



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXI No. 4B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 17 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. 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, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
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	Virden	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, Hon. 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

Tuesday, 17 April, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has 10 minutes remaining.

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

It is little time in which to reconfirm the weaknesses of the opposition. However, just when we rose at 5:30 — (Interjection) — well, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain wants a recap. I would like him to read this over another night as a nightcap. I am sure that he will have some sweet dreams if he recognizes the logic of what I say, and he will have nightmares if he doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, just before we adjourned at 5:30, I was pointing out that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues criticize our government for using relatively small sums of money to initiate very substantial projects which otherwise may not have moved because they just needed some topping up, and so we have been able to get people to advance their spending plans to get into some economic activity that they were otherwise reluctant to move on, and that's an incentive program that an astute government can follow.

Rather than throwing vast sums at some large projects, we have astutely distributed dollar incentives to encourage an infusion of multi-millions of dollars into the Manitoba economy. Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't understand that. He says that — (Interjection) — no, I am not going to comment on where the Leader of the Opposition is, but he fails to understand that that kind of judicious investment by government can be a very dynamic factor in the economy. It's not that we pour all the money in. We get a lot of private dollars activated, a lot of other government-level dollars activated by the infusion of relatively small sums of public money.

On a large scale it does become a significant amount of money when you look at the broad perspectives of the Jobs Fund, the municipal initiatives, the community initiatives. All of those things combined produce very substantial economic dynamism, and that is the result of the Jobs Fund. — (Interjection) — Yes. The honourable member doesn't know what that is because he has never felt that within his system or within his party. You know, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, again paying faint praise to our initiatives and the fact that we have very significant infusion of Federal Government dollars into Manitoba by the bargaining that we have carried on with the Federal Government, to make sure that we get our fair share of public investment in Manitoba.

For four years that party neglected the opportunities for investment of federal public dollars in Manitoba

because they chose the route to stand and attack the Federal Government at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that if you're going to try and get another level of government to put some money into the economy of Manitoba you don't attack them at every opportunity. You sit down with them and bargain, bargain tough but bargain fairly, and give credit where credit is due. When the Federal Government is involved in a program, you don't try to upstage them; you try to be fair and say, look, this is an investment of public dollars, federal dollars, provincial dollars to better the economy of Manitoba. That's the kind of thing we did in respect to the Forestry Agreement, joint announcement, no one trying to upstage anyone else, fair treatment and that's the kind of federal co-operation that the former administration in Manitoba, a Conservative administration, repudiated. They like to grandstand, to the neglect of the Manitoba people, because we didn't get our fair share of investment of federal public dollars in Manitoba. They are accountable for that, but what we have done is we have insisted with the Federal Government that when it came to housing dollars, when it came to forestry dollars, when it came to mining dollars, when it came to investment in transportation, we wanted our fair share.

We didn't want any more than anyone else but we wanted our fair share, and the Federal Government has recognized the correctness of those desires and has sat down and bargained with us on that.

During the time that the former administration was in power, what did they do in respect to forestry? What did they do about renewal in forestry? They did zero, absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, and now all we get is damning with faint praise from the Leader of the Opposition, echoed by his colleagues sitting there, when we recognize in the Throne Speech the infusion of \$27 million into the forestry sector.

A MEMBER: Tell us about wildlife.

HON. A. MACKLING: Tell us about wildlife, the honourable member says. In the years he was in power they put nothing into a habitat trust fund; there was no such thing. We have put some money into habitat trust, so that's the kind of attitude, that's the kind of conduct that was demonstrated by the former administration, Mr. Speaker.

I want to take a moment, too, to say something about the contributions of my colleagues in this debate. I want to say to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the sincerity of the convictions that he holds and the remarks that he made in this Throne Speech Debate, recognize that we owe much to our Native peoples, much that remains to be done to satisfy the needs that exist to allow the Native people to develop more autonomy. That's not an easy road, it's not a quick road, but we as a government are committed to assisting in that development.

Then I want to refer to the words and the speech of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, whose words

were criticized by the Leader of the Opposition, because she deigned to talk to little people. She talked to cab drivers, yeah, she talked to cab drivers and she related to people, not people that belonged to the Canadian Club or the Manitoba Club or the Carlton Club; no, she talked to cab drivers and asked them about Medicare in Ontario.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: That troubles members opposite, that an MLA would engage in political or social discussion with a cab driver, that's beneath their dignity, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of elitism that manifests itself from the Conservative Party.

We, as a government, want to know what cab drivers and waitresses and workers of every description, and farmers, people who work in the forest and on the lakes, we want to know what they think, Mr. Speaker, because we have a government that wants to hear, listen and respond to the needs of all the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to suggest, I'm going to give the opposition some constructive advice, and you know I do that without any great trepidation, because I know that they won't likely follow that advice, so I'm relatively comfortable in giving it.

I would suggest to the opposition that it's time they listened to the people, it's time that they started to recognize that what the people of Manitoba want, they want a political party that is encouraging government to get the economy going by doing things like the Jobs Fund, by taking initiatives like we're doing in the Jobs Fund, get with positive government, get with the idea that government can help in the economy, rather than just sitting back and reacting.

Give us your constructive criticisms about the things that we should be doing to make this a better Manitoba rather than nay-saying everything we try. The people of Manitoba may be listening to you, but continue on the course of action where you decry every positive thing we do and you will suffer, because, Mr. Speaker, if you are doomsayers and negativists the people will not listen to you. They are expecting a constructive critical opposition, not one that continues to attack every project we develop.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in all respect to those whiz kids that are advising you, they should drop the epithet "The Fraud Fund," because I tell you that the Jobs Fund has proven itself already, Mr. Speaker, and will prove itself many many times over. Stop the pretence, stop the charades, be responsible, be constructive as an opposition, and the people of Manitoba may listen to you. Carry on the way you are and you'll stay in opposition for many a decade.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Speaker, it's a rare pleasure one gets in following the Minister of Natural Resources in any kind of a debate, but I want to tell my colleagues on this side of the House who didn't know the honourable member from previous times, that when he worked for me he was a very nice boy. He said, yes, sir; he said, no, sir;

he said, what would you like today, sir; he even brought me coffee. He was a very nice boy in those days, but, of course, as many people on that side are prone to do, their principles are in their pocketbooks and it was worth money to him to say, yes, sir; no, sir; anything you want, sir; because his pay cheque depended on it. What a difference it makes when he's on that side of the House pretending to lecture to us on responsible government.

I remind the Minister of Natural Resources that that it was only about nine short months ago that the man announced a program for reforestation in Manitoba. I believe 28 Manitobans each had a six-month contract to work on reforestation in eastern Manitoba, and this much-touted Jobs Fund, "The Fraud Fund," demanded from the Minister of Natural Resources sufficient monies to put into the Jobs Fund. What did the Minister of Natural Resources do? He terminated those 28 employees halfway through their contract to put the money into the Jobs Fund to create jobs. Here's the man that was just up lecturing us about responsible opposition, the man that fired 28 people to create money for the Jobs Fund, and they were doing something that he just said was a major initiative of his government, reforestation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know it's unparliamentary to call an honourable member hypocritical, but that it is as close as we can hear tonight to that sort of a posturing from a government member, from an honourable member in the government treasury bench. What a lecture! What a lecture, Sir, and what a double two-forked message the Minister of Natural Resources gave to us tonight! It's shameful, Mr. Speaker, he shouldn't be able to look in the mirror and shave in the morning after what he said tonight, but then, of course, principle is not something that's in great abundance over on that side of the House, and particularly not the truth.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I will be supporting my Leader's motion of non-confidence, and I would hope that members opposite would screw up their courage and also support it, because it's a deserving motion.

This, Sir, in the third Throne Speech of this government, is an incredible document. I now see what the government has used all of those public relations people for. They must have taken the last six weeks entirely, all 30 of them, to create this massive document of verbiage with no new ideas, with no new directions for a government. It's simply prose, words in prose put together by 30 to 40 thousand dollar per year public relations people, all that, Sir, and nothing more. That's what the taxpayers of Manitoba are paying \$800,000 per year for. That works out to approximately \$4,000 a page, Mr. Speaker, because that's all those PR people have done for this government, is create a Throne Speech, the first one since I've been here in six years that has been criticized by all who listened to it.

