within the workplace and to exercise those rights in a responsible way. They talk about big unions and union bosses as if that discredits everything we did.

New Democrats work to protect our water resources through strong and, I might add, very successful opposition to the Garrison Project. What do the Conservatives talk about? The Conservatives talked about how we shouldn't upset our state legislators to the south; that's what they talked about.

New Democrats build upon expanding economic opportunity through innovative uses of the co-operative model. What do the Conservatives say? Well, they say nothing about that, listen to their speeches in any response to the initiatives that were outlined in respect to co-operatives, they say nothing.

The example of what we do and what they say is the same in almost every instance. We share the confidence and the optimism that Manitobans have in their province and in their economic future. They complain and they criticize everything, whether it's the hydro development; whether it's the policy for hiring and training that will flow out of that development; whether it's the Workplace, Safety and Health legislation that saves lives; whether it's the pensions that make people more comfortable in their old age. Whatever it is, they complain and they criticize and they lack any sense of confidence in any optimism for this province.

So there is a choice. They're not telling us what their platform is and what their policy is and what they would do in a positive way but, through their speeches and through their comments and through their constant complaining and criticizing, it becomes clearer and clearer what it is they intend not to do. There is a choice, and that choice will become more evident as we compare that which our government and the people of Manitoba have been able to accomplish by setting realistic goals and working together towards them, and the short-sighted comments and criticisms of the Conservatives opposite.

Now I've been fairly blunt in my criticism of the Conservatives, and I'll freely admit that I have probably taken their words as much out of context for my own purposes, as they have taken our Throne Speech out of context for their own purposes. As well, I have probably been as selective in my choices in my recollections which I relate to you, as they are in their choice of statistics and examples.

Mr. Speaker, you know that's certainly part of our respective jobs as politicians on opposite sides of this House and on opposite sides of the political spectrum; you see it far too often, but there is another part of our job as politicians; and that is to provide leadership for, no matter where we might want to take this province through our work in this House and in our constituencies, we must do so through that leadership.

Time and circumstances are neutral unto themselves, they do not change things. Leaders, ordinary people,

all of us shape our own age through discipline, information, courage, timing and, on the odd occasion, a bit of collective inspiration. Most of us come to this political arena with strong beliefs, with a hatred of injustice, however we might define that injustice, and with a sincere desire to build a better world. There are many difficult issues we must face as constituency politicians, in my own case, what is happening in Lynn Lake; or as Ministers of the Crown, in my own case, in how to provide support to an expanding co-operative sector through new initiatives; or as people who are genuinely concerned about our society when we talk about health care issues and pensions and others.

So it's not our desire for change that separates us from time to time, but rather it is our perception of how things should be done and what our ultimate goals should be that breathe fire into the debate. We all start out with certain disagreements - I strongly suspect that we'll all end up with certain disagreements. At the same time, we are learning, or at least I am trying to learn and others as well, to respect our respective rights to differ. In order to do so, we must not ignore our own fallibilities, or lose sight of our mutual objectives, or ignore or disregard our singular but important perspectives. So it's not a perfect world, and our own imperfections are woven within the fabric of Manitoba and the world in which we live.

It is with those thoughts in mind that I make this contribution to the Throne Speech Debate. I want to share some recent experience with my colleagues and members opposite, because I believe that these short vignettes put the proper perspective on the work that we undertake in these Chambers.

The other day I was speaking to a group of university students. All of those students wanted to see more funding flowing to their campus. I have to tell you that they were realistic in their expectations but, nonetheless, they want to maintain the quality of their education and their accessibility to it.

One of those students happened to be from British Columbia, and he was in Manitoba because of the cutbacks in his home province and the rise in tuition fees there. There is a lesson in that individual's story. He was concerned, as well, about the amount of funding to the Manitoba universities, but more than that he was thankful to be able to get an education, because he had seen what the alternative can be like and he didn't like what he saw.

So when we talked about what's happening here in Manitoba, let us also talk about what is happening in other jurisdictions because, within this country, we're all confronted with the same challenges and the same problems. I think you can tell how a government or a political party might respond to those challenges here in Manitoba by looking at what is happening where that political party governs in another province.

Just last month, I was in a small reserve community in my own constituency, and we were talking about hydro development. We've had a fair series of those discussions over the past number of months through the tours of the Working Group on Northern Involvement in Hydro Development, and I was talking with an older gentleman, and he had worked on previous projects so he had some first-hand experience about hydro development and what it means to the Native population in Northern Manitoba.

He had been lucky, he had been able to work on those projects, but he had seen far too many of his friends and his neighbours and his relatives unable to work alongside it. So it's not unusual that he would feel that his own employment was more a matter of luck than a policy and the statistics support that perception.

Northerners, particularly Northern Natives, have not had equal access to the jobs and economic opportunities during the previous hydro construction periods. That was indeed the case; there is no doubt about that. Notwithstanding all the good intentions and the honest efforts of many, the fact is that too few Northerners, northern businesses were able to take full advantage of the opportunities of hydro development.

This gentleman, who had much to say and from whom we can learn much, wants things to be different this time. That's what he told me. He wants things to be different this time. You see, he wants his sons and his daughters, who are now the age that he was at that time, or about the same age, to have a fair chance at those jobs. That's what he is asking for, a fair chance at those jobs, and we know the circumstances that keep them from those jobs are special. Therefore, the efforts that we must undertake to make certain that they get that fair chance has to be special.

There are so few opportunities in the North, in general, for the sons and daughters of this man. That is why Limestone is so important to him; that is why Limestone is so important to the thousands of others like him. That is why it is so important that we are able to provide the type of special support that is necessary for many like him throughout Northern Manitoba to finally have a fair chance.

That's not a short-sighted goal or objective; that's a type of program and policy that leads to a better Manitoba generation over generation. So when we talk to this man's sons and daughters, there will still be problems, but we can talk about the successes that we were able to accomplish by working together, by listening to each other and by having respect or the desire that we all have to play a meaningful role shaping our province, shaping our future, shaping our society and making it a better place for sons and daughters, grandchildren.

Back to the city - the other night I was talking to a member of a housing co-operative and she told me about her co-op. She was proud of the fact that she was on the executive and that it was a successful co-op and that, through the efforts of herself and many others like her, they were providing quality service at a reasonable cost and, most importantly, in a democratic fashion.

She was pleased with our new program, Co-operative HomeStart - I hope the Minister of Housing notes that - but she was also concerned about the rumours of the possible federal cutbacks in the co-operative housing sector. We have all heard those rumours and they are causing that sort of concern among members of co-ops that exist today among those who might wish to be members of co-ops. She asked me if we would take care at a provincial level not only to relay her concerns and the concerns of her housing co-operative to our counterparts in the Federal Government but also to make certain that our own programs supported her efforts in her housing co-op to build a democratic

structure and at the same time provide affordable housing. She wanted to work with this government to build a stronger co-operative sector. I think we can do that.

So those individuals and hundreds of thousands of others like them across the province are the reason we are here. Imperfect as we may be, we seek to serve them. They are the reason that this Throne Speech is before us and, imperfect as it may be, it is authored upon a desire to try to serve them to the best of our abilities, and that is why we are speaking to it because we happen to be just egocentric enough to think that our own thoughts and our own comments are important to the process. They are important issues.

I would like to revert back to something I said earlier in my speech about the vision - it falls on that note - because I think it is important to not only put our own work in the proper perspective and context, but the vision which this government carries to this Throne Speech through the debate in this House and, most importantly, to the people of this province in a day-to-day dialogue about their hopes, their concerns, their aspirations, their suggestions and ideas, and even their constructive criticisms is important to all of us.

The Throne Speech and this government and they, the people of Manitoba, speak to that vision of Manitoba. It's very clear. The message, as I said last night, is a simple one. Manitobans and our government are working together to build a better future. We have been able to weather the most recent recession better than any other province not because this government is better than any other government in this country, but because this government has taken the time to listen to those people and to work alongside with those people to build the type of policy and program that leads to proper planning and a strong commitment to a fair and equitable society.

Our vision is an economic strategy that works in a social system that is protected and improved. We believe, and we say that in the Throne Speech and we say that in our speeches, that by continuing to work with each other, the government and the people of Manitoba side by side, we can build upon our mutual efforts and our successes of the past three years and we can improve conditions for the ordinary Manitoban.

So the vision is that of a responsive economy where the individual is respected and we care each for the other and we do things each for the other, and the vision is an economic strategy that puts Manitoba first by providing the opportunity for meaningful jobs while improving our communities and securing our economic future.

When that economic strategy works, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba works and that is what this Throne Speech is saying to you and saying to the people in this Chamber and saying to the people of this province and anyone else who cares to listen is that Manitoba is working and we are proud of it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was privileged to be able to participate in the Throne Speech in this Legislature. It is, after all, the document

that is purported to lay out the future, limited as it may be, and of course, Mr. Speaker, it affords us individual members in the Legislature one of the few opportunities where we can use the latitude that traditions of this House have allowed us to enter into a debate that pretty well covers the waterfront.

I join my colleagues and others that have spoken before me in offering the congratulations of myself to you, Sir; to the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech; to the new Minister that has joined the Treasury Bench, the Member for The Pas.

It grieves me to see a reasonably decent person like the Member for The Pas, who I've had the privilege of doing some travelling with, join that gang of renegades that is known as the Cabinet, you know, for the Province of Manitoba. I fear for his soul, for his future character and for the stunting of what could be, I'm sure, a long and fruitful career for the Honourable Member for The Pas.

