



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 89B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 16 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 16 June, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The question before the House at 5:30 was the motion to go into committee. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek had five minutes left on the grievance motion.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — A few of us is worth all of you; there's no problem about that. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I referred to several quotes that were made by the NDP members of this House back several years ago, but you know, Mr. Speaker, in March, 1970, March 12th, Sir, the NDP, when they had their Speech from the Throne, they said, my Ministers believe that at this time in our history, we need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and tradition that have outlived their relative usefulness. That sort of laid the groundwork right then and there for the NDP to get rid of what they called tradition and old dogmas.

Mr. Speaker, we went through eight years of NDP Government where the province was nearly ruined. We started to get it back on its feet and unfortunately they're back again and on their way to ruining the province again.

Mr. Speaker, I've had some statistics this afternoon that absolutely proves it and the statistics, as I've said many times, come from the departments in the NDP Government, but they got back into office by making promises that they couldn't keep. They knew when they wrote them, that it would impossible to keep them, but their leader continued to mislead the people of Manitoba and under that type of campaigning, that's how they got elected.

Mr. Speaker, what has really happened now is that they haven't kept the promises. The people of Manitoba understand that, but they come along with legislation and I'm sure it's the influence of the Attorney-General because he goes into caucus and he says, this is what should be done, and nobody over there will debate with him because he has been known as a debater from the university and they won't debate with him on anything and he says, it will work this way, don't worry about it. That's the type of legal person the Attorney-General is, oh no, it won't work that way - but when the legislation's there all of a sudden you're in problems, Mr. Speaker. I remember a great member of this House, Mr. Campbell, who used to say, put it in the bill; say what you mean; don't confuse the people. The Attorney-General does not really believe in that theory.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation they've come up with that they didn't promise the people, that they didn't tell the people about, Sir, is one piece of legislation which will defeat them, and the one that says that the people are going to pay for their elections. Well, the people are not going to pay for our elections we assure you of that. We do not believe that that working stiff should be paying for it just to get the union donations that you receive off the hook; that's basically what you're

planning to do. Because we have the literature that shows us how much the unions did give to the NDP and worked for the NDP, so they'll get off the hook with this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, another one we have that is going to be an amendment to the Manitoba Charter which is going to make our province bilingual - that again is something that they never told the people they were going to do. The people of Manitoba are making it very clear that that type of legislation should not be brought into this House or have a request to the Federal Government to change our Charter unless the people of Manitoba have hearings on it and have the opportunity to express their views. Mr. Speaker, it's very clear in the draft that was presented to us. The Attorney-General says, well, it doesn't quite work that way, that's not the way it works.

But really, Mr. Speaker, those are the items that will defeat this government and there'll be no question about it. It will be automatic in the next election. The government will be changed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to take the opportunity to use my grievance at this time. I'd like to continue in the same vein as the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: He was making so much sense in the logic of his argument. The logic of his argument was so overwhelming, Sir, that I think that it's only fair to all of the members of this House that are here tonight that it be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, for the record, give you my impression of this government over two years as an individual that's come to this House as a new member. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what I see concerns me greatly, I can tell you that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, obviously my words are reaching upon some very tender and sensitive ears, which is just fine, because it's much better to be listened to by members opposite than have people run away like we do when the Member for Inkster speaks. Mr. Speaker, I'm terribly concerned about the future of this province, as it probably comes as no . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that members wouldn't want to miss what I have to say, so I thank you for telling the members to please be quiet.

Mr. Speaker, like I said earlier in my opening remarks, I am terribly concerned about the future of this province. I think there are too many members opposite who do not really understand. Well, there are too many members now but they won't be there for long, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about the debt of this province, and that probably comes as no secret to the Minister of Finance; I've spoken on it a number of times. I question him, and therefore the government, as to where this province is headed fiscally. I'm really wondering if they've set out any strategy whatsoever, not so much for the larger economic development of the province, because I know there's no thought given to planning ahead economically, but I'm wondering at all whether they're concerned about how we're going to manage 10 years up the road. I'd like to hear sometime the Minister of Finance and the Premier tell not only the House, but all Manitobans, how they're going to rescue this terrible situation we find ourselves in today.

I'm wondering how they're going to tell us, for instance, or where they're going to tell us where the interest payments are going to be for the province. I'm wondering if they would tell us whether inflation is going to have to come back in a rampant style so as to pay back this tremendous debt. Mr. Speaker, I hear none of this from the members opposite. I don't see any explanation whatsoever, or any inference to what sectors within our economy are going to jump ahead over the next 10 or 15 years, to give us the revenues, as a government and, therefore as a province, that are necessary to support all the social programs which, indeed, all of us want.

I see no attempt to grapple with those very real problems, and it's on that basis, Sir, that I see this tremendous dichotomy of members opposite. I see those that are idealists, and I do see some of those that are pragmatists, very few, I might say, but there are a few. That's what strikes me so hard when I come to look at this government over the last two years, Mr. Speaker.

So on that opening, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell you my impressions of the government opposite. Well, I look at the idealists and there are many of them over there, many of them that feel by laws, or by gentle persuasion, or by words, or by social engineering, we can make this province a much much better place to live.

Well, I look, for instance, at the Member for Inkster. That individual, Sir, who believes that by discussing resolutions, or by bringing forward some new legislation, that we can make all Manitobans perfect. He probably more so than any other person believes that there is perfect in every person. Just by turning the laws a little bit, just by changing this or engineering that, we can make all the Manitobans perfect people. Every word that is uttered by that member goes toward that end. All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is turn things a little bit and we'll be a just and a perfect people. It just comes out constantly and, of course, this is supported at times by the Member for Thompson.

People who believe that if this conflict of interest, if all of us as members, for instance, declare our financial assets on a piece of paper that, all of a sudden, we'll be perfect in every right as legislators. You just can see it, that there will be no wrong in the future if we just bring in Bill No. 18.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't end there. There are members opposite who believe that we'll increase the voting turnout to 95 percent if we do away with vouching, if we turn some other little regulations brought

about by Bill 14. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Thompson says, who said that? Well, if he had been in the House the other day, he would have heard the Member for Inkster say that. He said, that has to be the goal of a democracy, to make sure that everybody votes, whether they want to or not; that has to be the goal.

The Finance Minister's looking at me; it's true, and I'll get to him a little later, Mr. Speaker, in case he wants to run away. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, so we have that element from the members opposite who believe that by turning things a little we can make man and woman in this province perfect.

Then we have sort of a slant on that. We have those individuals who believe that if we make a few changes in regulations and if we talk nicely to business and labour, we can have the perfect economy. Of course, who am I referring to? I'm referring to the Minister of Economic Development. The individual who feels that if we talk in these platitudes of saying really labour and management want to get along, but up till now there's been a problem of bringing them together, and indeed now we have the government that's going to bring them together and work toward the betterment of all. So who do we have leading that? We have the Minister of Economic Development believing that every problem, Sir, can be solved in the Minister's office by bringing everybody around the table, offering them a cup of coffee and saying yes, we have a problem but I'm sure if we look at it this way and we realize that we have to work together in this world, everything will work out nicely. So there's the perfect economy. — (Interjection) — That's right. My leader says utopianism. Of course that's reflected by many many members opposite.

Then we have the Attorney-General bringing forward these perfect laws; the idealist; perfect laws. Of course we see it in every sense. Every law is brought forward mainly as a housekeeping change. You know many laws that we brought forward when we were in government previously, they were good laws, but they didn't go quite far enough. They needed a further extension. Again, like I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the friend that comes along and says you know you've played a great game tonight - after a ballgame - you played a great game but you struck out when the bases were loaded and therefore we think you should ride the bench for the next three or four games. That's the attitude of the Attorney-General. He gives us credit; "but". Of course I'll let others on my side address maybe the sinister meaning and some of the deeper meanings of some of the laws that are brought forward, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure they could do it better justice than I.