The media criticized it and contrary to what the Deputy Leader said yesterday and one of the Movers or Seconders, I forget which, said that the press did not have the intelligence to understand all the wisdom that was in the Throne Speech, that's what they said.

Mr. Speaker, the press are among 900, well maybe it's close to a million Manitobans who didn't see any wisdom in this Throne Speech. It's about time for honourable members in the government to do a little

self-examination and find out who lacks intelligence. It isn't the press gallery that said that the Speech from the Throne contained nothing, it's the people who wrote it.

Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech is an incredible document of half-truths, coverups, self-congratulations, and selective statistics. There were more references to the Jobs Fund than there are pages in the Throne Speech, but I was encouraged to see three things in the Throne Speech - not encouraged, but I noticed three things. There was one truth in the Throne Speech, there was one area of encouraging tone in the Throne Speech, and there was one area of rather ominous tone in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

The truth was contained on Page 1, where it said — (Interjection) — well, pardon me, I've been corrected, there's actually three truths - the Pope is coming, the Queen is coming, and then there's the truth that I noticed. — (Interjection) — Well, we're not so sure, we haven't heard about whether - you see it was raining the day the Throne Speech was given and they didn't tell us it was raining, so I'm not so sure that they haven't broken that promise already.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one truth that I noticed in there is in the last paragraph of the first page, where it says that our distinguished visitors will find a province which has weathered the effects of the international recession better than most, and here's the truth, "where Manitobans have emerged with an even greater sense of community and of commitment to a common purpose." Absolute truth! The language debate that this gang put us through united the province into a group of people, of all ethnic backgrounds, united to be Manitobans. They did. This government united Manitobans in a common purpose to defeat the government, and the second part of the truth is they united the community to the commitment of a common purpose, and that common purpose is to get rid of that gang of incompetents at the earliest opportunity. That's what the people of Manitoba are united and committed to do, and it will happen.

Announcements like a power sale, ten years from now, for 12 years for a fixed amount of money needs a lot of examination. There's got to be some questions answered and they will be answered, Mr. Speaker, providing this government doesn't try to duck them. We would like to know the pricing arrangements, whether there's an escalator in there tied to some international energy commodity price like oil, like the international price of oil. We want to know that since this government is choosing this firm power sale for 12 years, when the economic life of the Limestone facility is projected by themselves to be some three billion dollars, we want to know that whether having made the commitment to start construction, if Northern States Power backs out that they indeed reimburse the province for any sunk costs in the construction to provide that firm power to them.

There are many things in this agreement that we will be asking the Minister and the government to explain and to clarify. — (Interjection) — The initiative, Sir, I have no problem in saying that that is a reasonable initiative, but I only want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this government that is now taking congratulations for a power sale for a 12-year period, starting ten years from now, is the same government that two years ago

blew a Western Power Grid, which would unite Saskatchewan and Alberta and Manitoba, provide construction of Limestone immediately, not at some future date. This is the same government that said that agreement was not good for Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're patient people on this side of the House, we will wait and see who made the good deal and who had the good deal, and who was really negotiating for the benefit of Manitobans. I point out to you, Sir, that the Western Power Grid was of immediate benefit to Manitoba. We wait ten full years to see the first nickel out of this announcement today. Only two years ago they blew the Western Power Grid and now they come back with something - they haven't tabled the Agreement for Intent, we'll see that in due time.

Mr. Speaker, I got distracted slightly from the one truth that was in the Throne Speech. There was an encouraging tone and that, Sir, was the fact that for the first time in three Throne Speeches this government has chosen to recognize the private sector. I remind my honourable friends in the government that in their first Throne Speech there was not one mention of the role of the private sector in the Province of Manitoba, not one mention. In their second Throne Speech, they mentioned something about their Economic Summit Meeting in Portage, which was in co-operation with business. That was the only mention.

Now, Sir, in a deathbed repentance they are recognizing the private sector as being the engine of growth in job creation in Manitoba. This reminds me a lot, Sir, of the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who in 1973 said the private sector is dead, we must now have the government control all segments of the economy, and just recently when the Liberals are on their deathbed politically, they are now starting to recognize the private sector. These people, under the incredible leadership of their Premier, have made that conversion in two short years, it took Trudeau about eight years to foul his nest politically so badly that he had to repent and recognize the private sector. These people are desperate enough after two years, they're doing it already.

But, Mr. Speaker, they mention it, but what have they done? What have they done to help the private sector? Well, the first thing, I suppose, is they've recognized the comments of one Frances Russell, who reported in the Winnipeg Free Press, December 21, 1981. Now Frances Russell - oh, no, no, on the contrary, my honourable friend, my ex-patriot friend here behind me, said I am attacking the press. Not so, Mr. Speaker, not so. What Ms. Russell said in 1981 is that two other choices, and she is speaking about the Cabinet choices - remember that wonderful 13 person Cabinet that the Premier said saved so much money and was so good for the Province of Manitoba? I wonder how many dollars the extra seven Ministers are now costing. The first Cabinet, which was three short of ours, saved so much. I wonder how much the new seven are costing. We never hear a statement like that from the Premier.

But here is what Ms. Russell said in 1981. She said, "Two other choices are controversial. Muriel Smith is widely recognized as being the most prominent member of the party's left wing." Now I will interrupt the quote here, Mr. Speaker, in saying that that was before we got to know the rest of this gang of left-wing lulus.

Continue the quotation. "Her posting to Economic Development will be seen as a slap in the face by the business community. It is now likely to revert to its traditional hostility to the NDP after refreshing initial willingness to wait and see about the administration."

Okay, granted, the Premier recognized Ms. Russell's contribution and wisdom in this article in 1981. He got rid of the MLA for Osborne as the Minister of Economic Development. Okay, that's a step. But I want to tell you that there are eight things that they have done to the private sector in their two short years which has destroyed the private sector's confidence in this government and in this province.

First of all, in replacing the MLA for Osborne, they split the department three ways. Now, instead of one Economic Department they have three. So any business that wishes to locate in this province is bounced to three different Ministers through the layers of executive assistants, special assistants, PR people, directors, ADMs and Deputy Ministers of three departments before they can get to a Minister to talk about their project in Manitoba. Some streamlining of Economic Development in splitting it three ways!

It's split between the MLA for Lac Du Bonnet, and one of the interesting conversions in this New Democratic Party is the fact that the man who was Minister of Agriculture during the Schreyer years and was the second most despised man in rural Manitoba - the first most despised was his Deputy Minister "Red Bill" Janssen - now the second most despised man in rural Manitoba during the Schreyer years is held out as the economic messiah of the New Democratic Party, the only guy the business community can talk to. The good old left-leaning MLA for Lac Du Bonnet is the best man they have got to put forward.

It's incredible, Mr. Speaker, how much this party has switched to the left and has left the private sector in disarray in this province. They have put the MLA for Brandon East in another portion of the Economic Development portfolio, and I just want all members to note the incredible skill of the Member for Brandon East in successfully guiding McKenzie Seeds for the last two years. That is some record for the business community to hold out and it is some record for an Economic Minister to show the way to private sector investment in Manitoba. Incredible, Mr. Speaker.

The third fork of the economic triad of this government is the MLA for Seven Oaks, I believe it is, and I will be corrected if it isn't. He is the Minister of Cultural Affairs and now he is the third fork in this triad of economic strength. His private sector experience, I believe, is limited to being the union negotiator for a public sector union, for CUPE. That's the economic triad that this government is holding up to the business community. Well, not very encouraging.

The second thing this government has done in its short two-year term it has introduced the payroll tax. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that payroll tax puts the big lie to a statement on Page 15 of the Throne Speech where this Throne Speech says that "My government is proud of the fact that our province can offer among the best quality health programs in Canada, without resorting to regressive premium taxes and punitive unfair user charges."

The payroll tax before it was properly named, Mr. Speaker, was the health and post-secondary education

tax, a health tax that every worker in this province is paying out of his wages hidden skilfully but still there. It's a user fee in the medical care system paid on the backs of the working people in the province and they try to tell people they are not paying user fees. It is there, Mr. Speaker, it is there.

This government in two Budgets has brought in additional taxation on the private sector . . .