Mr. Speaker, I also note that during this particular debate on this particular Speech from the Throne, there have been a number of indications by members that perhaps this may be their last, or that they are retiring from this Chamber, I note specifically the Member for Ste. Rose, the Member for Virden, the Member for Roblin-Russell, the Member for Elmwood. Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to some of the members, particularly perhaps to the Member for Ste. Rose who made his speech sound indeed like a true farewell, that it may be somewhat premature because it's my indication that this Legislature will bring us back to Session one more time before this Legislature ends. However, that of course is not for members of the opposition to decide; that is up to the will of the Premier and this government as to when they are prepared to meet that roll call way up yonder or out yonder in the Province of Manitoba, which we all meet from time to time when the people decide who should be privileged to sit in this Chamber and who should represent them.

Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, those of you who have some knowledge of the traditions of the Constituency of Lakeside and perhaps remember one of my immediate predecessors, the Honourable D.L. Campbell, it should not be accepted as immodest of me if I indicate to you, Sir, that I look forward, now that I am nearing the halfway mark of my legislative career, to serve hopefully with more maturity and added experience and wisdom the Constituency of Lakeside that I have been extremely proud and privileged to represent these past number of years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with those opening comments out of the way, let me indicate to you one of the reasons why I look forward to participating in this Throne Speech. Sir, it's been my lot in political life to have moved not just once but twice from the government side to the opposition side. Although there are certain benefits on the opposition side, I do acknowledge to you, Sir, that it really is more fun being government, and there is more purpose in life being government, and there's more challenge in life being government; so I intend and I look forward to having that opportunity of being government very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, even on a greater scale, I go back and I can remember having these thoughts on a fine September day. It was a great September day, September 4th, when finally that coalition of New

Democrats and Liberals that ran this country for 16 years was set aside and a new era dawned in Canada. A new Conservative administration took office in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, let's not delude ourselves; it was a coalition of the Liberal and NDP that has ruled this country for the last 16 or more years.

We all recall the sustenance that Mr. Lewis gave and Mr. Trudeau when he was in the minority position in 1973. We know the sustenance that Mr. Broadbent gave Mr. Trudeau again when the short-lived Clark Government was defeated. Mr. Speaker, those of us who take the time to read some of the personal biographies of some of the main actors, the former Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, and some of his confederates, Messrs. Marchand, Pelletier, they openly acknowledge, always have, that they were first and initially members of the New Democratic Party and then decided that, particularly down east and particularly in Quebec where the New Democrats have yet to elect a member, that it wasn't getting them anywhere, so they kind of joined the Liberal Party, or seconded the Liberal Party to their cause.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's entirely accurate to refer to the Liberals and the New Democrats as the coalition that have governed this country for far too long, and have brought this country into very serious problems, fiscally, socially, economically and, Mr. Speaker, that's what has to change.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as much as I enjoyed that evening on September 4th when the northern half of this grand and great continent turned a beautiful hue of blue from the Maritimes to Vancouver, as the song goes, "From Bonavista to Vancouver Island," and then a few months later to be able to watch, I believe it was November 6th, to watch that same scene repeat itself when that Prince of Peace, President Reagan, was re-elected. Mr. Speaker, you saw 49, 50 states turn that same colour of blue, depending on what network you were watching - all but two, Mr. Speaker - and my tired soul was revived and lifted at that point, and I saw indeed that there was an opportunity for ordinary people, individuals applying common sense to their governments to change the direction of their governments and to offer new hope. — (Interjection) — Indeed as the Member for Morris says, not just to us who are privileged to live in this land, but indeed to mankind and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat — (Interjection) — I am. I won't digress, as the Member for Inkster did at great length, but I must tell you and I'm pleased to put it on the record. I am deeply saddened and discouraged at the hostility, the open disdain that is being exhibited in this country and particularly in this Legislature by so-called responsible legislators of our great and true friends, the Americans, who we are privileged to share our border with, with whom we have never had any serious difficulties with, who have always stood on the side of freedom in defence of that hope and of that position when called upon that for some reason, specifically in this province and indeed throughout this country, there seems to be a desire to heap scorn and abuse on our friends, the Americans. Mr. Speaker, that should not encourage any of us.

Mr. Speaker, in even a personal way they heap abuse on the President of the United States who has shown, as only a person can show in an open, free society, that his people like what he's telling them and like the

direction he's taking the country. The constant jibes, the constant references to President Reagan as the big actor, at the big theatrical performance that's taking place in the United States, you put that against the theatrical performance that you saw of the Leader of the other superpower.

If you want to talk about acting, if you want to talk about theatre, look at the performance that many of us witnessed just a little while ago about the late Leader of the Soviet Union. You know, that nation cannot be honest with respect to their Leader's health. They propped him up supposedly in a hospital room to make it look that he was approaching a ballot booth. He had to stand and barely leaned upon a chair. Official reports said that he was vacationing, that he had a cold, that he couldn't meet, when in fact the man was dying or indeed was dead. Mr. Speaker, these are people that we're supposed to conclude important treaties with? These are people whose word is supposed to be acknowledged?

Mr. Speaker, I am just saddened at the kind of nonsense we hear from members opposite when it comes to our friends and our allies, the Americans. Mr. Speaker, it is not said often enough. Canada is not a neutral country. We are not a neutral country. We are friends of the Americans. We support the alliance, and we are opposed to totalitarian governments and we have needs and we have concerns about that. That means allowing our territory and our country to be used in that defence. Of course it does! We're not standing in the middle between two superpowers. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

I am disturbed, saddened and annoyed when that comes into this Legislature and is allowed to be perpetuated in this Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only tell you, Sir, it did my Conservative Party nothing but good to see that whole continent turn a lovely hue of blue, firstly on September 4th, then November 6th. And, Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly it is our turn now, and it will be our turn very shortly here in the Province of Manitoba to complete that map, to attempt to write some of the direction, or at least point to a new direction that this country has been on, not only here, but in the States for all too many years.

Mr. Speaker, without being overly harsh on those who have run the affairs of this country for these many years, the truth of the matter, whether it is in Education, whether it is in Economic Development, whether it is in job creation, whether it is in Natural Resources, or development, it hasn't worked. — (Interjection) — Yes, we're in trouble. We have the 1.5 million people unemployed because of the policies of the coalition that governed this country for the last 16 years, the Liberals and the New Democrats, not because Brian Mulroney has been in office for five months.

Mr. Speaker, we could be taking a leaf out of what our friends are doing across the border. They are doing a better job at putting people back to work; they are doing a better job at controlling inflation; and they are doing a better job of increasing that pie of national wealth from which we all want slices, Mr. Speaker, the needy, the poor, the underprivileged and the minorities. Instead of worrying and fighting about that pie that can't increase, Mr. Speaker, just watch what's happening, and that's what has to happen in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I'm at least prepared to give our new government in Ottawa a considerable length of time to sort out the mess that they've inherited, to attempt to put the country on that course. I'm delighted that my Prime Minister is on the terms that he obviously is with the President of the United States, that they can meet with such cordiality, that there obviously is a rapport between those two leaders that can't help but auger well for the future of our respective countries. Mr. Speaker, so much for the national scene. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, blarney, it was indicated. I would far sooner have a little blarney, a little bit of humour, even a poor tenor trying to sing "While Irish Eyes are Smiling," than the kind of music that they like to march through, that comes from the Kremlin, that comes from Moscow, that comes from other places like that. — (Interjection) — Darn right. You hear the muffled cadence of jack boots every time you look at them. That's right, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: So let's all put up with a bit of "Irish Eyes are Smiling," Mr. Speaker, because I like freedom, I like to breathe the free air and I want my children to breathe free air.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal briefly with the matter that I have a principal responsibility for and, of course, a great deal of concern for. But before I want to do it, another one of the great Information Services pieces crossed my desk this morning, and I couldn't help but be reminded by the speech that my colleague and former desk mate made just a few days ago, the Member for Turtle Mountain, when he demonstrated this government's capability of double speaking. Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Health a little while ago cut chiropractic services. Right? Everybody understands that. — (Interjection) — no, no. This is what my colleague was talking about - doublespeak. You see, now we get out a news release: "Chiropractic benefit limit is increased". Now, the doublespeak they acknowledged. Earlier this year the Minister announced that the annual benefit limits for insured chiropractic service had been amended. You see, when they decrease, that's amended. Now, having cut the services, they are now coming under pressure because of 17,000 letters, because of 20,000 phone calls and because he's worrying his Premier to death about what's happening in the political scene, he's increased the benefits a little, out comes the doublespeak: "Chiropractic benefit limit is increased". What a classic example of doublespeak.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the question of Hydro development, and let me say at the outset, that there is a very fundamental difference between our approach and the Conservative Party to Hydro development and that of the New Democrats, our socialist friends.

Mr. Speaker, our approach stems from the kind of vision that people like Duff Roblin had, the kind of people like Mr. Stevens had, the then Manager of General Hydro and Deputy Minister for the Department of Natural Resources. It is understood on this side of the House that the true and lasting benefits of Hydro development is the use that the energy created by those

developments can be put to. That is the lasting important benefit of developing that resource. That is the only justification, for in some instances they're spoiling some of our natural resources, of flooding some of our lands, of damaging some of the other resources in the trade offs that are sometimes called upon, that have to be made if you want to harness that kind of a natural resource.

My friends opposite, they look as the major economic benefit coming from the construction of the dam. Now let me say that again, and we heard it again today. You heard it when the Minister talked about the 6,000 person years and the 11,000 person year spinoff jobs. All it was - the now, the now, the jobs, the jobs. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I can understand, I'm a politician, that is a short-term fix. When this government or their representatives speak to a vested interest group like the contractors - and I don't blame the contractors, they've had pretty mean, lean and hungry years - of course they'll stand up and cheer them. Or, indeed, if they go and speak to some of their northern constituencies who are particularly anxious to have some immediate employment at some of those jobs, of course they will applaud them, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, there lies a fundamental difference between the approach to Hydro development.