Well, let's move on, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, another idealist in our midst. Well, we hear he's a good man. Well, that may be true; there are a lot of good men in this world. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Agriculture who believes through Bill 3 and through Bill 90, which he's just brought forward for second reading the other day, that we can make all the necessary changes to agriculture, to maintain it along its orderly path of development, and keep it No. 1 as far as its contribution to the Manitoba society and to the economy. He believes that speculation is so bad, and it's happening in such magnitude, that indeed everybody in rural Manitoba wants it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say, representing some 12,000 registered voters, and I would say of that number some 8,000 farmers, Sir, I have not had one letter from 8,000 people within my constituency - not one - asking me to support the government's legislation as brought forward in Bill 3. I'm wondering why the members opposite, if they would not find that statistic a little, little odd and somewhat curious. Why have I not received one request to support Bill 3? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin, that famous farmer from that great parkland area, says it's because of my attitude, I think he used the words. — (Interjection) — Well, negative. Mr. Speaker, within my constituency there were some 1,800 votes cast for the NDP. — (Interjection) — Well, I apologize to my predecessor, Mr. Jorgenson; I know he couldn't rest well when that happened.

But the point is, Sir, out of those 1,800, I daresay 1,000 of them would be farmers - 1,000 of them - and yet not one of them has seen fit to put his views of their support to Bill 3 on paper and send it to me. I'm wondering why. Yet I hear the First Minister today on the radio saying, we will push Bill 3. It's going to go through. I wonder what mandate they have in the sense of what broader constituency do they have behind them that really wants that particular bill. Or is there one, Mr. Speaker? Or does it fit into some broader plan that in spite of themselves, in spite of all the people that don't want it, it has to happen, because it has to happen. — (Interjection) — Well, I have the Premier saying because of all the people that have to have it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could accept that. But where are all those people? Why doesn't one of them, just one of them, tell me that they want it? And I would like to know how many of them, and where are all these people, where are they geographically situated? Where are they? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent upon the government to say and indicate who these people are that want this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, we go to Bill 90, an attempt to make the Cattle Producers Act perfect too. You know, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — freedom of choice. Well, I'm so happy the Member for Springfield said those words, "freedom of choice." You know, Mr. Speaker, I heard something most interesting on the radio the other day, and it's to do with the Crow rate and I know many of the members opposite feel that it's a subject that's almost passe although the Premier is trying to reconstruct it with all his \$150,000 worth of ads, trying to stir it up again in the rural areas.

But Mr. Speaker, talking about freedom of choice, as the Member for Springfield said. As you probably are aware, there is a proposal being set forth in Ottawa which, if it came into effect, would offer those of us who farm an opportunity to decide how we wanted the method of payment to come forward. Either we could have it sent directly to the railways on our account or we could be paid directly and decide then how to spend it. That was called by the people that proposed that, that's called the freedom of choice.

I heard a most enlightening comment the other day on the radio, Mr. Speaker. The National Farm Union was asked what they thought of that concept, and a spokesman who comes from the Peace River District of Alberta, used these words. They said to the reporter, "We are totally opposed to freedom of choice. It should

not happen. Nobody should have the right to choose in this issue." And there we have the Member for Springfield says, are you opposed to freedom of choice? Well, I certainly am not. And on Bill 90, we talk about it, and isn't it strange, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan right today there's legislation being brought in to mirror exactly the legislation that's in effect in this province today. The Saskatchewan Stock Growers are bringing in almost identically what's in effect in Manitoba today. Why would that be, Mr. Speaker? Why would that be? Well, I'm sure it has something to do with every individual, something like the union concept, Sir, where, because everybody stands to gain, everybody therefore is asked to contribute.

Mr. Speaker, moving on, then we have the Minister of the Environment, another idealist. An individual who believes by removing all the soil, we can remove the lead, and by stopping us from eating fish we won't be eating this mercury, trying to protect us from ourselves, so to speak. Trying in every sense, believing that by bringing in all these new laws and regulations that as a society we will last so much longer, and yet not really understanding totally, but accepting at face value almost everything that's given to him by an expert. And that's the part that really concerns me.

Somebody comes along, whether it's within the bureaucracy or whether it's a researcher and says, I think we have a concern in this certain area and therefore we have to be totally prepared to bring forward all the new regulations that are going to prevent people, for instance, from eating any more than a half-pound of fish a week. And yet there's no substance behind that. There's no real research, but the Minister of the Environment believes it. The idealist.

Mr. Speaker, moving on, we have the Member for Wolseley. She believes that all people should live in a system of perfect relationship. She feels that by throwing money into the day care system that all the problems associated with those single parents that want to go out to work, all the problems associated with broken homes can be relieved.

And then we have the Minister of Labour, who a year ago felt that by setting up all these homes and throwing all the money in we could help the battered housewife. Again, perfect, perfect worlds. People who believe that just by the stroke of a pen, three readings, Sir, three readings, Law Amendments Committee and a stroke of a pen, that the world would be a much better place.

I say to them, do they really believe that? Do they really believe that still, after two years? And is the world a much better place two years since fall '81? Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say, as was indicated in the papers today, the people of Manitoba don't believe so.

Then we have the perfect perfect. The individual that melds it all together, the one person who believes that yes, under his guidance, under his trusteeship, that indeed Manitoba has to be a better place. And who would I be referring to, Mr. Speaker? To the Premier. The individual. Or is he the individual that pulls the strings over there? Who does? It begs the question. But certainly, outwardly, Mr. Speaker, the Premier would have us believe that because he and his government's in place and that we've been able to bring forward some 105 new laws this year, that Manitoba is so much better off.

I wonder when he's going to wake up; when he's going to realize that indeed this is the real world and all the journeys to the rural areas to tell people that they need Bill 3, that they need municipal conflict of interest laws, that they need - on and on, Sir, is going to make this a better place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could list another five or six idealists over there, I apologize to them for omitting them, I hope they'll forgive me. I hope they won't feel left out, but I'm sure I'll have another opportunity to grieve another time.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we move to the few pragmatists that are over there, the people that realize that this is the real world and they've got real problems, some real problems. Who would I include in that list? Well, Mr. Speaker, I include the Minister of Finance, believe it or not. Of course, he's engrossed in conversation, he doesn't hear this. But I believe deep down that he has an understanding of where we're headed, where we're headed fiscally. And he can't do anything about it, of course, because he's surrounded by too many people who say, I could care less about the next generation. I could care less about the next 10 years; we're living today, and today is where it's at. But I don't believe that's the real feeling of the Minister of Finance. I don't believe that; but the thing is, Mr. Speaker, what I do believe is, I believe he doesn't have the courage to stand up to them and say, look it, this is the way it is, and three years from now when we leave office, this province is going to be in terrible terrible condition. How else can it be, Mr. Speaker?

You know, we're in the process of discussing the Jobs Fund, and I find it interesting that the Minister of Government Services the other evening spent 10 minutes going through a list of items, and I'm sorry, I can't remember them all, but — (Interjection) — Well, the Premier is obviously proud, he should be; it took him 10 minutes to go through, but every item he said he didn't measure it, it wasn't measured in man or person years; it was measured in weeks, and he went through a list that took him almost 10 minutes, Sir, and he came up to 5,000 person weeks of work - person weeks. You do a calculation, Sir, and you come out to roughly 120 full-time jobs, and that's all we see over there. I tell you, Sir, one year from now when they are desperate and they bring out another program worth 80 million or 100 million, because that's all the money they can possibly devote toward it, it'll be measured in days, Sir, the Jobs Fund - an attempt to mislead the people.