MR. H. ENNS: \$200-\$300 user fees.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . a personal income surcharge, increased fuel taxation, increased sales tax. That's only three they have increased, all affecting the private sector, putting them in a non-competitive position. This government removed the hydro rate freeze which guaranteed the business community, the manufacturing community in the Province of Manitoba, stable electric energy rates. They removed it two years in advance of its term and jammed the rates up now, accumulating a total of about 20 percent, more to come promised by the Minister. Isn't that some kind of an encouragement to the private sector?

When we were government we used to be able to run ads in the New York and Washington papers to attract investment by saying, "Where in North America is your energy cost stable for five years?" — (Interjection) — Oh, Mr. Speaker, that towering tiller of wisdom, the Premier, is yapping from his seat. We attracted Alcan if you would have put a decent negotiator on it but you blew it. You blew it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I am amused when the Premier attempts that fake, phony laugh of his - ho, ho, ho, ho, ho - that sick laugh he has when he is in trouble.

Alcan was a Canadian firm. They preferred to deal in Canada; they were prepared to locate in Manitoba. They had undertaken a feasibility study in Manitoba; they took option on land, on property, to locate their smelter; and the only thing that happened was a change in government, a Minister that didn't like their advertising and a government that wouldn't negotiate with them.

Now what has Alcan done? The government tried to say it was the recession and a lack of demand for aluminum that caused Alcan to leave Manitoba. Well, then why, Sir, is Alcan renewing a plant in Quebec plus adding new capacity in Quebec and putting in new smelter capacity in B.C. if the market is so terrible?

The reason they are not in Manitoba is because they do not want to deal with a gang of incompetent socialists. These incompetent socialists drove that economic opportunity out of the province - cut and dried, Sir - and now these people who participate in demonstrations where American flags are burned now go on hands and knees and beg Alcoa, an American multinational, to come to Canada and pass up the opportunity of a Canadian firm investing in Canada. Some principled group of socialists over there, Sir.

This government has refused to deal with assessment. An assessment is harmful to the business community because of the inequities that are apparent in the

assessment system. They have got a report that is two years old but they won't act on it because they do not have the will and the ability and the intelligence to act on it.

No. 6. "They are running ever-increasing record deficits, a billion dollars in their first two years of government." One can say, well what's that got to do with the impact on the business community? Any business community, any person of the business community wishing to locate in Manitoba will look at the fiscal structure of this province and if they see that this province has been going into debt at the rate of a half billion dollars as this gang has been taking this province and that the province is now spending 10 percent of its budget simply to carry the interest costs on its borrowings, a potential investor in the private sector will write this province off because he knows if he locates here the taxes administered by the province will reflect that cash requirement to pay off the interest and eventually the capital borrowings.

A MEMBER: Nonsense.

MR. D. ORCHARD: My ex-patriot friend back here says nonsense and the Premier says nonsense. Does the Premier believe that he can borrow this money, this half billion dollars a year to pay wages, to buy paper clips, to buy postage on his mailings without having to pay it back, without having to pay interest on it? Is that what the Premier is telling us, when he says nonsense? Surely he's not that much of a fool, Sir.

A MEMBER: He better not put it on the record or else . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: He has put it on the record. The First Minister said it was nonsense what I was saying about the impact of the deficit on attracting private sector investment in this province. I realize that the First Minister cannot write a will properly, but surely he has a basic understanding of what deficits can do to an economy. Surely he must know.

Mr. Speaker, probably the biggest flaw that this government has as a detriment to attracting private sector investment in this province is its attitude toward private sector investment. All I have to do is refer honourable members to the speech made by the MLA for River East yesterday and the anti-business rhetoric that was in there. He seethed with hatred for the private sector because they're big, fast-profit people. They are polluters; they are bad people and that's the kind of attitude that is going to attract private sector investment to Manitoba? I mean, this is an incredible thing to have this junior member of the backbench already destroying an initiative which I give the government credit for in the Throne Speech of recognizing the importance of the private sector. Then the MLA for River East stands up and calls business people fast-profit artists and polluters of the environment. I mean, he disagrees with what his First Minister put into a Throne Speech and has gone categorically against the initiative of long-term private sector planning that his government laid out just Thursday of last week.

The last thing that is detrimental to private sector investment in this province is, of course, the known

fact that the Premier and his colleagues are in the hip pocket of organized labour in the Province of Manitoba. What organized labour demands, this Premier and this government gives them. Regardless of the demand, they will give it to them. That is not the kind of co-operative environment that the Member for River East talked of yesterday where management and labour will get together and negotiate co-operatively. His idea is, first of all make every possible labour law available to screw management into the ground and then engage in so-called co-operative negotiations with the private sectors where the unions hold all the legislative cards. That's his idea of fair and equal negotiations. Mr. Speaker, it's there.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most ominous things that was in the Throne Speech - and I have to tell you that it truly was ominous - and that was on Page 15 of the Throne Speech. It was addressing the health care issue and it says here, "My government will place special emphasis on the coming year on the develop of reproductive health services." I hate to say it, Mr. Speaker, but it looks as if my honourable friend, the MLA for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, has now lost again. It looks like the MLA for Wolseley and the other feminists in the group over there and feminist adherents have won Morgentaler's case for him in Manitoba.

We stand assured on this issue that, should that happen, the Minister of Health will resign. He's told us that. The only thing that we don't know is to what degree it has to happen and how much they will try to cover up the Morgentaler-type clinic so that the Minister of Health won't have to resign.

The public are quite aware of the sleazy tricks that this government will go to, to do the sort of conniving, scheming, slippery things that they're renowned to do and they're watching carefully, Mr. Speaker. The people know that the Attorney-General intervened in the Morgentaler case, got new charges laid, etc., etc. We know, but that was sort of the trade-off that we expected for support from other people in caucus for the language issue. It was the life for language trade off that I mentioned earlier on. I only hope, for the Minister of Health's sake, that he didn't lose this battle. I hope he didn't lose this battle, Sir, because if he lost this battle, then many lives will be lost in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the last Session was a particularly interesting one, contained a lot of hard rhetoric, solid debate, tough negotiations. It also demonstrated that democracy is alive and well in the Province of Manitoba because a minority in the Legislature was able to thwart the wrong-headed will of a majority government who were going against the wishes of 80 percent of its electorate. That proved that democracy is alive and well in this Chamber and in the Province of Manitoba.

Under ordinary circumstances, if we were dealing with a group of honourable members, which we must call them, if we were dealing with a group of honourable members who had gone down to defeat on an issue so major as the language issue, we now would have already had a provincial election, Sir, but we are not dealing with honourable members in this N.D. Party, because they . . .

MR. SPEAKER: All honourable members in this Chamber are in fact honourable members. It is not for

the Honourable Member for Pembina to suggest otherwise.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I accept your admonition, Mr. Speaker. These people over here, who we call honourable members, if they were to follow their values and the principles of democracy they espouse, they would have called an election, Sir, but they didn't. You know, that troubled me, and you know, Sir, I found out why on, an April 5th news release and an April 4th Order-in-Council, just exactly why this group of honourable gentlemen did not do the honourable thing and call an election, because it's been established already that there are 20 members in the Treasury Bench earning \$20,500 or whatever the Cabinet salary is. If an election was called, two-thirds of them would not come back; two-thirds of them are virtually unemployable, except in their present jobs, so there was some \$50,000 at stake. That explains the Cabinet reasons. It was troubled with some of the backbenchers. I thought there might be a semblance of principle amongst the odd one of the backbenchers, but their principle was in their pocketbook, as was explained, Mr. Speaker, in an April 4th Order-in-Council. I just want to go through the Order-in-Council: The MLA for Thompson, Legislative Assistant to Employment Services and Economic Security at \$2,500 per year; the MLA for the - next to him - the would-be Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, Legislative Assistant, Business, Development and Tourism. Going down the line we have the Party Whip, a paid proposition. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, my ex-patriot colleague, the MLA from River East, says that's big money. You bet it is, it's better money that he can make any place else, because he is virtually unemployable, Sir. After all, he can't get a job in the provincial civil service anymore, there's a hiring freeze on.