They look at the economic spinoffs and benefits coming from the construction of the dam. We look at the use of the energy those dams will create and provide for our economic spinoffs, and that's why we don't build for building sake, Mr. Speaker. Does anybody in this House think for one minute that in 1981 as we approached an election, that we didn't realize, that we didn't hope, that we didn't understand the importance of having a major construction going on like Limestone, that politically we would have wanted to do it? But, Mr. Speaker, we were not satisfied that we could responsibly make that decision until every "i" was crossed and every "i" was dotted, that would have ensured Manitobans the use of that energy; firstly, here in Manitoba; then secondly, as Canadians, with our sister jurisdictions, our sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; and then thirdly, to our friends, the Americans.

I have no objection to selling power to the Americans, but it is ironic, Mr. Speaker. Some of you will recall, some of you will remember, in fact, they passed resolutions on this subject matter at NDP conventions. They even ran around this city with bumper stickers: NO TO CONTINENTAL ENERGY POLICY. Remember that in the late '60s and early '70s? There was a concern expressed specifically by the New Democrats about the possibility of some of the initiatives that were coming from the south, that when the first concerns about energy were being seriously raised, that there should be a sharing of energy resources on the North American continent, and the New Democrats said, no, no, particularly no to the Americans. We're not going to share our energy with the Americans.

What's happened to them now when they're facing an election? Now they have just turned our policy around. You see, Mr. Speaker, their priorities are wrong. Our priorities, my priority as a Manitoban, is to use that power for Manitoba first, but I want the jobs in Manitoba. I want our engineers having those jobs in Manitoba. I want our kids having those jobs in Manitoba.

then I am prepared to share with my fellow Canadians in Alberta or in Saskatchewan and Ontario; that's No. 2. And No. 3, if we have surplus, then I'll sell it to my friends, the Americans.

These New Democrats, because they're in a hurry for an election, they have just reversed the order. They are selling to the Americans first, not providing any long-term jobs . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . in Manitoba, not to speak of, fulfilling their obligations as Canadians, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, all of that, that could simply be, although I think it is a very valid position to put forward, and one that I certainly feel very comfortably whenever called to speak upon on a public platform, Manitobans understand that language. They understand; they understand the importance of creating the jobs here.

When you export power, you export the jobs. These 500 megawatts of power that we're sending to Minneapolis are going to keep the factories in Minneapolis busy. They're going to employ the jobs in Minneapolis, not in Manitoba, not in Winnipeg. So, Mr. Speaker, they understand that. They understand it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were only left at that, if it were only simply a question that we had a different vision with respect to how the development of Hydro should take place as compared to our friends opposite, if that was all, maybe it wouldn't even be so bad. We do have unemployment. Our construction industry is particularly hard hit. It wouldn't be that bad. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a far more serious problem around the manner and way in which this government is proceeding. Because of their political timetable, they have made the political decision, and it's not supported by the National Energy Board, to advance the construction of Limestone to meet their political time schedule, Mr. Speaker. Then it becomes a very legitimate question, a very legitimate concern to ask who's going to pay for the advancement costs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something that many many people in Manitoba understand, and they understood it when we reminded them of that in this paper that so many of the members opposite like to refer to during their contribution to the Throne Speech. It's so straightforward; it's so simple, Mr. Speaker. There it is, your stable Progressive Conservative Years of Hydro Costs from 1964 on. This interregnum represents the NDP years when they skyrocketed 160 percent. Hydro rates went up 160 percent in four short years. Then came regrettably all too short a period of time of another four years of a Progressive Conservative Government, and hydro again stabilized - no increase. Now we're back on the rise figure, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier and his New Democrats have been in power for three years. The question that Manitobans are asking themselves today as this government runs around with roses in their lapels is how much higher is that line going to go? How much higher is that line going to go?

The National Energy Board says that it will go up 68 percent to industrial users. The Manitoba Hydro people have indicated to us, when they last spoke to us at the committee, that we can expect 7 percent, 8 percent, 10-percent increases annually . . .

A MEMBER: Where'd you get that? What page?

MR. H. ENNS: . . . right out of the book.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something. When any political party and when members put together material like this franking piece, we have to be concerned about its accuracy. After all, it goes out to everybody's home, and we know that particularly members opposite will read it very critically. It is surprising, although it has been referred to, they have not found a single error. They have not pointed out a single mistake in this publication, not one. They made references to it. They have not argued with the charts . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . because, Mr. Speaker, they are accurate.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there it is.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Are the members ready to proceed?
The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in response to a question by my leader, the Premier indicated to my leader that the decision to proceed with Limestone was made in 1981. It was on their election material and on their election platform.

A MEMBER: There's more truth in that.

MR. H. ENNS: There is a great deal of truth to that, Mr. Speaker. That really, Mr. Speaker, is what should be concerning Manitobans.

You see, Mr. Speaker, if ever there should be an issue in Manitoba that should be non-partisan, it is the development of our Hydro, because there is common agreement on all sides of this House. There has been, all these many years. All Manitobans recognize that we Manitobans are singularly blessed by the fact that the waters come down from the west coast along the mighty Churchill and South Saskatchewan Rivers. They reach into the mid-portions of the U.S. and the drainage area up to Wisconsin and North Dakota, South Dakota, the whole basin to the east of us, Lake of the Woods system. All of that water funnels into our Lake Winnipeg system and then up to our Nelson River system, and we can use it. So there is no argument, there is no division of opinion about the importance of that resource, Mr. Speaker.

I'll tell you what the difficulty is, Mr. Speaker. It's when politicians - and, Mr. Speaker, I'll use the word "politicians," because we can all be seduced when we think that there are politics involved. The seduction

that the New Democrats have allowed themselves particularly to be involved with is the vote buying of the construction of dams, rather than the more sober, long-headed planning and thinking about how that Hydro should be used, Mr. Speaker. That's the difference.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, and it may well be part of the reason why I'm now again in opposition and those of my colleagues are in opposition, because it was more important to me to have that firm commitment made with Alcan, to have those permanent jobs here, not 6,000 person year jobs, but 6,000 for every year into infinity, not just construction jobs. You talk about the spinoff jobs that a development like Alcan would have provided. I speak particularly, Mr. Speaker, with some vehemence on this subject matter, because it was my good fortune that plant was to be located in the Interlake, an area and a region that for too many years has been under-developed, particularly industrially-speaking, and that, Mr. Speaker, would have been the kind of marriage where you take the natural resource - yes, you spend the public dollars to develop it because it is a public resource - you make the kind of prudent arrangements, business arrangements with the private sector that can then turn that resource into long-lasting jobs and benefits for this Province of Manitoba.

This government, these Ministers squandered that opportunity away, Mr. Speaker, squandered it away. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Premier of this province that Limestone now would be well into its third or fourth year of construction, had we been given the opportunity in 1981 to have carried out that decision. There's no question about it.

So when honourable members opposite want to try to push us into a corner about where we stand on Limestone, Limestone would have been midway built, halfway built if we would have been in office, Mr. Speaker. Of that, there can be no doubt.

Of course, we, like they, see the economic benefits of that project but, Mr. Speaker, we also understand what happens when you allow politics to interfere with the decision. The people of Manitoba found out in the years, 1975-76, when the Schreyer administration found it was seduced by the jobs that it was creating and we kept building and building and building. Mr. Speaker, they even found it necessary, although they tried to deny it, by June, July, certainly by August of the year, 1977, to put a halt to the Limestone construction. Mr. Speaker, let's put that firmly and clearly on the record.

It was the New Democrats that stopped Limestone construction. It was the New Democrats that then played very loosely with the truth when, in their publication, they talked about they would start up energy construction on the Nelson again. Mr. Speaker, the prospectus that was under their jurisdiction that they went to raise money with clearly indicates electric power construction which represented 15 percent of total construction expenditures in 1976 declined thereafter, reflecting decision made in mid 1977 by the Board of Manitoba Hydro and further hydro-electric generating capacity, in mid 1977, Mr. Speaker. I remind you the election was in November or October of that year, Mr. Speaker. So let's understand that.

To the Member for Thompson, I want you to go back to your constituency and tell the truth. The New

Democrats stopped the construction of Limestone, and I'll tell you why they stopped the construction of Limestone, Mr. Speaker. Because they were worried where this graph was taking them to, Mr. Speaker, that's why they stopped it. They even were worried about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the First Minister that the re-starting of the construction of Limestone was of the highest priority with the Lyon administration throughout the four short years that we had that opportunity to serve the country and the province; and the construction of Limestone would have taken place had we been satisfied that it could have taken place without impacting on the rate users in the manner that political decisions, forced on Hydro, had impacted on that utility before.

Well, Mr. Speaker, under no circumstances are we in any way reluctant to talk to the people of Manitoba about Hydro. In fact, Mr. Speaker, our mail and our response indicates that they expect us to talk about Hydro. They are concerned about Hydro, and they want to see it developed in an orderly manner. Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable we have a government today that is prepared to place its own benefit and its - and when I say its I mean it, the government, the NDP party - interest ahead of the people of Manitoba. And Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to take any other reading out of this current situation than that particular statement.

The actual application before the National Energy Board was for a one-year advancement, but that didn't fit their time schedule, so they had to advance it by two years, because they want that construction to commence. They have no political time schedule to march to, and they're prepared to sacrifice the orderly development of Hydro and the future of secure and stable Hydro rates of all Manitobans to be sacrificed at their own particular hour. Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy. Whenever this government and these Ministers have the courage to call the election - I said that wrong didn't I? - call up their courage and screw up the election, whenever they have that courage, or whenever they make that decision, Mr. Speaker, we'll meet them on the hustings; we'll beat them and we'll then manage the utility in the way it ought to be. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I begin my remarks today by congratulating the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the Member for Riel who acted as Movers and Seconders of the Throne Speech. I am sure that their constituents are as proud of their members of the Legislature as I am for their very valuable contribution that they have made to the debate during the Throne Speech.

I would also like to commend the Lieutenant-Governor for her excellent presentation of the delivery of the Throne Speech.