Here now we have \$200 million devoted to the Jobs Fund and the government is running as fast and as hard as they can with that \$200 million, and I think it's been determined that some 18 million of it is new. Yet, Mr. Speaker, during the Schreyer years, \$600 million a year was pumped into Hydro, which in today's dollars would probably be closer to a billion, and yet 18 million new dollars are being put into a Jobs Fund today, and this government is using all the press, all the print and all the type they can to push that 18 million. I say that the people of Manitoba aren't going to accept this. They are becoming very wise to the attempt by the government to bail themselves out of that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell overly on the state of the economy and where it's at. I'd like to talk about another pragmatist over there, somebody who I know understands the situation and how

desperate it is, and that's the Minister of Health. I believe he understands how serious the situation is and I know he realizes the length of that government is short-term. Mr. Speaker, I don't know where that member is tonight. Like one of my colleagues says, he may be out attempting to soothe the wounds of the Member for Elmwood, but nevertheless, I consider him a pragmatist.

Then we had the Minister of Transportation who just left, another individual - I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the member is in the House - who fully understands as a businessman in his own right where we're at, who fully realizes that the province is in desperate shape, who knows how this government has let down rural Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, the comment is circulating around the rural areas that seat belt legislation had to come in; that the state of the roads is so bad for our own safety we had better wear seat belts.

The Minister of Highways and Transportation, he fully understands that. He knows the state of the roads in rural Manitoba. He knows that because of conservation of energy, those of us who are driving smaller cars on these roads that are rutted and are full of pot holes, he realizes fully well our commitment to saving tax dollars, those of us in rural Manitoba.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Four lanes to Morris and he's talking about ruts.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, the members want to jostle me a little bit about the four lanes to Morris. Mr. Speaker, I don't know when the last time it was that you had an opportunity to drive out Highway 75 South, but I can tell you right now, it's been twin to PR 429 and all it is, is a built-up dirt bank. That's all there is, and we're many many years away from seeing completed four lanes to Morris. As a matter of fact, I'm willing to predict right here and now, it'll only ever happen under a Tory government. It's the only time that road will ever be completed to Morris. That's the only time it'll ever happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, then we have the Resources Minister. The Minister in charge of energy and Crown corporations, the Member for Transcona, who believes by bringing forward this ManOil, this oil and gas corporation, that the province is going to reach its destiny, its place alongside of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to stop going through the members opposite. I'll leave out - because I don't think they could stand the torture - the Ministers of Government Services and Housing, those Ministers. Mr. Speaker, I believe this government is completely out of touch; I believe they could care very little about the next generation. I think, from an economic standpoint, that there is absolutely no thought or consideration given to where we are headed as a province. There is just a desire that the Federal Government succeed, built on the hopes that the U.S. pulls out of these difficult times and takes us along with them.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it should be of no surprise, when you look around in the Western World and you see what's happening. Nationally, the NDP are rated at a 16 percent level. That's the degree and favour they're held by the population of this nation - 16 percent -

and we just see what stunning defeat they received in England just last week. I think, Sir, that if I have a hope and if I have regained confidence in people as a whole, I can tell you I have over the last month; I've seen what's happened in the British Columbia election.

I honestly now believe that people are beginning to wake up and realize that government is nothing different than the people because I believe for too long you had people of NDP persuasion trying to convince the voters that the government was something different than themselves, that the government somehow was tapped into wealth that was other than their own, that indeed that the government could do things that the people themselves didn't have to pay for, and I think over the last half year, many things are happening where people at large are beginning to realize that nothing happens unless they pay for it, that there's a consequence to every expenditure by the government. That's why, Sir, I can tell you I was terribly encouraged by the election results in British Columbia. An election that even members opposite suggest that they lost; that if all the signs were perfect; that if ever there was an election they were going to win, that was the one; the one in British Columbia. Sir, they did not win it because they misjudged the people. The people came to their senses and realized that there's a cost to everything. They were prepared to throw away and throw aside those promises and realize that today they had to face up to the problems that were at hand.

Then we see what's happened in England, Sir, and we fully realize what'll happen in this province only too soon if it could happen. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, within that NDP caucus meeting tonight, hopefully, Sir, there are a great number of people who are now very concerned with the leadership of that government opposite; people who are now prepared to break rank and who are beginning to realize that the people no longer want this government and will work toward an election. Because the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when the citizens of this province are realizing, they're not going to believe anymore these comments of a \$200 million Jobs Fund, taking the money out of one department and calling it something else. They're not going to accept that anymore.

The bottom line of course, Mr. Speaker, is the 52,000, the 53,000 unemployed people. I'm wondering when the members opposite are going to say that these 6,000 work weeks, soon to be defined in days I'm sure, what their reason's going to be that it's not cutting into the unemployed figure of 52,000. What is the rationale? When are they going to come forward as to why their programs are doing nothing to help alleviate the terrible unemployment in this province?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's because the members basically are a bunch of dreamers. They're people that do not understand where we're headed. They do not care. They're just set off in their own area. They're not attempting to look at the problem as a whole. They just believe by throwing money at a few work weeks of employment that they can solve all the problems. Sir, why don't they turn it over to people that know how to manage? Why don't they turn it over to people that know what to do?

Mr. Speaker, the members can chide me all they want about protracted restraint. But Sir, for somebody that's in the business world, if you can't afford it, you

can't pay for it, and the bankers will only lend for so long. I don't know when the members opposite will realize that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, on those few notes I feel somewhat better that I've used my grievance at this time and hopefully the members opposite will take some of the things I have had to say to heart. Thank you.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I'd like to suggest to the Member for Minnedosa that when it comes to talking about heavies, he's the last one who should begin to look in this direction. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa has some way to go with his honey eating before I'll ever describe him as sweet.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going on today on the motion to go in to Supply, although I certainly don't have any grievances with the government, I would like to take this opportunity to speak on the grievances that I have with what I'm hearing from members opposite today, particularly the member, who some on this side have taken to describing as Don Gamble from Pembina, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek who I'm sure will be here during my remarks.

The Member for Morris I have less occasion to differ with because he's such a moderate, reasonable fellow most of the time. Generally I have respect for his opinions.

A MEMBER: Oh, you're in trouble now, Clayton.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I sometimes wonder how he feels comfortable when he meets in his caucus, although I understand that the kind of dissent I'm hearing referenced from members opposite about our caucus is something that couldn't take place over there. We all know the iron will and the iron hand that is used to keep that caucus in line. — (Interjection) — I also should point out that iron fist and that iron hand also keeps the caucus chairman in line.

HON. S. LYON: You weren't even good as the Deputy Clerk, why do you try to defend them?

A MEMBER: You weren't good as Premier.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — the unwillingness of the Leader of the Opposition to meet me on even ground but rather cast aspersions on a previous career demonstrates the weakness of his position right from the beginning. Those kinds of insults are not warranted in debate, and he would find that amongst his own colleagues they would not be substantiated.

HON. S. LYON: You aren't equal, that's why.

MR. A. ANSTETT: One of the things that members opposite seem to think will score points for them is to waver in this Chamber and on the hustings, a document called "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." They knocked this government as I do for its failure to keep every

single commitment it made, but I knock them for not moving fast enough in some areas. The opposition criticizes them for keeping 11 of the 15 promises that were made, but then on the other hand they criticize us for keeping none of the commitments made in that document. Well as the Member for Sturgeon Creek says so often, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. You can't criticize this government and this Premier for keeping the promises they've kept to date in a young government only 18 months in office, kept well over two-thirds of the commitments they made, and yet criticize the government.

Mr. Speaker, let's analyze why they want to wave that document. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if members opposite know this, but in the electoral division of Springfield, that document was received in my constituency office as background material. It was not distributed. The canvassers didn't even have it, let alone the voters. It was the same in Thompson.

MR. C. MANNESS: The question is, did Howard Pawley sign your copy?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes. For the Member for Morris my copies were signed by the Premier of this province, absolutely, I'm very proud of that. I've kept the one copy I had in my office just for that reason. But, Mr. Speaker, in River East; in Riel - well Flin Flon doesn't count because that's a safe seat - in Dauphin. Mr. Speaker, in all the seats which the Conservatives were so concerned about, because the election turned on those seats; with all the allegations that that election was won under false pretences, because all the electors were misled by this document of promises which have not been kept.