Going down the line the next on the backbench is a member of the Manitoba Hydro Board at \$3,900; then we have the MLA for The Pas, he's one of the heavy hitters, he's Caucus Chairman, he's Legislative Assistant, and he's a member of the Water Commission. Naturally, he takes the higher salary of the Water Commission at \$3,900.00. Next to him, the MLA for Rupertsland, he's Legislative Assistant to Northern Affairs; next to him, the MLA for St. Johns, member of the Board of MPIC, \$3,628 a year. I'll skip the MLA for Burrows for a moment and I'll go to the MLA for Inkster. Oh, he's Legislative Assistant to the Chairman of Treasury Board, and the only thing I have to ask my honourable friend - and I like my honourable friend, the Minister responsible for the Treasury Board - I don't know what he did to deserve this kind of punishment. I don't know how come he lost the draw and got the MLA for Inkster. Then we have the MLA for Wolseley, who is a member of the MTS Board and a Legislative Assistant also. Naturally, she took the top.

Now, there is only one fellow in here and that's the MLA for Burrows, the MLA for Burrows has not received any extra perk from the Premier. Now, isn't that something interesting? There is two theories one could propose on this. First of all, that in good socialist style, because he's employable, he's a lecturer, he's got a job, so they've decided that in good socialist tradition,

they won't share the wealth with him because he's got enough wealth - that's the first one - or, more importantly, he's probably too principled for this group, because I remind members opposite if they read back some of his speeches, you'll find he's one of the few people that have addressed, with principle, the parliamentary process.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's clear to see why the honourable gentlemen opposite didn't act in an honourable way and go to the people to have their mandate reaffirmed after their resounding defeat in the French language issue, because their pocketbooks were involved, Sir. It's as simple as that, and they have managed to duke in everyone but the poor Member for Burrows into the public trough for some extra goodies.

That's not unusual, Mr. Speaker, because look at the legions of executive assistants, special assistants, public relations people, directors, assistant deputy ministers, deputy ministers, that this government has brought in. You know, there is probably going to be a good use for them. It is rumoured now that we have rebellion in the northwest again, at Camperville, that the MLA for Inkster is going to strap on a pair of .38's and lead the legislative assistant legion up there to control this new government that's come up in Camperville. We wish the MLA for Inkster good luck as he straps on his pair of .38's. We understand he's taking the MLA for Wolseley with him too. We don't know what for, but we understand that she's very interested in controlling this subversive rebellion up there as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I simply want to say to my honourable friends over there that if you think for one minute that an announcement of a power sale ten years from now, lasting 12 years, at a fixed price with the terms undisclosed, is going to save your political fortunes in the Province of Manitoba, I wish you luck. Because if there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that constantly comes up - and my colleague, the MLA for Swan River, mentioned it this afternoon - no matter where I go, whether it be at Dauphin or other constituencies held by honourable members opposite, one of the first question you're asked is, "How much longer is it to an election?" People cannot believe that it will possibly be two more years.

This province has suffered under the weight of an incompetent socialist government for far too long. It has stretched their patience and their memory and, Mr. Speaker, today we saw the Minister of Natural Resources attempt to paint a philosophical picture to justify their terrible record in government.

Mr. Speaker, he tries to say that Conservative Governments are causing the problems in Canada, when he forgets that it is the Liberals in Ottawa, held in power by New Democrats, that have rung up \$30 billion deficits, that have invested billions into aircraft that are questionable economic value and questionable place in the marketplace.

I only remind my honourable friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, that whilst he was government during the Schreyer years, they tried that same kind of insane economic prop-up policy in Saunders Aircraft. The Canada Air fiasco is only a multiple of what the Schreyer Government did ten years ago, Sir. If he believes that the people are going to buy the economic stimulation alleged to have been created by "The Fraud Fund," he's wrong. People are not any longer going

to fooled by governments that come along and say a \$500 million deficit is good because we're using it to create jobs. People know it's their money and their future money that this government is squandering and they want it to stop, Mr. Speaker, they want an election, and they want it very very soon.

Mr. Speaker, I can only offer one piece of advice to my honourable friends opposite, take some of the job retraining funds that you said you were going to dedicate over the next two years and use it personally, because many of you are going to be looking for new jobs after the next election.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I am pleased to have this opportunity to take part in the Throne Speech debate, and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to wish you good health and also good luck in dealing with the members who occasionally become rather rambunctious and I admit that on occasion I have been among those who have transgressed . . .

HON. R. PENNER: No, no, Vic.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . and you have frequently been right in letting me know about that. I know you have a tough job. I hope you maybe have a little more pleasant job this time than the last Session.

Many members, Mr. Speaker, during this Throne Speech Debate, will be looking ahead. I will be looking ahead as well, Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday when I bring down next year's Budget. I trust that members will forgive me if I spend a little bit of time this evening looking back.

I would like to look back to the Throne Speech which I thought was a very good one. It indicates a government changing economic gears at the right time in the economic cycle, having stimulated the economy in a short-term way in the depth of the recession. Now, as we're emerging to some extent, moving into long-term economic development and long-term job creation, I like to look back over the past year at the past year's accomplishments. There have been many.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, well, we can talk about the "Wish List." Editorial writers referred to it as "pie in the sky." Members opposite referred to it as fantasy land, wonderland, it will never happen, you're dreaming. They would not have even tried. The opposition would not have even tried, and what have we accomplished since February 24, 1983, with the so-called "Wish List"? We have brought project after project on stream. We have put long-term investment after long-term investment into place in Manitoba using millions of federal dollars, millions of dollars from the private sector, millions of dollars from other sectors of government and, yes, some of our own money. We have put Manitobans to work in the short term and we have created long-term benefits for Manitoba. Just one example, the recent signing of the Transportation Agreement, the upgrading of the Churchill line which will mean jobs, which will mean an opportunity for farmers to transport grain out through Churchill at lower rates than having to go to the Lakehead or to Vancouver.

It will mean jobs for people in Transcona, making light rail boxcars, jobs, long-term quality jobs, not minimum wage jobs, decent jobs with dignity. That's the kind of activity that has resulted from our "Wish List."

We have every right to be proud and Manitobans, I believe, are as delighted as we are that they have a government that dares to innovative, that dares to take a chance, that dares to work hard on that kind of project and we have succeeded. I would have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that we have succeeded beyond what we expected at the beginning of the year. That is true. That didn't mean we shouldn't try; it didn't mean that we shouldn't try for more than we were prepared to accept. We're delighted with how far we've come with that particular project and in the coming years it will mean more long-term employment for Manitobans, more economic development for Manitoba.

What if that group had been in office in the last . . .

A MEMBER: Heaven forbid!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: What if that group that laughed at us and called that fantasy land and said it was wonderland would have been here and would not have proceeded and they said they would not? What if indeed we had the editorial writers in office in the last year who said it was "pie in the sky" and would not have proceeded? We're very fortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker, that we have people with vision and not just people who look at the first poll and say that's where they're going.

Mr. Speaker, one is tempted to wander back a little further to the introduction of the health and education levy. You will recall that we had some difficulties with funding from the Federal Government in respect to equalization payments, with respect to education payments, health payments, all of those agreements had terminated in 1981 and the Federal Government had before the election, I believe in the fall of 1981, announced changes which meant for Manitoba a loss annually of more than \$200 million, Mr. Speaker, and we had to do what we could to ensure that the basic social system in place would not be damaged by that kind of funding loss. It happened in the middle of a recession; it happened at a very bad time for Manitoba and we put on that tax.

We had some predictions from the opposition. They said, boy, you're going to have inflation, you're going to have inflation like crazy. You know, we just got some numbers the other day. Winnipeg is third lowest in terms of inflation year to year, March to March, '83 to '84. Yes, and if you look at the inflation factor from November of 1981 when we won the election to today we are well below the national average in inflation. They were wrong. You will recall their fantasy land exercises where some of them went through farm produce and said everywhere the levy will be attached and suddenly it will be a 5 percent and a 7 percent and an 8 percent increase.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek and the member for one of the western constituencies went through that kind of a charade as well. They were wrong. They said, Mr. Speaker, that it would affect jobs, that there would be less jobs because of this, that we wouldn't do as well as other provinces. You know, Mr. Speaker, we've done three times as well in our first two years in terms

of creating jobs in this province as they did from '79 to '81 in the good old days, before the recession, from the depth of the recession. From 1981, our first two years, 9,000 jobs as compared to their last three years, 3,000 jobs. Incredible.

Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to realize what has been happening in this province over the last few years. They were never able to bring this province into a position where they had the lowest unemployment rate in the country. Not once, not once in four years in office could they claim that distinction. We may not be able to claim it all the time, but we've been No. 2 for quite some time and in the last month we have had the lowest unemployment in the country, any province.