I welcome also, Sir, the new faces in the Legislature. First, the Deputy Clerk, the pages that we had present with us this afternoon and, of course, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry who was elected this past fall. I wish the Honourable Member well and I trust that his career as a member of the opposition will, indeed, be a long one.

Finally, Sir, to you, my very best wishes as you again preside over this chamber with a sense of fairness and decency to which we have grown accustomed to.

The United Nations has designated 1985 as International Youth Year; International Youth Year identifying development, participation, and peace. To be young, Mr. Speaker, is to have skills, talents, energies, dreams and aspirations. But, Sir, in 1985 is also to have fears; and the fears that come to mind in 1985 are quite different than the fears that existed amongst the youth of our generation. They are two principal fears - jobs and peace. The concern wasn't that kind of job necessary that I will have but whether or not there will be peace, whether or not there will be nuclear war, and that is a principal concern of young people today. I have found, in fact, Mr. Speaker, from my visits to various schools throughout the Province of Manitoba in speaking to our young people, high school age group, that peace and their concern about nuclear war is probably their number one concern in this year 1985.

Imagine, Sir, growing up in a world where one wonders that despite hard work, whether there'll be a world to live in. Our youth, Mr. Speaker, deserve better. Men and women elected to represent the interests of the province in the future, I would hope that all members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, will be exercising their duties and will pay special attention to the needs of our young people and to the legacy that we leave behind to them.

Mr. Speaker, my Ministers have taken a special opportunity presented by the International Youth Year, to plan improvements in permanent services for our young people in Manitoba. Programs that will help to ensure long-term employment and opportunities will permit young people to face the challenges of the 1980s and 1990s.

The single most important initiative is new programs innovated and developed by my government in respect to jobs and to training for young men and women. We're going to continue, Mr. Speaker, through this year beyond to improve and to develop those programs. Programs like Careerstart, programs to encourage young people to establish their own businesses, their own professional opportunities, to find permanent employment.

Mr. Speaker, the youth of Manitoba represents energy, enthusiasm, commitment, dedication and, Mr. Speaker, it is a responsibility, I believe, of all members in this Chamber to offer the young people of the Province of Manitoba hope and confidence in the future of this province.

In reflecting on the events of the past three years, there is none that we on this side of the House are more proud of than the fact that thousands of young Manitobans have returned to this province in the past three years. It indeed was a regrettable sequence as you can recall very well in the period 1977 to 1981 as we sat in this Chamber, and we were compelled to watch the fact that thousands of energetic, talented young people who wanted to exercise their talents, skills and energies in this province were forced to leave this province for other provinces because of the lack of opportunity in this province. They were forced to leave this province because the previous Conservative administration in this province was a complete and

total failure insofar as ensuring there be opportunity and challenges to be faced by young people.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard - and I don't know how better I can describe this - but so much crying and howling by honourable members across the way in respect to hydro-electric development. Mr. Speaker, we announced our intention in this Chamber to sell electricity to Northern States Power, to begin construction of the Limestone generating plant. But, Mr. Speaker, we have across the way members of the opposition that are afraid of their own shadows; we have an opposition across the way that are modern day Chicken Littles; we have an opposition across the way that indeed would do everything possible within their political opportunistic means to prevent the economic development of this province through energy development.

Mr. Speaker, they attacked the deal with Northern States Power; they attacked the development of Limestone. They went before the National Energy Board. The opposition went before the National Energy Board, Mr. Speaker, in a vain attempt to dissuade the National Energy Board from approving this venture on behalf of Manitobans, to prevent Manitobans from enjoying the benefits of the sale of energy to the Northern States Power. It was honourable members across the way that must bear responsibility for that.

The Leader of the Opposition went before the National Energy Board, Mr. Speaker, to argue that Manitoba Hydro had not done its homework, he said, and that all risks of the sale, he said, had not been analyzed. The board, Mr. Speaker, rebuked his arguments.

I quote from the report: "Some level of risk is always present in any major undertaking and it is satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to show that the risks associated with the proposed export sale are adequately examined by the application and found to be within acceptable bounds." That's what the National Energy Board had to say.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said that he doubted the Northern States Power transaction would bring a profit to Manitobans. I believe that at one point the Leader of the Opposition said that maybe it would be about a break-even point, were the words of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition may wish to deny now that he made those statements a few months ago. I wouldn't blame the Leader of the Opposition if he wants to rise in his place and attempt to deny that he made any such utterances a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, because again the National Energy Board, not the Manitoba New Democratic Party government, not Manitoba Hydro, disagreed and they supported the position of Manitoba Hydro in its application to the National Energy Board.

Mr. Speaker, let's go beyond to some other comments by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Limestone project should be delayed. I believe that remains the position of the Leader of the Opposition although mind you, it's very very hard to really figure out the position of the Leader of the Opposition on Limestone as well as a number of other issues these days.

The National Energy Board said, and I read to the Leader of the Opposition that, "The sale sequence from hydro's perspective, the excess of revenues over costs for the two-year advancement would be about 20 million

more than for the one-year advancement' - \$20 million more, the revenues, than for the one-year advancement. Finally, Sir, the Energy Board rebuked outright the Conservative argument that Limestone should not proceed ahead of schedule by saying that and I quote: "Their assessment of the export proposal has not however turned up any suggestion that the utility's generation expansion decisions are wrong."

I quote again for the Leader of the Opposition - "Their assessment of the export proposal has not however turned up any suggestion that the utility's generation expansion decisions are wrong" - despite every effort by the Leader of the Opposition and other spokespersons for his party to attempt to lead the National Energy Board into a different position to the disadvantage of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, an outside independent board has ruled that the Northern States Power sale is a good deal for Manitobans and they have said that it's a good deal for Canadians. They have found no reason whatsoever in delaying Limestone. The fears and the pessimism of the opposition members across the way have been put to rest as far as any objective observer is concerned, once and for all. But despite this we hear the deputy leader in news releases this morning make utterances that - and I found this very interesting and I don't know whether the deputy leader was speaking on behalf of the leader or whether the leader would like to indicate whether or not this is his position as well - "A Tory finance critic, Brian Ransom, says he fears that the two-year early start of Limestone will mean Manitoba taxpayers will be saddled with a huge extra load of debt." Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker. "Ransom said a Conservative government would look at stopping Limestone but that would depend on how much money had already been poured into it."

Mr. Speaker, that is the position of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition across the way. I would like to know, is that the position of the Leader of the Opposition? Is that position expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition also the position of the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber? Mr. Speaker, I ask that question because I believe it to be a fair question to direct to the Leader of the Opposition. I believe it is only fair on behalf of Manitobans that we ask the Leader of the Opposition to come out of hiding and to make his position clear. Come out of hiding! Make your position clear!

I might also just comment in respect to this which I found very interesting. For eight months we heard the Tories, Mr. Speaker, say we just want to get into the Legislature to ask questions about Manitoba Hydro. When did we enter into this Chamber? It was a week ago last Thursday. There has been eight question periods and I don't know whether my memory fails me - maybe somebody can correct me - but I don't recall the Leader of the Opposition asking any questions in this Chamber about Limestone or the Northern States Power transaction. I don't remember the Deputy Leader of the Opposition across the way asking any questions about Limestone or Northern States Power. Yet we have an interview last night on the CJOB radio station with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: "Well, we are going to continue to ask questions, to debate this issue."

Mr. Speaker, continue to ask questions. What questions has the honourable member asked in the

last eight days? If indeed the practice of the honourable member for the past eight days is to be continued, then we needn't expect any questions to be asked of the Minister of Mines and Energy in this House. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says call the committee. The committee will be called by Mr. Speaker, but in the meantime the honourable member should rest assured that the Minister responsible for Energy and responsible for Manitoba Hydro will be delighted to deal with any of the questions he poses in the Chamber if he develops the initiative and the courage to ask those questions in this House, but more specifically the Leader of the Opposition, because we still want to know where the Leader of the Opposition stands vis-a-vis the comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, are you both onside? Are you both onside on this? Would you stop Limestone once it has commenced? Is that the stated policy position of the Conservative Party of Manitoba? Is it the position of the Leader of the Opposition that you would start Limestone after it is initiated in this province?

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are not going to wait for an answer to that question. Manitobans expect an immediate answer from the Leader of the Opposition. Would they or would they not stop Limestone? I would hope, Mr. Speaker, we might get an answer before the conclusion of the Throne Speech Debate.

Mr. Speaker, I think, and I think Manitobans agree, that this sale and Limestone development is an outstanding economic development achievement in this province. But, Sir, outstanding economic development and long-term profits are not enough. We're not simply involved in hydro-electric development for the sake of power, for profits, we're doing this, Mr. Speaker, because we care. The strong economic future of this province, which we are building by way of ensuring that there be the renewable energy resource, is to ensure that there is economic basis that is available in this province to build health and social programs. Health and social programs are based upon fairness, equality and the preservation expansion of those programs.

Mr. Speaker, our policies are indeed a mirror of the hopes and the aspirations of Manitobans. Our agricultural policy is based upon a love of the land, a belief, Mr. Speaker, in the family farm. The Manitoba Jobs Fund was created because we believe in the dignity of work and the right of each and every Manitoban to contribute by way of their skills and talents to ensuring that it be a better provincial community in which to reside in and to work in.

We have developed, Mr. Speaker, a technology policy because we believe it is fundamentally important that there be a fair and equitable distribution, the risks and the rewards of technology.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that government has an important role to play in the provision of housing because people deserve affordable, quality shelter.

Mr. Speaker, our record is one of vision and one of commitment to ordinary Manitobans, and the Throne Speech that opened this Session is a testament to that. It is a testimony to our belief in Manitobans, in our belief that we share with Manitobans in the future of this province. But, Sir, nowhere is the future of the province and individual Manitobans being undermined more than by the Conservative Party and their spokespersons in that caucus across the way.