A MEMBER: Let's see it, come one, where's the copy?

MR. A. ANSTETT: I'm sure members opposite all have one in their desk. If they want to wave it, we'll cheer again. The facts of the matter are that the election was not won with that document; the opposition gives the government and the Premier far too much credit. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that, in virtually every one of what we describe as swing constituencies in this province, the issues were not, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans;" the issues were not what this government was promising, even though Manitobans had come to know, under Schreyer, that NDP Governments kept their promises. No, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the issue.

Mr. Speaker, wish as I wish, wish as I could tell the Member for Minnedosa that the people of Manitoba elected a New Democratic Party Government on November 17th, 1981; I can't. Mr. Speaker, they threw out the former Premier of this province and his colleagues; that's what they did.

A MEMBER: You lost it, that's what happened. Governments don't win elections, they lose them.

MR. A. ANSTETT: They threw them out. I'd love to be able to say that I was elected on the basis of the policies that the party was enunciating, and on the basis of how I articulated them in the campaign in Springfield; it's not true.

We were elected because of the incompetence and, primarily, the lack of credibility of an arrogant government that outlived its usefulness in one term.

A MEMBER: Oppositions don't win elections; governments lose them.

HON. S. LYON: Don't damage the furniture, your're not going to be there very long.

MR. A. ANSTETT: That's the issue. The Leader of the Opposition is concerned about damage to their furniture because he figures this Premier won't be here for long. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, the Leader of the Opposition is still looking for new furniture. The last concern he has is ever being on this side of the House, again.

A MEMBER: You run when he barks.

A MEMBER: Senator Sterling.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Pembina, the Don Gamble of this Legislature, said that the problem with this government in the last 18 months was a question of credibility. Mr. Speaker, that was the question for four years; that was the real issue in the last election campaign. A party which told Manitobans times are good; there are blue skies ahead and you're sitting on a gold mine, when more people were leaving Manitoba than were coming to this province, when the Manitoba 10-year economic review, shown in this House by the Member for Sturgeon Creek today, shows actual population declines in three years, net losses in population in three years, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek talks about the trustworthiness and accuracy of this document.

Of course, he was responsible for ordering its preparation, and it is accurate, and Manitoba's population did decline in those years; but, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, and others on that side, weren't prepared to admit that point and tried to fudge those statistics. They refused to tell the people of Manitoba that times were tough.

The difference between this government and that government was we were honest with the people of Manitoba during that election campaign and, Mr. Speaker, we've continued to be honest with the people of Manitoba.

I would enjoy being able to tell the people of Springfield that the tide has turned; that things are better; that there's a blue sky; that people aren't leaving Manitoba; that there are jobs for every young person; but that's not true and I'm not going to go out and destroy the credibility of this Premier, or myself, by telling my constituents that. But, Mr. Speaker, that's what the previous member in my constituency did, and that's what every member of that former front bench did; they went out and told the people of Manitoba that, and their pocketbooks, and the for sale signs, and their children's suitcases packed to go to Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C. called them liars. I don't call them that, but the children and the adults of this province called that government liars.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, could I speak on my grievance now?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is well aware that he has already spoken on a matter of grievance. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy that you denied the Member for Lakeside an opportunity to speak again because I suspect that he is about to fire me. I had offered, at the Manitoba Association of Rural Municipalities dinner, last November, to be his campaign manager in the leadership contest and, at that time, he tentatively accepted the offer but he wasn't prepared to give me a commitment because I think he suspected that maybe I carried the wrong card. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that tonight I've confirmed that and he's about to fire me, so if you continue to deny him the floor, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina complained about election finances legislation; talked about how this government and this political party was going to be dipping into the public trough to gain funds to finance the next election campaign. Mr. Speaker, there's something that doesn't ring true about that, because the bill that's before the House provides that subsidies only are paid after the election, and after a political party achieves a certain level of success. If one were to dip into the public trough in order to finance an election campaign, before the event, one would have to get the money in advance. Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't propose that; but you know, it's already possible in Manitoba. We have a tax credit system so that any money donated to a political party, up to \$1,150, is eligible for a tax credit of up to a total of \$500, and that money is payable, in advance of the election campaign, as long as you've filed your income tax in advance of the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, who brought in this advance financing from the public trough? Who brought that in? The former Attorney-General of this province, the Member for St. Norbert, brought in that legislation. The Attorney-General says, are we keeping it, or who's keeping it? Absolutely; it's an excellent piece of legislation and I agree with it, and this government agrees with it; but that's a bit of false honesty coming from members opposite to denigrate this government for bringing in legislation which doesn't go half the distance theirs did. Their legislation gave money, in advance, to political parties to finance election campaigns, so there's a real problem with that suggestion from members opposite.

The other interesting angle about this is the Leader of the Opposition made a big storm in this House about financing left-wing kooks; he didn't want to say right-wing kooks because he was afraid the press would label him. We've got a real problem; it's only left-wing kooks he's worried about. — (Interjection) — Yes, he's got too many friends on the other side sitting with him who might be offended if he referred to people on the right that way.

Mr. Speaker, this bill won't supply any support to those parties which do not receive support from the Manitoba electorate, but the bill that was brought in by his government has been providing tax credit rebates to members of the Communist Party, to members of

any other left wing or right wing or centre party; even the Liberals got support from the Progressive Conservative Party.

The next problem the Leader of the Opposition has is he cannot conceive that a tax credit is a tax expenditure. The Leader of the Opposition does not understand that taxes deferred are often just as good as taxes not paid if the deferral lasts long enough. He certainly fails to see that a tax credit, money taken off the amount payable under our income tax system, does not amount to a grant from the public treasury. Every program that government offers for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition is the taxpayer getting his own money back. There's only one taxpayer; every dollar comes from the voters and taxpayers of this province, and if the Leader of the Opposition thinks that when a taxpayer has an obligation to pay taxes, that the forgiveness of that obligation for whatever reason does not then impose a new obligation on all the other taxpayers in that society to make up for that lost revenue, then he has been in wonderland.

Mr. Speaker, if he can't sell peanuts to one customer in his peanut stand, he'd better find another customer or he'll go broke, and when he learns that lesson and he can run a peanut stand properly, maybe the people of Manitoba will give his party another chance in government.

HON. S. LYON: Stop acting like a dumb Deputy Clerk.

MR. A. ANSTETT: We're obviously having some success at getting to the Leader of the Opposition, because he's back to personal attacks again. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to debate policy or wants to debate the issues that are before the people of Manitoba, fine. I'm not prepared to debate his past, and in many ways he should be very happy that I'm not, and I don't mind him debating mine, because I know it has no credibility on either side of this House. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition enjoyed it much better when I wasn't allowed to speak in here.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina again talked about a 27.5 percent pay increase for civil servants. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the '70s we had the one big lie technique and it was basically on the state farm issue. That was the issue which was trumped up to the point where, as the Member for Inkster is wont to quote, Goebbels, if you repeat something often enough, people will begin to believe it. Without a doubt, there were many people in rural constituencies in the Province of Manitoba who believed that a New Democratic Party Government was trying to take control of all the land in the province, was going to communize all the farms in the province; the Member for Lakeside was one of the proponents of that big lie technique.

Mr. Speaker, now I wish we would bring back in the land-lease program. It was one of the best programs that was ever brought in this province to get young farmers on the farm, and I have suggested many times to the Minister of Agriculture that that land-lease program should be brought back. Mr. Speaker, actually, the opportunities now for bringing it back are greatly enhanced because many of the members opposite have continued to destroy their credibility by using the same techniques.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. ANSTETT: Oh, some members opposite think that my support for the land-lease program is something that is a political liability to the government. Mr. Speaker, I wish the government would bring in that program because I don't think it is a political liability. I think that young farmers in this province, because of the actions of the previous government, particularly in the whole area of land ownership, particularly in the way they mismanaged the whole delivery of services in the Department of Agriculture under the auspices of the Member for Arthur, has put young farmers in Manitoba in a position where entry into that occupation is more difficult today than it ever has been.