Mr. Speaker, we have done that at a time of population change. Now, Mr. Speaker, that group used to say that the levy would chase people away, there would be people moving out because of this terrible onerous taxation regime. What is the truth? What is in fact what happened? Last year, Mr. Speaker, 1983 is the first year since the year 1919 that Manitoba had a population growth which is larger than the growth for Canada as a whole. First time. That was the response of people to a government that cares. That was the response of people to a government that does what it can to alleviate the worst effects of the recession. People moved here rather than running away as they did when the Tories were in office from '77 to '81. For a couple of years we had net decreases in population. Forget about interprovincial migration; forget about the fact that we were getting thousands of people into here at that time, the boat people from Vietnam. Forget about those kinds of things and even natural increases from births over deaths. Overall, they had a couple of years where we had total decreases in population. That was the kind of effect that their shepherding of this economy had on the Province of Manitoba.

Sometimes one does like to go back and we can go back a little further. The minimum wage increase - when I was Minister of Labour I announced a minimum wage increase of, what was it, about 20 percent? Did you hear about the doom and gloom that those people preached about the economic effects of that kind of a reasonable increase in the minimum wage for those at the very bottom of the ladder? Of course it didn't happen at all and we didn't expect that it would and they were wrong again in their projections.

They projected lower investment because of the levy. In 1983, investment in Manitoba overall was the third highest of any province in Canada. In 1984, the StatsCanada Conference Board are predicting investment, overall in Manitoba, will be best of any province in this country, the very best.

A MEMBER: See how they smile when they hear Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Of course. How can it be that you have a province with a large population increase and the lowest unemployment rate in the country, moving from third lowest to the lowest, without there being some good news in the province?

The idea that everything is wrong in this province has got to be the most distorted piece of sick, twisting of the evidence that one could possibly imagine. Here

we have a large increase in population; we have a large increase in jobs compared to other parts of the country. We have the lowest unemployment rate in the country and those people can only spread doom and gloom or play their sleazy game of attacking people on the basis of personality and on the basis of origin, as tonight.

It is embarrassing. We have people up there in the gallery. They had to listen to a member of this Legislature attack another member on the basis of the land of his origin. What kind of people do we have on that other side?

They made other predictions - going further back a bit - rent controls. Remember on rent controls, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They were telling us that if we brought in rent controls, we could have a real housing problem. We've moved from 1.6 percent of housing starts in 1981, 1.6 percent of all housing starts in the country - when they were in office in 1981 - to 3.6 percent of all housing starts in 1983, with us in office, with decent rent controls, that we reimposed after the Leader of the Opposition took them off.

HON. R. PENNER: And he still says they're bad and wants to change them.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That's right, Mr. Speaker. He still wants to change those controls and I'm sure that, as members opposite would want me to do, I'm certainly passing that on to the tenants in my riding.

They predicted bankruptcy. They predicted more bankruptcies. The fact of the matter is that we are the only western province in the country to show a decrease in business and personal bankruptcies overall in the last year; only 10 percent but it was at least better than going the other direction. We have the largest decrease in business bankruptcies in the country - 17.9 percent for the year.

Some of you will have seen the Tory report from the Legislature from the last Session. We could spend a little bit of time having fun with that. I really don't want to waste too much time but I just want to point out how selective they are. They picked the month of December for retail sales but they don't talk about retail sales, they talk about department store sales which is 15 percent of the total sales in the province. Just department store, because that looks better. In that one particular month, we were on the low side. We were third lowest in that particular month, but they didn't look at where we had been in December of 1981. They looked at just the one year and they didn't look at retail sales as a whole where we were the strongest in the West, and indeed we surpassed the Canadian average for the second consecutive year. They didn't say that to their people. Why would they tell them what really happened? Why show them the forest when you can find the odd sick tree here and there to show people.

HON. R. PENNER: He didn't even ask Banman about auto sales.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: We could talk about other things, 62.5 percent increase in building permits last year. That was four times the national increase in building permits. We don't have to dwell on that. We

can talk about beef stabilization. Remember the Member for Arthur telling us there won't be any cattle on the Beef Stabilization Program?

If the Member for Morris would imagine a green hat on - no, I'm sorry. Anyway, there was another prediction that bit the dust, when we had a chance to have a little bit of history, and in fact the majority of cattle in this province, as I understand it, have been enrolled under that plan. It's a very good plan. I could talk about, Mr. Speaker, in looking at history, the average weekly earning increases.

There's one area that I really have to spend a bit of time on and that is the deficit. Indeed, there were some predictions with respect to the deficit last year. On February 24 last year I predicted a deficit of approximately \$580 million, that's current and capital, and we had people opposite - now, the Member for Tuxedo didn't make any predictions last year. He didn't say anything significant last year, no more than he said anything significant this year during the Throne Speech Debate and I'm sure that he won't say much significant during the Budget Debate.

He did say a few things in the Throne Speech Debate and maybe I should just move up to that. It seems that the opposition has a philosophy that they can take about 10 percent if they're working on cash; that is, the Budget figures presented last year showed that interest costs for last year - and I remember the Member for Lakeside referred to it a number of times - would be about 8.5 percent of spending, somewhere between 8.5 and 9.

The Leader of the Opposition the other day said, "It's going to be between 9 and 10." He's got no evidence to back that but he's just making that as a statement. Why not move it half a point or one point? The Member for Pembina tonight took it up to 10 percent, so now they're up to 10 percent. The fact of the matter is that it will be below that, that it will be below 9 percent. That doesn't matter to the opposition; they just pick a number and fire away.

The Leader of the Opposition, just as another example of an inaccuracy in his speech the other day, referred to our increasing the numbers of civil servants in each of the first two years in office. That is a historical inaccuracy that certainly if he wanted to talk with Mr. Doer, Mr. Doer would very quickly have set him straight because he knows the dues aren't coming in in the way he would have liked them to.

But there were other members, in terms of predictions on the deficit, who were a little more adventurous than the Leader of the Opposition. They followed the lead of their great leader John McCallum, the man who was so optimistic in 1981 . . .

A MEMBER: "800 Million McCallum" they call him.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . and talk about 1981, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you believe, that in the Tory propaganda sheet they have attributed the 1981-82 deficit to the NDP. — (Interjection) — That's right.

The Member for Turtle Mountain, I am sure, still recalls presenting the Budget which predicted a current and capital deficit of \$219 million or something like that, and I am sure that he recalls that when he left office he was predicting somewhere around \$260, \$265

million, and I am sure he recalls as well that when the final year-end numbers came down after we had been in office for a couple of months, the final number was about \$250 million, came down while we were in office.

But that is not what they told their constituents. It doesn't look so good. The charts look much better if they are coming down during the Tory years and up during the NDP. It doesn't matter that that is not historical truth, but anyway John McCallum was the economic adviser to that Minister of Finance. He of the great optimism in 1981, he of the great optimism that oh, yes, we will have a \$219 million deficit, he had all the numbers, he was working with the department. He should have been a little more close if he - in fact, he was 15 percent over-optimistic. Now those things happen. I am not too critical of him on that.

What I am critical of him on and of the people who listened gullibly to his advice is on what he was saying about last year's deficit. When I said 579, he said, "Oh no, it's going to be much over 700 million." We had people on the other side then getting up, we had the Member for Swan River said, "Certainly, the Budget deficit is going to rise to well above the 579 million that was projected. Revenues are obviously overstated. We would require a complete economic recovery during this fiscal year to accomplish a revenue growth of 15.6 percent. A \$700 million deficit this fiscal year is certainly a real possibility."

Well, there you have it. We've got the economic guru from Swan River telling us that if we meet our Budget projections for '83-'84 we have a complete recovery, complete economic recovery.

Have we met those projections? Yes, we have. Our latest projections show about 492 million, close to 90 million below what we originally projected. They show revenue at 1 percent above what we projected above that 15.6 percent he was referring to; expenditures of about 2 percent below what we had projected. But anyway let's remember that that was their economic advice. If we meet our projection for '83-'84, then we have complete economic recovery according to the Tory definition of complete economic recovery.