I'm sure I speak for thousands of Manitobans when I say that I am offended and I reject, along with Manitobans, the lack of confidence, the lack of vision, that pours daily across from honourable members across the way in their doom-and-gloom attitude towards the economic and social prospects for the development of this province. It angers me, Mr. Speaker - and that's the only word I can use - to watch honourable members, elected by their constituents to represent the interests of their constituents and the interests of Manitobans, tell Manitobans that they have failed and to tell people that Manitoba is not a good place to invest in, is not a good place to work in and not a good place to live in.

That, Sir, Mr. Speaker, is inexcusable behaviour on the part of anyone elected to this Chamber, for one that is elected to serve the people of this province. I think it's a sign, Mr. Speaker, of desperation, the politics of desperation of a party that is hungry for power at any cost, a party that seems willing to sell Manitoba short because they think that's a politically opportune thing to do. The members opposite lack confidence; they lack vision. They are pessimistic. They are opportunistic, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, too frequently they are uninformed.

Why, Sir, at a time when Manitobans are so proud of their achievements, so enthused about the future, would that party and its leader try so hard to crush that pride, attempt to undermine the future of this province? The answer is simple. The Manitoba of today and the Manitoba of the future, where all people are encouraged to play an active part in developing a society characterized by justice and equality, simply does not fit in with their plans.

Sir, people come first with this government. We believe the economy exists to serve people and not people to serve the economy. Political power is nothing but a vehicle to be used to ensure that they be the advancement and the improvement of the human condition. It is not, as opposite members would suggest, an end onto itself. It is certainly not a means of entrenching privileges for the few within society. All members of this House have been served to represent the people, the interests of Manitoba. Now I think it's time that honourable members opposite realized that, and they commence to act in a way that is responsible and accountable. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition used his opportunities, when he travels outside this province to promote Manitoba, to promote the benefits of this province, rather than to spend his time discouraging potential investment in the province.

How many jobs, Mr. Speaker, has the Leader of the Opposition cost Manitoba by distorting the economic reality that exists in this province, or by frightening investors by his constant pessimistic and misinformed predictions of doom and gloom? How many dollars has he cost the Province of Manitoba? How many jobs has he cost this province by the constant refrain of doom and gloom by the Leader of the Opposition and by those who surround him? Mr. Speaker, enough, I say that it's time that members opposite looked at the facts, listened to Manitobans, and listened to what Manitobans are saying about Manitoba.

For example, Sir, the Economic Council of Canada reported that Manitoba's in a better position than many of its neighbouring resource dependent provinces to

enjoy stable, economic growth. It also went on to state Manitoba is found to have the most significant manufacturing sector in all of Western Canada. Just over 10 percent of the new jobs created in Manitoba in the 1970s were created in manufacturing. Over the past 50 years, manufacturing per capita production in Manitoba has grown faster than anywhere in Canada, including Quebec and Ontario.

The President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce says that he will also, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of February 6th, "One of my first priorities is to my company, but I would also undertake to spread the word about Manitoba as a good place for investment." Mr. Keith Godden - Manitoba, being a good place for investment.

The Vice-President of Homestead Computer Services says, Mr. Speaker, on January 17th, as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press, "The province should be commended for its foresight."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Again I would quote from Penny Kelly, Vice-President, Consulting Services, Homestead Computer Services Limited: "The province should be commended for its foresight, for its innovativeness in providing a program which, unlike so many grant or make-work programs, actually facilitates private investment in small business." — (Interjection) — Penny Kelly, Vice-President, Consulting Services, Homestead Computer Services Limited of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote from - honourable members may even want to make note of this - a senior Vice-President of North American Life, and I would commend this to all honourable members, Manitoba Business, November, 1984: "Listed expansion in Winnipeg is part of a greater plan." North America Life, the Vice-President of North American Life, said upon moving some 200 jobs to Winnipeg, and I quote: " 'We had no trouble lining up people to come to Winnipeg,' he said. 'Most of them displayed a great deal of enthusiasm about our new venture, and they were delighted to make the move.' " - some 200 in the move to Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of comments that responsible Manitobans are making in respect to Manitoba, the strengths, the opportunities that exist in the Province of Manitoba. They are making those comments based upon fact, on understanding, not fiction, not fairy tales, not myths that we hear so often in this Chamber.

I would like to deal with facts, Mr. Speaker. Fact - in 1984 Manitoba's unemployment rate was the second-lowest in Canada and, for some months indeed, it was the lowest in Canada. Fact, Mr. Speaker - in full-time job creation from prerecession to January of this year, Manitoba has out-performed the national average by some 300 percent. Fact - in the three years that this government has been in power the population of Manitoba has been growing at a rate unprecedented in recent history, much of that due to immigration. Fact

- while private investment has been down nation-wide in Canada, Manitoba's private investment has been increasing, and has increased by over 12 percent in the last year, in fact the second-highest rate of increase in the country. Fact - over the past year, Manitobans have enjoyed the third-highest increase in average weekly earnings in Canada. Fact - in the last two years, there have been only 15 work stoppages compared, Mr. Speaker - and I found this to be most interesting by way of research - with 85. When were there 85 work stoppages? During the last two years of the previous Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba - 15 compared to 85. Then they talk about lack of harmonious labour-management relations. They have the capacity to attempt to misrepresent the position in the Province of Manitoba when they were in government, compared to the present situation in the Province of Manitoba. What gall, Mr. Speaker!

This kind of progress and economic development did not happen by accident. Manitobans worked very hard to achieve these objectives. They worked for and they found new, innovative and creative ways of doing business. They worked with the government, with community organizations. Mr. Speaker, our style of co-operation and consultation has been welcomed by Manitobans, and it has been reflected, Mr. Speaker, in the legislation, the policies and the programs of this government.

We began, in 1982, by introducing, because of the very nature of the time in which we were elected, some emergency measures to deal with the pressing crisis of high interest rates, the devastating impact of the previous four years of Progressive Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba.

We introduced Emergency Interest Rate Relief for over 3,000 Manitoba farmers, business people, homeowners. We revitalized the credit union movement. The Homes in Manitoba Program enabled many Manitobans that would not otherwise have been able to purchase homes while providing a much-needed stimulation to the construction sector.

In 1983, we turned our attention to the mammoth job of attacking unemployment. Our goal was to eliminate some of the suffering, some of the misery that comes from being unemployed, not being in a position to contribute to your provincial or national community through your own efforts and your skills and your talents. We proceeded to work on that as quickly as humanly possible.

Funding for job creation was doubled, and the \$200 million Manitoba Jobs Fund was created and was launched. In the face of sharply-reduced federal support, we were forced, Mr. Speaker, to repriorize our existing expenditures in order to ensure that there be a Jobs Fund thrust in Manitoba, unlike what was taking place elsewhere in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the debate in this Chamber, I remember what the honourable members said. They indicated it would not work; they suggested it was a shell game. They even went as far as saying it was a Fraud Fund. Mr. Speaker, I still hear comments that it was a Fraud Fund.

It was rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, though when they were compelled to vote, one by one, they stood up and voted for what they call now the Fraud Fund. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you find that rather a peculiar

contradiction, indeed, that they did not have the courage and the initiative to vote against what they denounced as a Fraud Fund, what they denounced as a shell game. If I recall correctly they stood, one by one in this Chamber, voting for the Jobs Fund, despite the denunciations that they directed. Maybe there were a few that weren't here for the vote, but the major chunk of honourable members across the way voted for the Jobs Fund and the legislation to ensure that it be legislated and brought into existence in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt about this, the Jobs Fund has worked; the Jobs Fund has worked well, and Manitobans know that it has worked well.

As the recovery progressed in 1983, we shifted our focus to longer-term undertakings, strategies designed to ensure employment growth and development of the infrastructure in Manitoba. We enhanced essential public services, the quality of life in Manitoba. Our record of economic initiatives is one that we are proud of, and I think Manitobans are proud of the achievements. Despite the difficult economic circumstances that we were confronted with, I believe the vast majority of Manitobans are pleased that we stood up to those economic circumstances and we confronted those economic circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

I remember many Conservatives saying in 1981 or 1982 that there was not much that government could do, that we were only one million people, a small province. Mr. Speaker, we challenged that erroneous message that was being delivered by Conservatives in this province; we went to work in an activist way. We established the Jobs Fund; we established other economic initiatives in this province, Mr. Speaker.

It was interesting to note that, in the last federal campaign, I think there was recognition by just about everybody but the honourable members across the way that Manitoba was an economic model for the rest of the country. In fact, if honourable members are laughing, let me repeat what I said in this Chamber but a few days ago, that when I met with the Prime Minister in December, he expressed his pleasure at the economic development thrust of this government in Manitoba and, not only that, Mr. Speaker, he mentioned that in Montreal he had found there was great interest in Montreal in what this government was doing by way of Limestone expansion, and how, indeed, investors in Montreal and elsewhere could be part of the economic thrust of this government. Mr. Speaker, again they have the Chicken Little, the one that is fearful of his own shadow, the doom and gloomers, those that are more interested in political opportunism and doom and glooming than in building, in constructing, in working with Manitobans to ensure that there be a better province.

Mr. Speaker, I think Manitobans will clearly turn their backs on that kind of regressive and hopeless attitude of despair that we hear issuing on a repeated basis from honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, our record of economic initiative is one we are proud of. We've been active; we have been innovative; we have not been fearful to be creative, like honourable members across the way were. The unfortunate thing, not only are they afraid of their shadows when they're in opposition, when they were in opposition, when honourable members had the

opportunity, they were so afraid of their own shadows that they made Manitoba's economic performance across this country a joke, and we had to turn that around after we were elected in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, when honourable members were seated in these Treasury Benches, by way of economic indicators, they were No. 8, No. 9, No. 10, by way of all the important economic indicators; in fact, in 1980, we had a drop in the economic growth in the Province of Manitoba when the rest of the country was doing well. Mr. Speaker, they did not, by way of economic indicators, enjoy No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, they were even behind the Maritime provinces and other parts of this country. So they need not lecture us about how well they did. When things were going well across the country, they were fouling up the economy in the Province of Manitoba.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why it would be, if they were doing so well, there were so many Manitobans - in fact, by the thousands - that were voting by way of their feet as they went west or they went east to leave this province because there weren't job opportunities between 1977 and 1981 in the Province of Manitoba. I would like the Leader of the Opposition to explain that to this Chamber.