Mr. Speaker, provision of a land base for young farmers to enter agriculture would be one of the most valuable contributions any government could offer, and I have to congratulate the Member for Arthur. He went some distance to doing that, but he went some distance because of a series of convoluted principles: (1) He got rid of the whole land-lease program but, on the other, he recognized the merit of the program. So he said, well, I really screwed that one up; what am I going to do. So he said, well, I'll sell off the heritage of Manitobans. I'll sell Crown land and use that as the land-lease program of the Conservative Government

HON. S. LYON: Why are you still doing it?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Because we have to do it, because it's an excellent program; we don't have a land-lease program. We need a mechanism for having young farmers acquire farm land. Mr. Speaker, I would never support a land-lease program that did not provide for young farmers to buy and own their own farm land. I would never support it if it didn't provide for that, but members opposite have this real problem. They think the program introduced by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the former Minister of Agriculture in the Schreyer Government, made no such provision. That was part of the big lie; it was a land grant. There was always an option to purchase.

The Member for Arthur is going to get up and say that that purchase had to wait five years. Well, certainly it had to wait five years.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to correct a statement that the member has made and a point of order that he is misleading; that the provision for buy-back in land-lease was not always there under their government under the Schreyer years; that was introduced something like a year after the initial introduction, and it was pressure from the Legislative Assembly of the Progressive Conservative Party that forced that to happen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that was really a point of order. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur has his facts, as usual, half right. The initial program provided for purchase after five years.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, it didn't.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Arthur is correct. The opposition and many farmers in Manitoba were concerned about the length of time farmers had to lease the land, and there was strong pressure put on the Minister and in March of 1977 the program was modified to an immediate purchase option, without a doubt

HON. S. LYON: Just going into the election, imagine that.

A MEMBER: Half a year before the election.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Well, the program was only 18 months before the election. It was one year after it was introduced, as the Member for Arthur says correctly, the program was changed. But the program was changed from a five-year compulsory lease to a one-year compulsory lease. That was the change. To suggest that there was not an Option to Purchase that under the Land Lease Program was the very basis of the big lie campaign used against this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is where I have problems. That whole campaign has now been expanded to half a dozen different issues and one of them is the increase granted to civil servants in this province this past April 1st - the 27.5 percent lie. They've called that an increase of 27.5 percent knowing that the public will perceive that as an annual increase. That's an increase over 30 months, Mr. Speaker, and for the last 18 months of that period, that's an increase at an annualized rate of 5.9 percent.

Now, if the opposition were to tell the people of Manitoba that's its 27.5 percent over 30 months and 5.9 percent annualized over the last 18 months, then they'd be telling the truth. But, Mr. Speaker, they've used the same technique they used in the '70s by only telling half the truth, just as the Member for Arthur when he got up to ask me that question - I think that's what is was, I don't think it was a point of order - about the Option to Purchase - only told half the truth. He only told us that after a year the program was changed to allow an option after one year renting. He didn't tell us that for the first year you had to only rent for five years to obtain that option.

So, there's a real credibility problem opposite, just as they had a credibility problem with the electorate in the last election because they had not been telling the people of Manitoba the truth, the verifiable truth, that people on the ground could see. They are having the same problem today. They're telling the people of Manitoba that a Land Lease Program is communism, is a state farm technique, and they're going to go out and do it again. Nothing this government does will change their minds, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, now we can do it. In the 1970s it may have been doubtful because members opposite could have used that big lie smear campaign successfully.

But, Mr. Premier, I have to tell you, you should be thinking seriously about introducing a new Land Lease Program for young farmers in Manitoba. If necessary, you should work with the Minister of Natural Resources to combine it with the excellent Crown Lands Sale

Program, which also helps young farmers get started in agriculture. I give the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur, credit for the way that program was set up and the initiative shown in getting it under way. I don't give him credit for some of the things that were in the program that had to be cleaned up, but I admit that in any program initially there are a few bugs and they have to be cleared out.

But, I think we could have a Land Lease Program with Options to Purchase for young farmers in this province, and I think the people of Manitoba would accept that program now for one reason: they would not believe the opposition this time. This is an opposition that has totally destroyed its credibility in this province. It has not regained it from the time of the last election, and that election was a measure of credibility. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what members opposite want to say about polls, measures of credibility will tell it all. They don't trust the Conservative Party in this province, and the reason they don't trust the Conservative Party is because they've blown their credibility on so many issues.

So, Mr. Speaker, it may not be a popular question with members on this side, but I personally - and I speak only for myself on this - members opposite have asked, would I introduce the Land Lease Program with guaranteed Options to Purchase as a young farmer incentive program? Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that appalled me and the Member for Minnedosa - I wish was here just now to hear it, I guess he's just slipped out for a moment - said from his seat earlier when the Member for Pembina was speaking that he'd like to see the Cruise tested at Churchill, he called that across the floor. Well, the Member for Pembina was commenting in a disparaging way on the various series of private members' resolutions that are being debated in the House this year, concerned about the debate on the flag.

The Member for Arthur is concerned about 3,000 new jobs at Churchill. Let me tell the Member for Arthur that I don't want 3,000 new jobs. I don't want 300 new jobs. I don't want 30 new jobs or three new jobs that are based upon the premise that we must employ people in the art of killing others. If that is the basis of employment then I reject that totally. — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Sturgeon Creek wants to make an appeal to Manitobans on the basis that the provision of munitions and aircraft and other instruments of war is good for the Manitoba economy. It makes excellent sense. It makes the same kind of logic that this province had to follow and this country had to follow during the Second World War when we said, thousands of men who could not be employed during the depression can suddenly be employed so that we can shoot planes up in the air to shoot them down. So that we can send our young men, the prime of this country, into the air and across the oceans to be sunk with torpedoes and to be shot down by ack-ack. Mr. Speaker, if that's how members opposite want to provide employment for Manitobans, then, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry for anyone who concurs with that logic.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek was complaining that Manitoba combined public and private investment and was in 1982 the second highest in Canada. He was complaining that we were dropping from second highest in 1982 to third highest in 1983, and that's only the Conference Board forecast, we don't know if that's true yet.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't tell us that in 1978 Manitoba was eighth in the country; in 1979, it was eighth; in 1980, it was ninth. Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't want the people of Manitoba to know is that the stewardship of his government ranked this province among the lowest in Canada on virtually every economic indicator. That's a sad commentary on the stewardship they offered this province. The one bright star and the only bright star on which the Member for Sturgeon Creek can hang his hat is the manufacturing sector and, Mr. Speaker, since he had some responsibilities in that area, I can see that he's justifiably proud. I concede some gains were made during that period.

But, Mr. Speaker, in virtually every other economic indicator - and the member has the Conference Board material in front of him. He knows the facts. They've been repeated often enough in this House. Manitoba was eighth or ninth in retail sales increases in the late '70s, Manitoba was first last year. If the Member for Sturgeon Creek wants to dispute that, let him rise and ask me a question quoting contrary statistics, he has them in front of him.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek blows himself out of the water with his own inflated promises of what he did. His own inflated claims. He was a member of a government, Mr. Speaker, which promised homes for all senior citizens, because there were waiting lists under the Schreyer Government. Mr. Speaker, he said those waiting lists would disappear; we'll build homes for senior citizens. You know what happened, Mr. Speaker? The waiting lists disappeared. They came into office, they froze all construction of senior citizens homes and people gave up. They went home. They went to live with their children but they were no longer on the waiting lists.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I realize that the point of order is brought up because I think the member has misled the House and it's only fair to correct him.

The point of order is that we did not freeze senior citizens' housing. We went ahead with the construction that was on the planning boards by the previous government, and that is fact, Sir. I think the member would appreciate knowing that because I have the statistics to prove it, Sir, and I can show him the buildings that were built. I just think that he wouldn't like to mislead the House.