Now we've got the gambler from Pembina. I was hoping that he would be here. He said, just after he looked into this crystal ball, "You can bet your bottom dollar that when we total the deficit and it goes up to 750 million, it will go up entirely because of current account expenses." Okay? He was telling his constituents to bet their bottom dollar that the deficit for 1983-84 would be \$750 million. That's the accuracy that people have to judge by in terms of his previous statements.

Now, of course, one has to be a little bit sympathetic, understanding all of his problems. I am sure that if you had those problems you might not be able to predict as well as others do, but that is what the man said - you can bet your bottom dollar - and fortunately there are not too many people in Pembina who would take his advice in economic matters. Those that did would no longer have a bottom dollar if they had taken it on that one.

The Member for St. Norbert: "The revenues in this Budget are overestimated and the deficit of this province is regrettably going to be much higher than the Minister of Finance has estimated so far." He said that on February 28, 1983.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the frustrating moments in my political career. We had gone through projections in terms of what was reasonably to be expected. We were looking at the fact that the opposition obviously did not read, to be fair, that there were a whole pile of taxes from the previous year that had only been on for part of that year and therefore the 15.6 percent was not a real 15.6 percent year over year. We had taken, as every Finance Minister in the last 20 years had done as far as I know, the federal numbers in terms of the majority of our revenues which include transfer payments, personal income taxes and corporation income taxes. We had taken the best numbers we could possibly get to in terms of our own source revenues and we were on on those numbers. In fact, we were under on liquor. We heard a number of people out there saying, "You're never going to make it."

I want you to know that we are going to go over what we had originally projected, as with sales tax and a whole host of other provincial taxes. You were wrong. I could have been wrong. I don't say that I am always going to be right. I have been wrong in the past, but what you were trying to say, which was really unfair, was that somehow we had deliberately done this, somehow we were deliberately distorting the books of the province, and I believe that those were foul balls.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris, and certainly he didn't say that, but I have kept newspaper clippings and there are things like the Member for - I probably shouldn't pay much attention to the Member for Pembina, to be fair to other members on the other side, but you know there were things like "This Budget, it's a recipe for fudge. They have fudged the figures." You recall that, I am sure. Those are the kinds of statements that they made.

They were wrong, and I would expect that those - not those people who simply said "Well, I believe that number is wrong, it should be this or that," I think that is legitimate. Those people who were saying "Hey, somehow the government is doing something to the numbers," I think that quite frankly they owe us an apology. It is very clear that they were wrong.

A MEMBER: You won't get it though. They are not man enough.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, I don't suppose so.

Let's recall that this was in a year - now you know we have the John McCallums now saying, "Oh, you know what happened very simply was that Canadian economy, boy, did it take off. Boy, hey, hold on, . . .

A MEMBER: I didn't anticipate it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . I didn't expect that." But can he then explain why a majority of the Tory Governments in this country have had their deficits worsened during the year? Can he explain that? I think it is about time that he tried. Here we were going down from what - \$294 million to 236 million in our current account deficit - a tremendous, I think somewhere around a 20 percent decrease in current account deficit and you had Tory provinces going in the opposite direction during the same strong recovery that Mr.

McCallum is not prepared to admit we had something to do with in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those governments were pulling back during the recession, they were pulling back on social services, cutting back on social assistance payments to the very poorest, making sure that the people at the bottom of the heap, the people who were in the real trouble, got less. That's the way they saved money and it didn't work.

There is an alternative. The alternative, I believe, has been demonstrated by this government. Our current account deficit, as we improved, has improved, and I say unequivocally that certainly it will improve again for the next year.

Anyway, I had a little bit of fun talking about history and reminding people that not even the opposition in this House is infallible. They sometimes make mistakes. In fact, I think they make mistakes far more often than they do not, and most of the time, in fact, I will say all of the time, they do so honestly, but I would hope that they give the same to us when we make mistakes. We are only human as well.

So, that's the past - I said I wanted to deal with the past tonight, I will deal with the future next Tuesday evening, and I would hope that next Tuesday the opposition and their Finance critic and so on - I could have quoted him, he had some juicy quotes as well last year - I hope that they will be a little more accurate . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Maybe they should bring McCallum down on Tuesday night to get his predictions.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . in their reaction to next week's Budget.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'm waiting for the initial debate to subside just a bit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity to also participate in the Throne Speech Debate as I have had the occasion to do from time to time, and I find it a very enjoyable experience to participate in this. I really do, because when you consider the level of the debate, the speeches that have been made today, there have been some dandies. I was thinking in my mind if each speaker had the total audience of Manitoba in front of him, just the individual speaker, that the public would be swayed back and forth in terms of the debate as it takes place, because the quality of the debate has been relatively good. It's been pretty dicey at times and I think it maybe is fortunate that the people of Manitoba are not all in audience here listening to the whole thing going on all the time, because they would be thrown into a confusion as to what actually is happening, however, I will deal

with that a little later as to what the perception of the public really is.

I feel maybe I'm not quite adequate to speak after the Minister of Finance has spoken and I would have possibly have preferred to have our critic of Finance follow up the Minister of Finance. No matter what kind of expressions and statements the Minister of Finance was making and excuses, to get the confidence of the people of Manitoba back on track is going to be very difficult for this government.

In spite of the fact that an announcement regarding the hydro sale to the USA, and I think we all feel very strongly and hope that everything is going to be realistic, that it will happen that way. Questions comes to mind, of course, because the thing is so far out in advance - we're talking of the actual sale starting to take place in 1993 - it leaves a lot of questions to be answered in the meantime, and I am sure that as time goes on that we will have an opportunity to get into this. We hope that we are not selling out future benefits and profits to this province in this program. As I indicated, until we really have the information we won't be able to tell.

I want to take this opportunity to compliment the mover and the seconder on the moving and seconding of the Throne Speech. As my colleague from Swan River already indicated, we want to compliment them because I think they had a difficult task in supporting and moving the Throne Speech and seconding it, for the simple reason that it was a document that, I believe, was 21 pages long, the longest I think in the terms of history, and when you consider the fact that last year - I think last year would have been the time when we would have expected a very long Throne Speech, because when you consider the amount of bills, Mr. Speaker, that we passed last year, that is the kind of Throne Speech you would have anticipated. This year the anticipation has been - a general consensus seems to be in the public - that it's going to be a shorter Session, there aren't going to be that many bills being presented from the indications by government, that we would have had a very short Throne Speech.

I personally, listening to the Throne Speech the other day, found it sort of a letdown. For the time it took, there was an expectation that there should have been much more; in fact, there was very little. Irregardless of what the government members are saying in the House here now about all the great things that are going to be happening, that the public maybe didn't understand it, that the press did not understand it; I think they all understand what we have is a government that is trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, and that Throne Speech - and it's a very lengthy document as I mentioned, many pages - a lot of it is repetition. We actually have the history of the last two-and-one-half years of the NDP, and I don't think it is a very effective document.

For the first time that I can recall, the public and the media has been extremely critical of this kind of a document. There is always criticism and not everybody is going to applaud the Throne Speech and the initiatives of government, but there has never been a more negative response by the public of Manitoba.

Now why is that actually there? Why is this actually there? It is because the people of Manitoba have lost confidence in this government, and we have to go back

to the time that they got elected in 1981, November of 1981, and I have used this expression before, that the government got elected on false promises. That old saying that I've used before, I have indicated this before, when you promise and don't deliver, the public will turn against you. This is what has happened, and if members opposite are going to be honest with themselves, after the last Session they destroyed themselves, self-destructed with things where they had no call to get into.

When they got into government, and we all recall, we've had the manifesto, the NDP manifesto that we've looked at and quoted here from time to time, they promised better things, at a time when the recession was at its worst. They promised many things. They promised the farmers would not lose their farms, business people would not lose their businesses, that people would not lose their homes and what we have - and the Minister of Finance alluded to, to some degree, and said it's not as bad as it could have been, obviously. But in 1982 a record 398 businesses and farms were forced to close their doors forever. The number has declined slightly in 1983 to 362. In 1981, 14 farmers lost their farms due to bankruptcy. In 1982 this figure climbed to 30, and in 1983 it rose to 62 bankruptcies, and we know by the economic conditions the way they're going right now that it could be higher in 1984.