We have a 10-year economic regional development agreement . . .

A MEMBER: Right now.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says, right now. I wish the Leader of the Opposition would have spent a little time explaining it in the first speech of this Session when he had the opportunity to do so. Manitobans were awaiting his explanation as to why there was such poor performance on the part of the previous Conservative administration in this province when things were doing well across this country.

We have a 10-year economic regional development agreement to the Federal Government, a commitment to over 400 million in cost-saving initiatives. The Manitoba manufacturing investment tax credit introduced in 1984, in fact, has been a welcome incentive, as the Minister of Finance indicated it would be in 1984.

We have entered, Mr. Speaker, a number of development agreements with individual enterprises. Good strong viable hydro-electric sales have been negotiated with American utilities. The orderly development of northern generating activity is now under way, is going to provide continuous, direct, impetus, to significant segments of the Manitoba economy; and we are committed, as the Minister of Energy and Mines has indicated on numerous occasions, to maximize the opportunities for local firms; and, as the Minister for Northern Affairs and the Member for Rupertsland and others, through their efforts, have said, to maximize the opportunity for employment in Manitoba and also in Northern Manitoba, particularly.

Early this Session, my Minister of Agriculture announced plans to reduce interest rates on the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation loans to 8 percent. Mr. Speaker, I heard something about raising

them first. I think I heard something today, and honourable members can correct me if I'm wrong, that the Federal Farm Credit Corporation, which is a Crown corporation of the Federal Conservative Government in Ottawa, increased their interest rates to 13.75 per cent. Maybe we should have some comments from honourable members across the way. That, I understand happened today, and the long range is?

A MEMBER: The long term is at 15.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Fifteen, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I want to, just for a moment, offer honourable members some advice. Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about something that happened a few weeks ago, I'm talking about a deliberate decision on the part of the Federal Government's Farm Credit Corporation to lift the interest rate on farm credit corporations today to 13.75 percent. Maybe the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain ought to issue a press release as to his views in respect to that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know where honourable members across the way stand in respect to the outdated, outmoded monetary policy that has unfortunately created havoc in Canada for many years now, an interest rate policy, Mr. Speaker, that I have repeatedly declared my opposition to, an interest rate and monetary policy that honourable members supported, particularly the Member for Turtle Mountain, when he said, as Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, in the previous administration of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I might suggest to you that one good thing the new Federal Conservative Government might do - and I hope honourable members don't feel that I'm a little unkind in this comment - but I think one of the most progressive things that this new Conservative Mulroney government could do would be to appoint Governor Bouey to the Senate, and then quickly pass the appropriate measures to ensure the abolition of the Senate. Maybe then, Mr. Speaker, the farmers, the small business people and the homeowners of this country would have a fair deal, and not constantly be pressed and crushed by an insane interest rate policy that I commend my Minister of Agriculture for clearly taking a position against and delivery a clear signal to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I want to tell honourable members, because I'm sure the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is hearing this, and the Member for La Verendrye, and other rural members, because I have heard it repeatedly in the last few weeks, isn't it excellent that we have a Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba that is prepared to take a stand to deliver a clear signal in respect to interest rates; a Minister of Agriculture that is prepared to call upon the banks and the Federal Government. And when they failed, and when they defaulted on their responsibilities that our Minister of Agriculture, at least in the Province of Manitoba, was prepared to take action, and his action was concrete, definite and precise, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to come to the Wilson statement in a few moments, too, because I'd like to discuss the Wilson statement. By the way, I have some good things to say about some of the federal colleagues. There are some pretty good federal colleagues, I met

one the other night, but we'll be coming to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of the program announced by the Minister of Agriculture is some \$6 million. Assistance will be provided for as many as 4,000 Manitoba farmers, most of whom are young farmers, or those who are just beginning to enter into production. We have introduced livestock development, stabilization programs, programs costing some \$38 million covering 75 percent of the Manitoba cow herd, 50 percent of marketable hogs, and we have signed the federal-provincial Agri-Food Development Agreement providing for \$38 million over five years.

Mr. Speaker, in fact this government has done more for rural Manitoba and especially the farmers of this province in three years by way of — (interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, there may not be many of you left after the next election because this government has done more by way of program, by way of legislation, by way of funding for the farmers of this province than, I must say, any other previous administration has done in the Province of Manitoba under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, for the past three years we have also been actively promoting and supporting just about every segment of the Manitoba economy and we are proud of the results. We are even proud of the fact that these bold economic initiatives that I mentioned occurred while we were fulfilling our ongoing commitment to enhance and to improve health, education and social programs in the Province of Manitoba. We had significantly exceeded the rate of inflation and we make no apologies for that. We avoided severe cuts as has happened in other parts of the country. We did this despite cuts insofar as federal funding agreements were concerned. Mr. Speaker, we are proud that we have been able to maintain those health, those education, those social programs in the past three years despite the circumstances under which we have been able to force to work within the Canadian context.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our record and I believe Manitobans are proud of our record because we have been prepared to work together with Manitobans in weathering the worst impacts of the recession. Their success is evident in not only the major economic indicators, as I mentioned earlier, but the number of people that have chosen to return to Manitoba since 1981. Our population has increased by some 33,000 in the three years that we have been in government, Mr. Speaker.

What happened during the term of office of the previous Conservative administration? Was there an increase in 33,000 in Manitobans? Was there a 25,000 increase? Mr. Minister of Finance, was there a 10,000 increase in population? No, Mr. Speaker, there was a decline of 1,500 Manitobans between 1978 and 1981. Why, Mr. Speaker? These statistics reflect in part the failure of the previous administration and the success of this administration, and despite the fact there has been 33,000 more Manitobans enter this province since we have formed the administration of this province we have been able to absorb, comparatively speaking, by way of additional employment and many of those people have returned to this province.

Sir, Manitobans are not going to be fooled. They will not be dissuaded by the front bench on the opposition.

They will not be fooled or tricked by the opportunistic attacks that are made from time to time on this government, this province and its people because, Mr. Speaker, this opposition not only attacks this government but they attack the people of the Province of Manitoba; Manitobans that have worked together and are proud of the achievements of this province and would like to see, in fact, a response of pride in the achievements of this province rather than the constant refrain of doom and gloom that we hear on an hourly basis from honourable members across the way. Why can't we be pleased with the performance in the Province of Manitoba?

People and businesses are coming to this province, businesses like St. Jude's Medical, Toro Canada, National Hard Chrome Plating, Westeel Agricultural Products, Coldstream Products of Canada. There have been major expansions. You know this is where the honourable member across the way wouldn't be aware because he only looks for what he can find by way of a bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker. Coldstream Products of Canada, Simon-Day, Electro Trac Circuits, Premier Peat Moss, these are additional expansions in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: How about the Glenella Creamery?

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . the course we have charted. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says, what about some creamery out in the rural areas. Mr. Speaker, economic development to us is just as important whether it be in the village or town or the cities of this province.

A MEMBER: Is that why you closed down the Boissevain Land Titles Office?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the course we have charted for the Legislative Session is a logical extension, a carefully planned strategy that we have followed over the past three years, not accidental but a purposeful strategy to ensure the creation of employment, the reduction of unemployment in Manitoba.

The National Energy Board found out that our work in the area of hydro development to be in the best interests of Manitobans and Canadians. Sir, we have listened to the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, I must commend the National Energy Board at this point because if they had listened to the Leader of the Opposition when he made his presentation in November, Manitobans would have been deprived of the benefits that were flowing from our hydro development policy and what a shame that would have been. I want to commend the National Energy Board for ensuring good, sound judgment in ignoring the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me tell the people of Manitoba - and I want to serve notice here on honourable members across the way that we are not resting on this one sale or this one particular project - my Energy Minister and his officials are presently negotiating with a number of Canadian and American utilities for both term and long-term energy sales. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I am hopeful, and if I am to in fact judge by way of performance, I am more than hopeful that the Energy

Minister will have succeeded in being in a position where he can announce, prior to the end of this year, another major undertaking that will result in us looking at the construction of Conawapa Generating Station further along the Nelson River.

Sir, we are going to continue, we are not afraid of the future. Mr. Speaker, we are not fearful of the future. We do not lack confidence in the strength of our province. We are not afraid of our own shadows. Honourable members, in fact, when they get up in the morning, they must be afraid of their own shadows. I wonder how many honourable members across the way sometimes trip over their own shadows because I have never in all my life, even with previous Conservative caucuses across the way that have sat in this Chamber, I have never seen a more fearful, a more insecure, a less confident group of Conservative members of the Legislature than we have presently in this Chamber - I have never - and I know honourable members don't like my reference to Chicken Little, or they don't like my reference to being fearful of their own shadow but, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a typical example of a group of frightened, lacklustre, non-confident individuals in the future of this province, they sit directly opposite from members on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know because I think Manitobans want to know the answers to a number of questions from the Leader of the Opposition. I mentioned that we were going to be actively pursuing additional Hydro sales, that we would trust by the end of the year that we might be in a position to announce more major Hydro sales that would permit us to undertake further construction. Mr. Speaker, maybe what we ought to find out is just what is their policy in respect to Hydro development — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let it be placed clearly on record that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has announced to this Chamber he does not agree with the sale to Northern States Power.