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

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has learned well from the Member for

Arthur. He's told half the truth. Mr. Speaker, yes, that government, after the freeze expired, built some senior citizens' homes, but initially upon taking office all public housing and public projects of that type in this province were frozen, and if he doesn't believe me, ask the people of Ashern; ask the people of Erickson.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just finished bringing a point of order up because I believe the member would not like to mislead the House. So I corrected him, Sir, the public housing and senior citizens' homes continued on as fast as they did in the previous government because I was the Minister of Housing and I can show you when it was done. I can show you when it was done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge the First Minister to go on a stage with me because I have the statistics.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield has the floor.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, in addition to freezing construction of many worthwhile projects in this province upon taking office, the previous government also failed . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The previous government, Mr. Speaker, also failed to deliver on their commitment to help young people in this province find employment and buy homes. They promised a special program to enable young people in this province to buy homes. Mr. Speaker, as it turned out they didn't need the program. All the young people in Manitoba had packed and were leaving this province and the Minister of Housing, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, didn't have to deliver on that promise. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has just challenged the Premier to a debate. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon he challenged me to a debate. When I told him to name the place and the time and I'd be there, he said, no, no, I issued the challenge, you set it up. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I recall the old etiquette, I get to choose weapons, you choose the time and the place. Those are the rules. You choose the time and the place, I'll choose my weapons. Mr. Speaker, I tell you I will come there with no weapons. All I need is my mind. The Member for Sturgeon Creek will have to bring an arsenal. Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't

want to fulfill the challenge he's issued, I'll gladly give him my shirt.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite are also wont to quote extensively from all kinds of statistics. That's why the Member for Sturgeon Creek won't come unarmed; he'll bring a wealth of statistics. One of the statistics he'll bring to back up the argument often used by members on that side is that the best government is the least government. The Member for Gladstone says, right on. The Member for Gladstone wasn't here in 1980 when a record was set. Mr. Speaker, the last 14 Sessions, right back to 1970, not counting '70, because there were a lot of bills that Session; 135. The current Minister of Natural Resources was responsible for a good chunk of them. The busiest Session since then in 14 Sessions, was in 1980 when there were 115 pieces of legislation. What a deliberate sense of hypocrisy to talk about the best government is the least government, from a group of members when in government who set a record for introducing more bills than any other government in 14 Sessions. Mr. Speaker, that's just nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, but in that Session they demonstrated their total incompetence by having to withdraw a very large number of those bills for intersessional study, etc. Close to 20 bills were introduced, withdrawn and held over for later discussion. Let's talk about disgrace. Let's talk about the least government being the best government. If you really believe that, then you probably should have a Conservative Government because they'll bring in 115 bills but because they're so incompetent, most of them will have to be withdrawn. That's the only way you get less government from Conservatives. — (Interjection)

The Member for Sturgeon Creek also was concerned about a memo from Don Vernon to the Honourable Member for Brandon East in which he complained that the Government of the Day refused to implement a whole series of four recommendations: (1) to decrease the corporate income tax rate for manufacturers from 15 percent to 13, see - for large business. From 1977 to 1981 what happened? No change. For small business, from 13 to 11. You know last year this Minister of Finance lowered it to 10. Who's the friend of small business?

Mr. Speaker, another recommendation, eliminate the corporation capital tax of two-tenths of 1 percent; '77 to '81, no change. Eliminate the 5 percent provincial sales tax on production machinery and manufacturing plans; Mr. Speaker, no change. So, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of difficulty listening to three speeches on grievance with this government, all of which challenge the fundamental credibility of the opposition and its ability to provide effective opposition in this House.

The Member for Morris complains that no one in his constituency expresses support for Bill No. 3. Mr. Speaker, he spent more than a year trying to kill that bill. He fought it, wanted it withdrawn last Session. Intersessional meetings were held. He fought last December. Every one of his constituents knows where he stands on that bill. No one would write to him asking him to save that piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, that would be as foolish as asking Dr. Henry Morgentaler to save your unborn child. Mr. Speaker, he asks, who wants this kind of legislation? If he wants to know, I

tell him, ask the Member for Arthur. The Member for Arthur had the Women's Institute, the Farm Bureau, the United Church, all telling him that his bill was inadequate. Who wants the change? Ask the Member for Arthur.

Mr. Speaker, many members on that side tell people that they support freedom of choice. Mr. Speaker, I support freedom of choice. I support the choice the people of Manitoba made on November 17, 1981 and one of the problems with members opposite is they still have not given the people of Manitoba that freedom. They continue to feel, deep in their hearts, that the people of Manitoba made a mistake. Mr. Speaker, that's a denial of democracy; that's a denial of freedom and that's a denial of their role as an opposition.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I've ever, since I've been a member of this Legislature, ever used my grievance and I think it is appropriate and almost essential that it be used now.

The previous speaker's speech, Mr. Speaker, was so riddled with errors that I don't want to dwell on it at any length. But in the last few remarks he was making, referring to the document that the Member for Sturgeon Creek referred to earlier on today, he indicated there was no change in the corporation Capital tax. Mr. Speaker, if he consults with the Minister of Finance, he will find that there were significant reductions or increases in the exemptions with respect to that tax over the four years while we were in government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to correct that particular statement, indeed there were changes, in terms of the minimum amount at which a corporation would have to pay, but the same applied also in the first year of our government. We also made a change. The effective rate is what the member was referring to, the two-tenths of 1 percent of the paid-up Capital of the corporation, and that did not change, and that was what the memo requested.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that clarification.
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield will find that the increase in the exemptions eliminated that tax from a large percent of those businesses who were paying it. He has referred, Mr. Speaker, to the great benefits that the NDP Government have given to small business by giving them a \$2 million tax reduction, overall, in Manitoba.

This is the same government, I remind members opposite, that small business employs approximately 70 percent of the employees in Manitoba. If we consider the fact that the payroll tax is raising some \$110 million for Manitoba businesses, what they have done is impose a tax of some \$75 million on those same small businesses that they say they gave this great tax relief

of \$2 million to. Now, Mr. Speaker, who is the friend of small business in Manitoba? Who is the friend? It appears to me and everybody here, an obvious discrepancy of some \$73 million, so we know who the friends of small business are.

That really raises the essence of my grievance, and the essence of my grievance is with respect to the Jobs 'fraud' Fund and the destructive way in which this government has affected employment in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, because we can go through each Minister on that side of the House and look at how each one of those Ministers has destroyed employment opportunities in this province and they bring forward a so-called \$200 million Jobs Fund to attempt to cover up for the actions of the past 20 months.

We have the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs speaking, through the Throne Speech and since then, about this government going into the life insurance industry, Mr. Speaker. They are studying going into the life insurance industry and it may seem like a small item to members opposite, but to investors from outside this province and to people who are contemplating further investments within Manitoba, it tells them a great deal about how this government views the private sector. They may not realize that; unfortunately, I don't think they do, but it says a lot to the investor who is looking at Manitoba, either to make a new investment here or to expand an existing investment and it is not conducive to more investment in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, staying with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs - a gentleman who has some responsibility with respect to consumers in Manitoba. We have seen during the past two or three months, the consumer price index in Manitoba increasing at a higher rate than any other major city in Canada, when during 1981, we had the lowest consumer price index across Canada, Mr. Speaker. Apart from the effect on the individual consumers in Manitoba including those 52,000 unemployed persons in Manitoba, that is another increase in the cost of doing business in Manitoba, to employers throughout this province. That increase, as we've seen, as cited clearly in Statistics Canada, is a result of government-induced increases in sales tax, in gasoline tax, in the whole range of government taxation. So they, Mr. Speaker, have once again been increasing the cost of doing business, hurting employment opportunities in this province.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has not dealt yet with the report on assessment, the problem of assessment. Assessment was a problem prior to our taking office in 1977. The previous government had not taken any action even though it was brought to their attention how serious a problem it was. Mr. Speaker, the government had a report, shortly after they assumed office, a well-researched, thorough report on assessment and we have seen no action to date. The Minister, yesterday I believe, indicated he is prepared to call a committee meeting now. He's prepared to bring forward some sort of a government report, a government position we hope, but with the way in which he's handling this, I would forecast that we will not see anything, any legislation, until perhaps 1984 when there will be only some legislation that will set up a structure. There will be no substantive legislation until perhaps 1985 and there will be no changes made in the assessment problem. The

assessment problem. Mr. Speaker, is a problem which affects business and the cost of doing business in this province is only one of a number of factors.