It's unfortunate. It is not anything that anybody wants to gloat about. I think both sides of the House are very concerned about the economic conditions the way they are. When somebody loses a business, loses a farm or loses a home, it is a traumatic experience. I think we're all concerned, but where we have the difference is that this government, when they got elected, promised it would not happen. It would not happen. Nobody shall lose their farm, their business or their home because of high interest rates. They implemented a program; it was a band-aid program and they use that now and say that they have helped so many people.

The Minister of Natural Resources, in making his speech a while back this afternoon, indicated no government has ever spent so much money in agriculture as the NDP Government have now. I don't deny that, but the thing is how have they spent it, and that is the thing that bothers the people in the rural areas, because what they've done, they've thrown grants through subsidization in the hog industry, in the beef industry, and in various areas. It's how they've spent the money. They've spent millions but they haven't cured the problem, and what has happened? If we look back at the development of this province in terms of agriculture, how has it all developed? It was when government basically started building the infrastructure, the roads, the drains, set up the accessibility to land, credit availability. That is what built this country, and now these things have come to a standstill.

This government has changed their priorities in the rural areas. They have a different approach to it. They say we'll give grants, we'll have subsidized programs somewhere along the line, but I'll tell you something, if we look around, how much drainage work has taken place? We'll deal with this with the Minister of Natural Resources when his Estimates come up. There are many things we'll deal with him at the same time.

We'll also deal with the Minister of Transportation and Highways. How much road work is being

undertaken, relatedly to when it was done? Granted, the costs are higher now to construct a mile of road but there's a deterioration taking place and, the Minister, if he's going to go and check with his people that are working for him in the various departments, will indicate to him that there's a deterioration taking place in the highways of Manitoba; and it is because less money is being spent in terms of the improvements that have to take place.

It costs more money now to do the same work that was done 10 years ago, but the system is starting to break down. We have less drainage works undertaken. There are many aspects of this that we have to be concerned about, but what does this government do? They've created a Jobs Fund. What they do, they try and camouflage the problems.

As I indicated before, no matter what you do, no matter what the conversations are that take place at this stage of the game, you have lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba. No matter what this government will do, they can make the kind of announcements they did today, for a long time, as many as they like, because it is, as the Minister of Finance referred to, to some degree, pie in the sky and the people are not prepared to accept that as factual with this government because they have been misled by this government. If you people have any doubts about it, go out to your constituents and talk to them.

When we call facetiously, "Call an election," we really mean it, we do, because if we'd have an election today there would be very few people left on that side.

We know that this will not happen. We know it will not happen that you will call an election after two-and-a-half years, but if you did, and you have gauged this. We have gone through this after the last year's debate on various issues, and you came up and you camouflaged your inability to deal with economic things by coming up with things like seat belts and helmet legislation. We dealt with a controversial language issue that was handled very very poorly by the Government of the Day and the people have lost their confidence in you people. They have, across Manitoba. My colleagues have mentioned, people ask, when is the next election? They really do ask this, and when you tell them it could be another two years, at least two years, maybe even more, people are disappointed and they don't know what to expect from this government for the next two years.

We're on a holding pattern at the present time in terms of what will happen, and no matter what you do I don't think you can restore that confidence in the people of Manitoba. We will be here all the time as opposition to make you accountable for the statements that you make and we hold you accountable for the statements that you made when you got elected that you would make things better in Manitoba, and you have not been able to do that.

Every government, of course, can set their priorities in the direction that they want to go and we have seen the direction that you people have gone. Now you're trying to do a turnabout. In the Throne Speech there's reference made to the jobs that will have to be created by the private sector. All of a sudden, a complete turnabout because you read that your direction has not been acceptable. The people are not accepting what you've stated. You proved that you cannot deliver

in that respect. Now you're turning around in the Throne Speech and you indicate that the private sector shall be your salvation in terms of job creation and that is the hypocrisy of the whole thing when we consider what you have done to the private sector and the small businessman.

Let's just look at the case history a little bit. The payroll tax, as was referred to by my Member for Pembina already, you talk of the other provinces, how they collect their funds, their taxes, whether it is user fees or things of that nature, you put a user fee on everybody in Manitoba that works. The increase in sales tax has taken place. Hydro rates - you took the freeze off. The first increase was over 9 percent; the one that started April 1st was over 7 percent; the dramatic increase in compensation rates. All these moves are moves that are negative to the private sector and now you're going to turn around and say the private sector is going to be creating the jobs. It's not realistic.

The private sector will not respond to you people. Everybody will still work and do the best they can because they are Manitobans and they're Canadians. They're here to make a living. They want to provide a living for their children, for their families, to give them the best education, the best opportunities possible, but if this government is going to hang their hat on the private sector to pull them out of the mess that they have created, I think they're going to have a very deep disappointment.

From time to time there are personal attacks in this House and I don't like to do that either, but one of the problems that we have with this government is lack of leadership. I think that out of the 30-some-odd members that have been elected, everybody thinks he is a leader on that side. There is not any direction and leadership coming from the Premier of the province. The people of Manitoba, it doesn't take long - the people in the province - they sense if somebody has a rein on things, has the strength and power to give direction, and that is not happening at the present time.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Because we don't have a leader. There are so many shortcomings in this government and I think most of you realize that. We as opposition can certainly anticipate what is happening. We anticipate what's happening across the House. The people of Manitoba are anticipating what is happening and sensing what is happening. It isn't there anymore, the confidence isn't there anymore, and you can pound your tables all you want when somebody is speaking. It doesn't change the perspective of the people of this government. What you are doing right now, your Minister of Finance has said - he goes back and he tries to grab at all the positive things that possibly could have happened and he made a nice speech.

As I indicated before, if one individual could speak to all of the people in Manitoba at one time you could have them swaying up and down. You would have the Member for Pembina getting them on his side, the Minister of Finance possibly on his side, but that is not how it happens because the people of Manitoba do not get exposed to the kind of speeches that are being made here. They can read it, Mr. Speaker, but they do

not have the presentation that has been made in this House. Thus it is not as effective. But their minds are made up. The majority of people in Manitoba have their minds made up because this government let them down. For us, it is not unfortunate but really it is unfortunate for the people of Manitoba to have to live through this.

HON. G. LECUYER: Give credit to Manitobans. They are not that stupid.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I am glad that the Member for Radisson says the people of Manitoba are not that stupid because I agree with him. They have already got this figured out. They have this figured out, and all the excuses and the whitewashing and the propaganda that you put out will not change the aspect of it. I can't foresee anything in the next two years dramatic enough that is going to change that whole picture around. I know that you are trying because if I look back and I look at some of the propaganda pieces that you send out, or that the NDP send out, there was reference made to ourselves sending out certain stuff, and in June of '83 it says here "Great people, great future of Manitoba and the NDP" - June '83 - and it refers to "saved 800 farms, more than 400 small businesses and additional hundreds of homes from high interest rates when no other government was offering such comprehensive relief."

On the other hand, when you look at the statistics as to the increase that has taken place in the bankruptcies, unfortunately, but the fact that you say that you have saved these when everybody knows when there are neighbours going down the tubes that this is not a realistic statement - "doubled health care construction to help ensure that every Manitoban has access to reliable medical, hospital and nursing home care" - and we know the problems that there are in the health field, the funding end of it, the concerns that are there. When you put out this kind of material, the people in Manitoba, it just builds the case of the misconception that you got elected on in 1981. It strengthens the case, and the more propaganda you put out at this stage of the game just verifies the case that you could not, in spite of what you said, you could not change what was happening, but you keep on putting more stuff out all the time. This wasn't June of '83.

Here is a good one. "And you can be sure, Howard Pawley and the NDP will keep listening to you and to all Manitobans as this work advances." Well we saw a good example of how this government listened to the public of Manitoba when we debated the French language issue in Manitoba. When almost 80 percent of the people said no, the Attorney-General said we will do it anyway. That's how you listen to people.

We have many examples of how you listen to people. The thing concludes finally, "This province again has sensible, sensitive good government, thanks to the NDP power in the Legislature." Well, it is that kind of thing that builds the doubt in people's minds.

I have another one that was sent out here under legislative postage. It's signed by Howard Pawley. It says, "Dear friend. The end of this month marks two years in government, two years of working and learning together, two years of developing services for people

and strengthening the economic foundations of Manitoba." At a time when more people are in trouble than you have ever seen for many many years. People, you know, they don't buy this anymore. They just can't accept that anymore, this kind of stuff, and much of this is coming out.