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

MR. H. ENNS: I have been around this Chamber long enough, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the kind of tactic that the Premier is now employing. That is, of course, not what I have said. I have said, and I said it very forcibly in a speech just prior to his speech, that in my judgment the priorities of this government are wrong. I prefer the power to be used in Manitoba for jobs in Manitoba, then secondly to Canadians . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . then thirdly, if surplus to our needs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . I'll gladly sell to the Yanks. That includes Northern States Power.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member might have had a difference of opinion. He did not have a point of order.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think all the honourable member did was make more muddy what was already a muddy position.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition claim to be a responsible group. I just wish that some Manitobans could understand what their positions are on important issues as they develop week by week and month by month. If I have ever seen a group that walk a tightrope and say nothing, again it's honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place on the table a question to the Leader of the Opposition. Again, what is the position of the Leader of the Opposition in respect to Limestone? Would the Leader of the Opposition stop the construction of Limestone, as was suggested by his deputy leader last night? Secondly, would the Leader of the Opposition pursue aggressively and does he support the aggressive efforts to sell power to the various utilities in the United States, Ontario, Saskatchewan, in order to permit the construction of Conawapa along the Nelson River? Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are entitled to know and to be informed as to the position of the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition has no position, then let him announce to this Chamber that he has no position.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like another question to be answered by the Leader of the Opposition. What about the Jobs Fund that honourable members voted for but have been attacking at every opportunity, sniping at? Would they be prepared to continue the Jobs Fund as a major economic and employment initiative in the Province of Manitoba? The statistics are clear. The Manitoba Jobs Fund has been a success. Thousands of Manitobans are working today because of the programs due to the initiatives of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Employers are lining up to take advantage of the Jobs Fund programs. Mr. Speaker, the Jobs Fund is entering its third year, and it is going to continue to act as a catalyst, as a facilitator of economic development, generating long-term economic opportunities for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing what the position of the Leader of the Opposition is. Would the Leader of the Opposition recommend the dismantling, the elimination of the Manitoba Jobs Fund? Mr. Speaker, would the Leader of the Opposition propose that the Jobs Fund programs from Careerstart to Homes in Manitoba to the other programs for youth in this province be scrapped, and that we have the elimination of the Jobs Fund in the province? Mr. Speaker, let the Leader of the Opposition clearly articulate his position in respect to the Manitoba Jobs Fund in fairness to Manitobans as to where he stands. Mr. Speaker, again if the Leader of the Opposition has no position, let the Leader of the Opposition tell this Chamber and Manitobans he has no position.

Mr. Speaker, we are planning a — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would like to put a colourful description he just threw my way on the record, he can do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are planning a number of initiatives supporting workers and employers in the area of technology. The very root of our policy in this area is our commitment to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of the risks and rewards that come with technological development in Manitoba. We believe that technology and the economic development that comes with technology serves the needs, the desires and the aspirations of Manitobans. We believe Manitoba industry must be in the mainstream of technological development. The question we face is not whether we will be involved in technology, but how we can be involved.

Jobs, Sir, long-term job creation, employment preservation must be the outgrowth of technology, innovation, adaption and creation. On this point, business, government and labour agree, and as a result of co-operation and consultation we'll be calling on members to approve during this Session - and the bill will be introduced by the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology - a bill to provide for workplace innovation, a centre designed to help business and workers cope with the human dimension of technological change.

This kind of co-operation and consensus is not new. Co-operation in the area of labour and management in Manitoba is strong. We, as a province, should be proud of the fact that our record in the area of industrial peace and harmony is amongst the best in Canada.

In 1984, Mr. Speaker, there were eight work stoppages in Manitoba. Two of those were the result of a national dispute in the meat packing industry. Had it not been for the effect of the national disparities, Manitoba would have enjoyed the lowest number of days lost due to strikes or lockouts of any province in Canada. In fact beyond that, in the history of the Province of Manitoba, we would have enjoyed the best record in the entire history of the province.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when you contrast the record of Manitoba in the past 10 years with that of any other province in Canada, you will find that we are the second-best by way of lost days due to job strikes or lockouts. I think that is a record that we can be well proud of, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber. By the way it's a sharp contrast, as I mentioned, to the last two years of the Lyon administration in this province when there was quite a warp in the traditional pattern insofar as labour-management relationships were concerned in Manitoba. It was, unfortunately, a warp in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, when you contrast our record of labour-management with the record of other provinces that have chosen to go the route of confrontation, confrontation that is being suggested by honourable members across the way, it becomes clear that our co-operative, conciliatory approach works. Mr. Speaker, no one likes strikes or lockouts. They hurt business; they hurt workers; they hurt Manitobans. Yet if we heeded the advice of the Conservative caucus, Manitoba would indeed probably find itself faced with an industrial war that is going on in provinces like British Columbia.

We don't know, Mr. Speaker, where the Conservatives are on the issue of Hydro development. We don't know where the Conservatives are on the issue of industrial relations, because they keep talking about their desire to undo or wind back certain laws in the Province of

Manitoba, so we don't know where they stand in respect to industrial relations. Mr. Speaker, for a long time we didn't know where the Conservatives stood in transfer payments. First we heard a comment by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, way back last October-November, questioning the reasonableness of Manitoba's position. Then the Leader of the Opposition tried to keep out of the limelight, Mr. Speaker, on the issue. Then, when the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Leader of the Opposition discovered that they had to take a position, then they got outside, Mr. Speaker; and then I notice in a pamphlet that was distributed - most of them ended in garbage bins - that they undercut the very position that they were supposedly co-operating with the Province of Manitoba in Manitoba's presentation to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, during their last two years in Government they mentioned there were 85 work stoppages involving about 10,000 Manitobans, and costing an estimated 200,000 lost working days. Sir, we've had 15 strikes in Manitoba in the past two years, 15 compared to 85 in their final two years, the difference between a government that respects ordinary people and one that fears ordinary people. Our co-operative approach in this area has served the people of Manitoba well, a fair and a responsible agreement that the Minister of Finance has just completed with the Manitoba Employees' Association is an example, I believe, of the results of that kind of fair consultation approach. We will not deviate from that approach, Sir; in fact, we will work to improve that approach of ensuring improved worker-management relationships.

This Session will bring forth a number of initiatives on the part of my Minister of Labour that will deal with matters of greater equity, greater dignity in the workplace and, as an employer in partnership with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, our Affirmative Action Program will move into an implementation stage. We plan to expand the program to include, not only women, natives, physically disabled, but to add visible minorities as a fourth target group. We will, through this program, ensure that groups within the Manitoba community, ensure that they have a full opportunity for fair representation within the public service.

We are pleased that we've managed to do as well as we have in the fight against unemployment but, Sir, it is far from being adequate. Whether we have the second lowest or the lowest unemployment rate in Canada it is still far too high, and that is of no consolation to the thousands of Manitobans that remain unemployed. Dealing with the human tragedy of being unemployed, the devastating consequences of this unemployment, remain of paramount concern to my colleagues and myself. We believe that plant closures, mass lay-offs must be avoided and prevented; and where that's not possible, we believe that government, business and organized labour have a responsibility to ensure that there is a humane transition for workers affected. Workers cannot simply be cast aside, there must be fairness and decency in our relationship with them. That same sense of fairness and decency is at the root of our policy in agriculture; that policy is based on a belief in the family farm and understanding the problems facing Manitoba farmers.

The banks tell us that there is no problem involving the Manitoba farm community. They say that only 2 to 5 percent of Manitoba farmers are in any serious difficulty, but we need only ask farmers and speak to farmers to know how serious the present agriculture situation is in Manitoba and the rest of Western Canada.

The Federal Conservative Finance Minister, Mr. Speaker, has betrayed farmers as the "fat cats" of Canadian society. Through his department he has told us that farmers are nine times as wealthy as average Canadians. He tells us that farmers earn massive returns on their investments and that farm failures are lower than in any other business.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this Conservative Finance Minister ought to take a visit to rural Manitoba and meet the families of farmers in this province, meet farmers where they live. He has, Mr. Speaker, not only been provided with a poor assessment of the farm financial situation, but I think, Mr. Speaker, he's insulted and offended thousands of family farmers struggling to earn a living in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, did the honourable members across the way leap to the defence of the family farmers? No, Sir. Instead, they criticized my Minister for attacking their Conservative Federal Minister. Sir, my Agricultural Minister, joined by other members, such as, the member for Ste. Rose, have spoken out with deep conviction and with understanding of the plight of the family farmer. The Conservative Finance Minister, Mr. Speaker, is wrong; in fact, the data clearly demonstrates that 17 percent of Canada's farmers are in severe financial shape and in danger of losing their farms. In Manitoba, this translates into 3,600 commercial producers. Over the past three years, my Agricultural Minister has introduced a wide range of financial assistance projects to help in the recovery on the adverse economic pressures, circumstances and conditions which have placed so many of our Manitoba farmers in financial difficulty.

We have formulated a five-point program for farm economic delivery for recovery. That program features low-term, low-interest rate loans at fixed rates, improved coverage levels under the crop insurance program, minimized rail cost increases to farmers, aggressive trade in market development for agricultural exports. Recovery in agriculture is going to require a vigorous and a co-operative approach involving all governments, involving the private sector. Because of our commitment to the family farm we called on the other provinces and Ottawa to co-operatively come together, to introduce bold, responsible measures to revitalize the family farm. But that's not all we did, Sir. I heard some of the honourable members say - and thought it was a big joke - that other governments in Canada ignored the Minister of Agriculture from the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. In some way or other, Mr. Speaker, it was suggested that that reflected upon the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture. We would like to inform the honourable members that did not reflect on the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, it reflected upon the indifference of too many Conservative politicians across this country, to the real plight of the family farmer in this country.