Mr. Speaker, next to him we have the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, a 9 to 20 percent increase in assessment to businesses in Manitoba who support the operations of the Workers Compensation Board. As we have said on this side in the past, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to support improvements in Workers Compensation Board where they can be shown that they are required. We had initiated a judicial inquiry which would have started that. The Minister has appointed a Board of his own choosing without consultation with labour and business, a Board which is firing long-serving employees of this province, Mr. Speaker - at least three that we know of - and many more that I understand have been let go, have been fired, have been forced to retire at a very significant cost, Mr. Speaker.

The first two that we knew about cost over \$125,000.00. This new board is all operating cars, Mr. Speaker. They all have close to \$50,000 salaries. The expenses of administration have increased significantly and it all results, Mr. Speaker, in a 9 to 20 percent increase to the employers in this province. Again, another increase in the cost of doing business.

He's introduced a bill today, Mr. Speaker, which he acknowledges would in one year cost the employers of this province some \$4 million to implement his changes to The Workplace Safety and Health Act. Again, Mr. Speaker, everyone supports the objective of avoiding injury to workers, but it is simply another factor that will add to the cost of doing business in this province, and when you add them all together as we will at the end, it makes an extremely significant impact on the cost of doing business in the Province of Manitoba.

We have, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance who introduced the payroll tax; the 1.5 percent which is costing as I've said small businesses throughout this province some \$75 million per year. That's where 75 percent of the employees of this province are working, Mr. Speaker. The employees have to be suffering either through reduced employment opportunities or through reduced remuneration. Another cost of doing business in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

We have, as another example, Mr. Speaker, of the destruction of the economic scene in Manitoba and employment opportunities in Manitoba has been the work of the Minister of Mines and Energy who has lost the mega projects for this province which would have provided thousands of jobs for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, he persists in pursuing the ManOil proposition in spite of the successes that are occurring in southwestern Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, he almost, as my colleagues say, is providing us with all of the counterarguments. He comes into this House every week with another announcement of something new happening in that area of the province brought about as a result of the changes in taxation and royalties that we made in this province in that particular area to provide the incentives for the development that is occurring, and which they voted against, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues say, and he still persists in spending \$20 million of the taxpayers' money in asking for that authority to proceed with a

government ManOil Corporation. It simply defies understanding and logic, Mr. Speaker, and is another example like the life insurance study by the government of the mind-set of this government and their attitude toward the private sector which is not helpful in attracting investment in this province. — (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker, that same Minister responsible for the Manitoba Hydro has removed the hydro rate freeze so that individuals, homeowners, consumers, and businesses will have a 9.5 percent increase effective I believe in the month of May of this year. Another increase in the cost of doing business, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — we have a Minister of Labour who gives support to union leaders who take the position that they do not have to make any concessions to their employers to save jobs in Manitoba. She has supported that position, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the public I felt last winter was outraged that workers in that industry would continue on with the demands that they have, and I believe the public opinion said if they have a job and a small increase, they should be very happy. They could be one of those at that time 54,000 unemployed workers in Manitoba. But that again, Mr. Speaker, is a pro-union leadership attitude that is not helping investment in this province and is not helping industry and business in this province in attracting and developing new employment opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, we have an Urban Affairs Minister - and the Member for Springfield seemed to dispute the figures when the Member for Pembina was speaking today - a Minister of Urban Affairs who has presided over an increase in real property taxes on an average home in the Winnipeg school division assessed at \$7,000, when you combine, Mr. Speaker, the net increase in taxes on that home in two years under the NDP, it is three times the increase on that same home during four years of Progressive Conservative administration. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, and that is right in their own constituency, in the inner city, in the Winnipeg school division. That is the record with respect to real property taxation. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, that is going to get worse and worse and worse. It is a deplorable situation.

Over four years, Mr. Speaker, the increase in taxes was some \$78.03. The increase in two years under the NDP is three times that; three times the increase that occurred over four years under our government, Mr. Speaker, because we supported the City of Winnipeg and we supported the educational system to a very significant degree. We supported it, Mr. Speaker, on the basis that the municipalities and the City of Winnipeg made the decisions as to how that money was to be spent. It was spent well, Mr. Speaker, and the taxpayer benefited from that system.

We have, Mr. Speaker, not only this very significant increase in the consumer price index in the City of Winnipeg when it was the lowest in Canada, and now has had for two or three months the highest increase across Canada, but we also have, Mr. Speaker, a very deplorable unemployment rate in the City of Winnipeg. The latest statistics indicate even in May, 1983, compared to May, 1984, the rate has increased to 11.8 percent, and the number of employed persons in the City of Winnipeg are 271,000 compared to 275,000 a

year ago. So we have, Mr. Speaker, within the City of Winnipeg a very deplorable unemployment rate.

I remind members opposite, this is their constituency, Mr. Speaker. It's no wonder that poll, that was referred to in the Winnipeg Free Press today, has indicated the results that it's had, because this government has failed them with respect to providing employment opportunities, failed them miserably in that area; it has failed them in protecting them against the consumer price index increase; in fact, it has caused it through government taxation; and it has not protected them with respect to real property taxation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to unemployment, the rate of unemployment is something we've talked about during the past days. The trends, Mr. Speaker, are very disturbing when we find that in May of this year, Manitoba had the highest seasonally adjusted rate increase of any province, tied with Prince Edward Island. When that seasonally adjusted rate dropped across Canada, it increased .7 percent in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the highest seasonally adjusted rate increase in the country.

Mr. Speaker, as we said yesterday, the number of unemployed persons remained constant from April to May at 52,000 people at a time when that number of unemployed people should be dropping significantly at that period of time. All during this while, Mr. Speaker, we've had supposedly \$131 million committed from the Jobs Fund, and this is happening. We have, Mr. Speaker, an unemployment rate of 16.9 percent among the young people of this province; among men between 15 and 24, it is 20 percent. One out of every five young persons walking around on the streets of Manitoba, living in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, one out of every five young male persons between 15 and 24 is unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, that is a shameful statistic. Mr. Speaker, this is for May of 1983. The Careerstart Program has been in effect; the Minister of Labour tells us that they've employed some 6,000 young people during this period of time, and we still have an unemployment rate of 20 percent among males 15 to 24. Mr. Speaker, we'll be asking the Minister of Labour questions about this. She closed the applications for the Careerstart Program at the end of April, and the applications. At the end, in a matter of a week, we will have thousands of high school students coming onto the job market and what's going to happen to them? Mr. Speaker, there is going to be nothing available for them, absolutely nothing; they will join the other one out of five young men of this province who don't have jobs.

What is more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, as we've said, is the complete lack of development in the private sector under this government. Do we ever hear them talking about the private sector? They referred, Mr. Speaker, and with some pride when the Premier introduced the Jobs Fund, to the fact that the spending of \$131 million had levered \$81 million from other governments and the private sector. When we look at the statistics, we see that \$62 million of that \$81 million comes from other governments; \$18 million comes from the private sector but the bulk of that, Mr. Speaker, comes from Careerstart where the employers have always had to subsidize part of the wages. So, Mr. Speaker, there is very, very little private sector money being leveraged by the Jobs Fund and it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker.