The other one that I read was in June and I have one here, November 25, 1983, also signed by Howard Pawley. His signature, we don't always know whether it is authentic or not but it's on all these documents anyway. It states here, "Your government strove to maintain public services at a high level so people do not have to worry about disaster, sickness or the right to decent schools, Manitoba imposed no user fees on the old and sick as did British Columbia, New Brunswick and Alberta."

Well, if this government thinks that they can hoodwink the people of Manitoba in saying that it is that much better here than it is in any other province, the recession hit across Canada. The recession has hit across Canada and the Minister of Finance hung his hat on saying during our government many people moved out of the province and during this great administration under the NDP they moved back.

You know, we can have the play on words all we want as to what realistically happened. It hit every province and it hit them in different stages and different categories. As I have personally experienced, some of my children that have been involved that moved to Alberta during the boom days out there and came back. It isn't that great in Alberta right now. I am not defending Alberta's position, but if you hang your hat on saying that people have come back, that they have come back to Manitoba because it's so good here then you are fooling yourself and you are trying to fool the people of Manitoba because it's not true.

It says here next, "We put government to work as a way to put people to work. The Manitoba Jobs Funds was created to target government assistance to areas where meaningful work would contribute to long-term economic and social progress." I want to tell you that the fund has been a great success helping to restore three-quarters of the jobs lost during the first 18 months of the deep recession."

Many words have been spoken about the Jobs Fund. There have been questions raised in this House about the length of these jobs. The comment has been made that some jobs lasted one day, lasted a week, two weeks, whatever time they lasted, but when we talk of permanent jobs, I think the effort was possibly sincere enough. I just don't think it was handled right. I will tell you something, it is the way these things are handled, a matter of conception.

For example, we have the Careerstart Program that is in place right now, I think the deadline was March 28th and I feel very concerned. Many people in the rural areas don't really have an access to this thing until it is too late because many people, the farm people, very often, the business people, are busy making a living for themselves. They do not catch up on all the advertisements that go on. I think that there should be an extension on some of these programs. March 28th, for many of the students that are going to be looking for work don't realize what it's all about until the deadline is passed. I think it is done on purpose so that only a limited number of people can really apply,

because I think every student that comes out of the classroom, whether it's Grades 11 or 12, or out of University, is looking for a job. I think the direction that is being taken is probably acceptable, to create jobs for these people, but many many of them don't become aware of these programs until it is too late.

To further illustrate why the people of Manitoba have lost their confidence in this government and members opposite use quotes out of our speeches that we make, out of our leaders' speeches and criticize aspects of it, but these are speeches that take place in this House and are open to criticism right now, but when the NDP Government sends out their propaganda pieces, and I have one here sent out in December as well. I don't know how but they keep sending out an awful lot of literature. They're critical of it when we send out one franking piece and this obviously is not a franking piece. This is just straight propaganda that's being sent out.

This December issue starts off: "Dear Fellow Manitoban: You hate it when politicians wriggle away from tough problems and pass the buck," and it says, "I don't blame you. As citizens, we all help choose a government and we expect to really deal with the problems, not duck them." Then it goes on and says, "The government of Premier Howard Pawley is managing Manitoba's problems, not evading them." I'll tell you something. If we look at the last Session and how the government managed the Manitoba problems, it enforces the statement that I made that the people have lost the confidence of this government. It says here, "And the problems have been big ones, inherited from the previous administration."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please, order please. If there are members present who wish to conduct their own private debate, would they please do so outside the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just go back and repeat this aspect or the statement that I made here or the quote that I was reading. It says, "And the problems have been big ones, inherited from the previous administration, which hope these needs and challenges could be swept under the rug and would somehow disappear." It's surprising that after over two years that the NDP would still have to use this tactic of saying that the problems were created by the previous administration. I think it's sort of a favourite ploy, after the first year of election, to try and shovel some of the responsibility onto the previous administration.

In December of . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know it shouldn't unnecessarily disturb me if certain conversations take on. I'm a bit of a shy individual as a rule. When I try and assist some members across

the way with my interjections, it is done only on a helpful basis.

I want to continue reading out of this NDP document here. It continues and says, "Look at the record. The government has been faced with an array of difficult problems, foreign ownership of farm land." It wasn't even an issue during the last election; it wasn't even an issue and we passed that bill, of course, in the last . . .

Education of course is always an issue, especially the cost of it is always an issue. Unemployment is a major issue, granted. Women's rights, the controversy about French. Why was it a controversy? You created the controversy. Abortion, it says. The Member for Pembina alluded to that in some respect already about the difficulty that's been taken place on the other side of the House with that. Investment - we've heard very little about investment, very little about investment that has taken place during this government's term of office. Actually, if I have to be truthful, I can't foresee that there's going to be a major improvement in that direction because the private sector has reservations about investing in this province as long as this government is here. We've seen that the way they've bungled the major projects. Now, interestingly enough, what a difference a day makes!

Now, this same government is almost identically in the same track as what the PCs were when they were in government. We talked restraint; we thought it was appropriate at the time. The recession was just in its nose-dive at the time. We talked restraint. I can recall the pages and pages and hours of statements that were made by members on this side criticizing ourselves as government at that time for the restraint program, and what do we have now? A little over two years later, we have the Minister of Health stating 3 percent and then he has to be a little cagey and allows a little bit more, but we're in the same position now.

These were the people that were criticizing the PC Government. They're doing exactly the same thing. We talked of mega projects at that time and there was a lot of laughing going on about all the things that we were hoping to bring into this province. We were dealing with the Western Grid; we were dealing with Alcan; we were dealing with potash. Now where are we? A little over two years later we have this government on a restraint program and we have a mega project — (interjection) — Thank you. The Member for Lakeside, our House Leader, indicates exactly what I was going to say. We have a mega project announced that it's going to take place in 1993; and we have this same government now talking about Alcoa, an aluminum company from the States, and you know what's going to happen? It makes me laugh. By the time, even if you proceed with Alcoa, by the time you have this program come close to any realistic talk at least, the next election will take place and you'll be sitting there with the same kind of position that we were in the last election and you will have gone through the restraint aspect of it.

You will be promoting, saying, listen, we have these things almost there. How will you sell it? It's going to be interesting. Of course, when we get into the election aspect of it we will also look back at your record of four years and the follies and the mistakes and inadequate and the leaderless things that have gone

on. In spite of what you say, in terms of your speeches, the people of Manitoba already have made up their minds. They already have made up their minds and all we're doing is marking time. We're marking time until we can take you on in the next election because it is not us who have defeated you, you have self-destructed.

This is the only province that has an NDP Government provincially and, federally, we see what has happened there. The lowest support that the party has had for I don't know how long and, Mr. Speaker, I dare say that is going to plunge even lower. It will go even lower because the one thing that you have with the NDP people, they cling to control, if they have it, to the last minute, and that's why I know, no matter how much we urge and make fun of it, about calling an election, that this government is going to hang on till the last bitter minute. Just like their federal leader, Mr. Broadbent, is hanging on to the leadership of the federal party, even when his ship is sinking, he's still hanging on to the wheel and saying, I'm riding it through the storm. It is that kind of fallacy that makes people suspect of this government, of the NDP Government.

There are other things, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to touch on, some of it I'll have an opportunity to debate with the Minister of Natural Resources in the Estimates. I have concerns that I want to express about how he's been handling the designation of wilderness areas. Again, many people have indicated their concerns, and a government that keeps saying - and they have to say it tongue-in-cheek, Mr. Speaker, that they are listening to the people, they are not listening to the people. They have demonstrated that time and time again. They demonstrated that with seat belt legislation;

they demonstrated that with helmet legislation; they demonstrated that with the French language issue; that they do not listen to people. They are still trying to raise that forward in all their literature, "We are listening to the people."

Mr. Speaker, it will not wash anymore. You have let the people of Manitoba down from the day that you got elected and that will remain in the minds of the people of Manitoba. In spite of all the gallant speeches that will be made here in the next while, we will be debating the Throne Speech first and then we'll have the Budget Debate, all the speeches that you make here are not going to change the perception of the people of Manitoba of this government.

I personally am happy that it will not change it, because the position that we are in right now, I'm looking forward to the day when we can take you on at the polls. It is because you people have let the people of Manitoba down, you have let them down; you have deceived them; and you will pay the price.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs, that the debate be adjourned.

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