Mr. Speaker, that's not all that we did though. We acted on our own to reduce interest rates on Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation loans to 8 percent. It

is an \$8 million package, \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, that we feel on this side of the Chamber is money well spent. Mr. Speaker, the basic institutions of this province built on the strength of the family farm, and we will not sit by and permit the family farm to crumble. The problem is real; the solutions that are taken must be bold, must be innovative, and must be creative. Mr. Speaker, we know on this side of the Chamber the value of agriculture to not only our economy, but to the very social fabric of Manitoba.

Although agriculture remains one of the critical bases of our economy, it's clear that future economic growth is linked heavily to the diversity of this province. Thanks in large part to government programs, our housing industry is strong, our forestry sector is developing and, Mr. Speaker, much of that is due to the work that is undertaken now to replenish the forests which, for too long, were being neglected in the province.

Our mining sector is developing. For example, Inco's decision to concentrate its capital investment in Manitoba, some \$90 million worth in Thompson, a definite and concrete demonstration of confidence by Inco in the future of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of confidence and optimism that surrounds the Manitoba economy, and that Manitobans are proud of by way of the achievements that take place in respect to our province. The list of economic accomplishments, the positive indicators is lengthy. Mr. Speaker, most of those achievements are well known to the public and, I believe, well known to most members in this Chamber, and should be known by all members in this Chamber.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity — (Interjection) — now to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . put this success in perspective, to talk about a strong and a steady economy and what it means to the average citizen. A government governs for people. Political power is simply a tool that is used to build a better society. Politicians are the craftspeople that are entrusted with that tool and that responsibility. If political power does not lead to progressive social change or to improvement of the human condition or to a society dedicated to full participation and justice and equality, then that power has been misused, and people have been misled.

Three years ago, we pledged to the people of Manitoba that we would protect and we would enhance health, education, social services. These were rights to be enjoyed by ordinary Manitobans. We have done that, and we're going to continue to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it was a New Democratic Party Government under Tommy Douglas that pioneered universal, accessible health care in the country. My government has a noble tradition to uphold, and I can assure the people of Manitoba that we will uphold that tradition, our defence of this province. This country's health care system will not waver. Medicare will not be weakened in Manitoba. There will be no extra billing; there will be no user fees. Every Manitoban, regardless of income, will have access to quality health care and to facilities.

Expenditures in the area of health will continue to be a priority and, though we are proud of the fact that expenditures in this area have increased at a rate higher than the inflation rate in every year of our administration, we realize that more money is not enough. We are continuing with our long-term range plans to reduce the costs of medical service, while maintaining and enhancing the quality. We will be further enhancing preventative medicine, providing alternatives to unnecessary use of expensive hospital facilities with emphasis on development and expansion of outpatient services.

In education, Sir, we're taking equally innovative steps to improve and to protect the quality of education in our province. Mr. Speaker, in times when governments everywhere are preoccupied with deficits and spending limits, programs like these in health and education have become targets for cuts. We have seen it from Conservative Governments across the country, and we've seen it in the United States. Children, students, the sick, the elderly, the weak, the powerless have too frequently been forced to bear the brunt of Conservative administrations.

Sir, I believe that this is not only unfair, it is immoral. I am proud to say that our government has not fought the recession on the backs of ordinary Manitobans, but rather we have fought it for them. Acute protracted restraint does not work. It didn't work when the honourable members across the way tried at the end of the last decade, and it will not work now.

Let the Leader of the Opposition be warned. Manitobans have not forgotten the kind of assault on ordinary people that he, as a member of the Cabinet, supported. Manitobans remember the massive public service spending cuts; Manitobans remember massive layoffs; Manitobans remember a decaying health care system. Manitobans remember what it's like to watch their sons and daughters leave home to find work in other provinces, because the government that the Leader of the Opposition was part of believed more in a warped ideology than they did in creating jobs. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba know nothing has changed opposite. The deck may have been shuffled, but it is still a deck that is stacked against ordinary Manitobans.

It is the policy of this government to do everything in its power to better the lives of ordinary Manitobans. We will continue to do everything to safeguard the health, the independence, the personal dignity of elderly Manitobans. We will bring to this House measures enabling the community and government in partnership to strengthen services for families, to protect children, spouses exposed to abuse, to further enhance day care, to strengthen community services and to help the mentally-handicapped people.

Mr. Speaker, these are the responsibilities of government. These kinds of programs are the reason for projects like Limestone, for other economic initiatives. This is the kind of social change and dedication to humanity that is the responsibility of government. Mr. Speaker, that responsibility is above partisanship. It knows no economic, cultural gender, or geographic restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, Northerners have in the past felt isolated, removed from the process of government. Not only is there a geographic barrier to overcome, but there is

a cultural one as well. Manitoba Northern development is a key priority for our government. We are introducing block funding policies to increase the level of decision-making and responsibility at the community level. We are improving health services to the North. We are committed to seeing that Northern Manitobans receive a maximum share of the benefits of Hydro development.

Sir, we will continue to work with aboriginal peoples in order that we may further advance and support proposals protecting their rights and furthering the cause of self-government within the constitutional framework. I must here mention the work and the effort and the commitment by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland in ensuring that cause is brought forth.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in people. We believe that a fair and a just society is not simply a laudable goal, but is a right for all Manitobans. We believe that women have a right to earn a wage based upon their contribution in the workplace, and not on some antiquated notion of the role of women in the economy. We believe in pay equity, and we will be introducing measures to ensure that women receive a fair share of economic benefits in this province.

The Leader of the Opposition has supported this initiative. His federal leader has supported pay equity, Sir. I can only hope that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have enough influence over their members opposite that they can bring them onside. I know, Mr. Speaker, it will not be an easy task. We on this side are never quite sure who the Leader of the Opposition is, or if members opposite are willing to listen to their federal Leader at the expense of political opportunism, but we are hopeful. We continue to be hopeful.

This relationship between Manitoba Conservatives and their federal counterparts is an interesting one. Mr. Speaker, I believe that federal relations requires consistency. More important, they require that the Provincial Government promotes the rights of provinces, and not the policies of a political party. Can the Leader of the Opposition really expect to be respected by either the Federal Government or the people of Manitoba when he clearly puts party politics ahead of the interests of Manitobans?

Sir, I alluded earlier, Mr. Speaker, to remarks by the Conservative finance critic on the plight of the Canadian farmers. While my Minister of Agriculture expressed his anger and disbelief at the statement members opposite shouted with indignation that we dare criticize their brother in Ottawa, while the government struggles with Ottawa over the threatened cut of \$72 million in transfer payments, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues wavered on the issue. One day they supported Manitobans; the next day, they supported their political siblings in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for partisan politics in the area of federal-provincial relationships. We have fought the Federal Government hard on the transfer issue. We criticized them over cuts to such projects as the National Research Council and, Sir, we will continue to fight them in an effort to promote Manitoba's interests. But we have also worked with them, and I am pleased with the co-operation we have seen in the area of tourism.

I am pleased with the approach taken to date by the Minister of Tourism at the federal level. I am pleased

with the approach taken by the Federal Minister of Regional Economic Development in working with my Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. I am pleased with the approach of Mr. Crombie in the area of Native affairs. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to co-operate with Ottawa, and the best interests of Manitobans and Canadians are served.

I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that it is time that he, too, put the best interests of Manitobans ahead of either partisan or opportunistic policies. It is time, Sir, that he come out of hiding, and let Manitobans know exactly where he stands on the basic issues confronting Manitobans today. It is time that he and his caucus begin to discuss the real issues of the day by dealing with facts, results and detail. Manitobans must surely be disappointed and confused by the performance of the opposition in this Legislature.

I, for one, Sir, sit here in disbelief during the opposition's claim that somehow the failure of Pioneer Trust was the responsibility of the Manitoba Government. If the Leader of the Opposition feels so strongly that he must place full responsibility on the Manitoba Government for the failure of Pioneer Trust, then I urge him to write his Conservative colleague, the Premier of Saskatchewan, and suggest to him that Conservative economic policy must have been responsible for the leading to the economic downfall of that financial institution.

Mr. Speaker, mistakes, distortions, half-truths, personal attacks have been the hallmarks of this opposition. Where is the attack on our record that we were promised? Mr. Speaker, they claimed they couldn't wait to get into this Session to reveal to Manitoba the failures of the past eight months. Well, Sir, we are back in Session, but the opposition's run into a problem. The facts, the statistics and the results of our policies and programs don't fit in with their plan. Our record is good; they know it is so.

So what do they do? Well, they don't recognize the accomplishments of Manitobans or pushes to greater progress. No, Sir, they avoid the issues. They deal in half-truths; they deal in distortions; they level personal attacks at members of the government; they wage war

on groups of civil servants; they look to our particular future with cynicism, with fear. They want Manitobans to believe that they will fail. They fret about numbers on a page. They are frightened at the prospect of success. It is time that the Leader of the Opposition pulled his head and the heads of his colleagues out of the dark clouds, came down to earth to see the reality of a province and a people optimistic about the future.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak well. They speak for themselves. Manitoba is strong; Manitoba is growing stronger. Our record is one of careful, orderly, innovative economic development combined with dedication to the commitment of protection and advancement of social services.

I began this address, Sir, with reference to the youth of Manitoba. It is fitting that I conclude with some remarks on the vision we have for Manitoba that they will inherit. Manitobans have been hardworking people, dedicated to the betterment of human condition. The legacy we leave our youth must be an extension of that dedication, that commitment. I see a future where all Manitobans play a vital, meaningful role in the life of the province. I see a future characterized by justice and equality, a future where the sick are cared for and the elderly respected; the weak given strength; the disenfranchised a voice.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistakes. Every initiative this government has undertaken, any plan it has undertaken, is designed to move us one step closer to that vision. Let the youth of Manitoba know that we care about the world that we will be leaving them. Let them know that we have confidence in their ability to continue moving along that path for greater equality and equity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Has the honourable member concluded his remarks?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 p.m. when the debate will be open.