For example, they said they were going to appoint an advisory committee when they announced the Jobs

Fund, and they didn't do that until June 3rd when they had \$131 million of the \$200 million Jobs Fund committed. So they obviously didn't seek advice from the advisory committee and from the private sector representatives with respect to that, and the results are plain. There is very little private sector money being levered; it is all Federal Government or Municipal Government money, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a great deal of money being spent on job creation in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, but there is very little being done in the way of encouraging the private sector to develop the long-term employment opportunities that have to be developed in Manitoba in order to provide those long-term jobs, and it's the things that we've talked about; the anti-business attitude that the president, now past president as of a few weeks, of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, when he described the anti-business attitude of this government. That's reflected in the mind-set of this government in looking at the life insurance industry, in considering whether or not the government should go into that industry, and proceeding with ManOil, a Crown corporation, when there already is a successful private sector activity involved in that area. Those are the kinds of things that deter development and investment in this province by the private sector.

There are the increases in the cost of doing business in this province, Mr. Speaker, that are caused by the payroll tax, the increases in the sales tax, the increases in the gasoline tax, the increases in the Workers Compensation Board assessment, the increases in the Manitoba Hydro rates, the increases in the real property taxes. There is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, of the pro-union leadership exhibited by the Minister of Labour; and, to give her all due at the very least, the very neutral attitude by the Minister of Economic Development towards the private sector. All of which, Mr. Speaker, do not bode well for this province and the development of employment opportunities by the private sector in this province. The province, Mr. Speaker, cannot go on funding the kind of deficits that this government has incurred in order to spend on short-term job creation projects.

The credit people warned the government some months ago, when they imposed a credit watch, that they had to discipline themselves; one of the main concerns being, I think, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the deficit that eventually came in was substantially and significantly above the predicted deficit when the Budget was brought in, and again, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned that this is going to happen in the forthcoming year. Then we have a reduction in the credit rating of this province which can only result in a reduction in the availability of finances available to this province or an increase in the lending rates to this province, Mr. Speaker. We simply cannot go on forever and ever, Mr. Speaker, in borrowing money and incurring deficits the way this government is doing, to fund short-term job creation projects, while the government carries on with anti-business, anti-private sector concerns and decisions increasing the cost of doing business to this province.

The Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, must compete with other provinces and with other countries in order to sell the goods that we've produced in Manitoba. When you increase the cost of doing business

as this government has, you make this province much less competitive, Mr. Speaker, with other provinces. We have a government next to us, just west of us, in the Province of Saskatchewan, that has reduced taxation, that is doing everything it can, Mr. Speaker, to attract investment to the Province of Saskatchewan, and they're succeeding, Mr. Speaker. They're succeeding and I have had occasion during the past few months to speak to a number of businessmen from this province who have been invited to meet with the officials of the Government of Saskatchewan, who have had described to them what they describe as very advantageous circumstances to invest in Saskatchewan. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that some of that investment is going to happen in the Province of Saskatchewan, because under this government we are not competing in any way whatsoever with the Province of Saskatchewan.

If that happens, Mr. Speaker, and continues to happen, we're not going to have those jobs created in the private sector that we have to have to provide jobs for these 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba, to provide jobs for those one out of five young men in this province between the age of 15 to 24 who are unemployed, Mr. Speaker. Young people today, Mr. Speaker, many of them, are losing hope in the future. Short-term jobs are not solving that situation. People have to see an opportunity for the long term, Mr. Speaker, for the long-term future. These short-term jobs, Mr. Speaker, are not going to satisfy that concern.

We have asked, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour in her Estimates to study the effects of the payroll tax. She has refused to do that. There seems to be, Mr. Speaker, no recognition, no care, no concern of the effects of the increases in tax that have occurred in this province on the private sector and how that affects the development of employment opportunities in this province. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have what has been described rightfully as a political charade, the Jobs Fund, which is supposed to indicate to the people of Manitoba the great concern of this government over unemployment in this province, when it is the actions of this government that is causing unemployment in this province and the lack of employment opportunity, a government that has lost the mega projects, that has increased taxation throughout the province and increased the cost of doing business.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a charade. It is an attempt to cover up for the destructive economic policies of this government which have caused unemployment, a charade which they hope pass off the people of Manitoba to show that they are really concerned about unemployment, when they go on, Mr. Speaker, with a 19.2 percent increase in expenditures, a rate of percentage increase almost double that of any other province in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government are so much different from the actions of almost any other government in North America today, and the predictions that we're seeing now are demonstrating that Manitoba is going to rank well behind in terms of economic growth and development, in terms of real job creation and give this one more year, a year and a half, Manitoba will be well behind other provinces in this country in terms of economic growth in creating these employment opportunities that some 52,000 people in Manitoba deserve.

Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Springfield was speaking, he talked about The Elections Financing Act, and he almost spoke derisively of the tax credit program that we had introduced, and Mr. Speaker, in commenting at that time from my seat, he did acknowledge that that program was going to be retained by the government. He pointed out how much it cost, some \$670,000 - \$680,000 in 1981 according to the Electoral Commission Report which was, of course, a year of an election.

Mr. Speaker, as we've attempted to point out to the government, under that program a taxpayer in Manitoba chose which party he wished to support and he could support any of those that were registered, he could support any of them.

HON. S. LYON: If the kook wants to support a left-wing coup, that's his business.

MR. G. MERCIER: He had a complete freedom of choice, Mr. Speaker, to support any individual he wished to choose. Now, we have a system, though, Mr. Speaker, that will, according to the comments from the Attorney-General, in 1981 would have cost \$1.4 billion. In 1985 or 1986, what will it be? It would be close, perhaps, to \$2 million. The Member for Springfield says, no. Well, perhaps it'll be 1.6, 1.7. — (Interjection) — The Member for Springfield has a great deal of difficulty in understanding, Mr. Speaker. 1981 was two years ago. We're talking about an election in another two or three years. We're suffering through the highest consumer price index across Canada in the City of Winnipeg right now, so obviously through inflation, Mr. Speaker, the cost is going to increase by some \$200,000 or \$300,000 at least, at a very minimum. It will be a cost, at that time, Mr. Speaker, imposed upon every taxpayer in Manitoba, whether or not they want to support philosophical political views of any of the parties that do receive public funding.

Mr. Speaker, what would be interesting to note, and the Attorney-General has referred to the fact that there are other jurisdictions who do have public funding, to some degree, of elections. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the public in Manitoba, or the public of Canada, realize what it is costing them to support the federal political parties who receive support under the federal legislation. Mr. Speaker, I don't think they know; I don't think 1 percent or 2 percent of the public of Canada know what they are paying, through their taxes, to support all of the political parties who receive public funding in federal elections; I don't think they know. I think, Mr. Speaker, if they knew, they would be very very annoyed at what it is costing the average taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer in Manitoba is going to be very annoyed at having to spend \$1.6 billion, \$1.7 billion in 1985 or 1986 to support all of the political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the tax credit program was introduced to encourage individuals to support political parties, and it's been successful. The Attorney-General, I hope, will let us know later on during debates, certainly we'll ask him in committee, how many individuals contributed, through that system of tax credits, to the support of the political party that they wished to support.

It was a program, Mr. Speaker, that was designed to broaden the support of political parties; it was

successful there. If you're going to support publicly 50 percent of the election expenses of a political party, you're going to reduce the reliance of a political party on attracting and developing a wide base of support among individuals, Mr. Speaker, and that's important. What's going to happen is it's going to remove, to a certain degree, political parties from the individuals in our community, Mr. Speaker; because of that they won't have to rely on them, won't have to go to them for financial support.

So it has, I suspect, a disadvantage from that point of view, not considering the fact that the support has to be done on an involuntary basis, Mr. Speaker. That's something the members opposite should be concerned

about because that was the clear intention of the tax credit system, and it's been very successful in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate this is the first time that I've ever had to speak on a grievance. The unemployment situation in Manitoba is drastic and the policies of this government, Mr. Speaker, are making it worse. The Jobs Fund is only a charade to cover up the destructiveness of the economic policies of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 10 o'clock the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.