



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 87B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 14 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 14 June, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - JOBS FUND

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Order please. We are considering the Estimates of the Jobs Fund.
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suppose the thing that strikes me most about this government's action so far, aside from the presentation of this fund which seems to be more of a desperation move than it is one that's calculated to really have a significant impact, is the failure of the government to implement any sort of successful economic strategy that would see some development take place in the province and some real jobs being created. We recognize that there are difficult circumstances prevailing the rest of the country and indeed internationally as well.

It's alarming enough to see that the unemployment figures are as high as they are. It becomes even more alarming when we see them begin to set other benchmarks for the first time, such as the numbers of unemployed not going down from April to May for the first time, and we see the consumer price index starting to rise after Manitoba has for a long period of time enjoyed a lower consumer price index than much the rest of the country. This hasn't just been one month now; I think one goes back for at least the past three, perhaps the last four months, to see that figure is starting to rise, and that also becomes a matter of concern.

We hear a lot of talk from the government about working together and everyone agrees that working together is a good thing to do. It's good to have co-operation between government and labour, and government and business, but it isn't a substitute for some action and for some results. Unfortunately, what we seem to be getting from the government is more from the talk end and less by way of results than we would like to see. We'll have some questions for the First Minister and for the Minister of Finance concerning just where the money's coming from, just how much of a thrust there is.

I think the Minister of Finance knows that there isn't really very much new budgetary money involved here at all, but we'll see what kind of answers we get to those questions. Given the fact that there is some new non-budgetary Capital with it, along with some new budgetary funds, the Minister says that approximately half of the fund is new money, whether it's budgetary or non-budgetary. That's a pretty small amount of money compared to the stimulation that the economy was receiving during the first part of the 1970s through Hydro construction, when one considers that in today's dollars, there was an annual amount of money of approximately \$600 million being pumped into the economy of the province by the Schreyer Government.

It wasn't identified as the Schreyer Government's Jobs Fund, but that's really what it was because they were building Hydro plants for which there was no sale for the power and consequently we have a substantial overcapacity today. But the range of the money that was going in was \$600 million a year as compared to what the government is putting into job creation now, and it will be interesting to hear from the government where they feel that these jobs have been created.

I think that, depending on the measure that the Minister used in saying how many jobs there were, whether it's measured in weeks, 288,000 weeks or 5,000 six-month jobs or whatever, it's difficult to see just where these jobs are occurring, because we hear the government speak with great favour about their housing program and what that has done for job creation, but if one looks at the figures for employment for April to May, you find that employment in the construction industry is far below what it was last year.

In April of last year, there were 18,000 people in the construction industry; in April of this year, there are 13,000. It went up to 21,000 in May last year and this year it's 16,000. To go back to May of 1978, there were 38,000 people working in construction that year. The last year of our government there were 24,000. There are 16,000 this May and the government is making something of that by way of performance. I also find it interesting that Mr. Greasley looks with some favour upon the way this government has handled Capital Expenditures and what it's done for the construction industry, but the fact is that there are two-thirds as many people working in May of 1983 in the construction industry as there were in May of 1981. So that's quite a drop there, Mr. Chairman.

In any case, we'll have a number of detailed questions, some explanations that we'll expect to get from the First Minister and the Minister of Finance. I am sure that we will be spending some time in attempting to get some answers to those questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(a) Jobs Fund, Current Operating Expenditures - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to start by asking the First Minister or the Minister of Finance, whoever wishes to answer, what has happened, say, in the area of Co-op Development where there was \$100,000 in capital last year and this year there's only \$50,000.00. What would that capital have gone towards last year?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see the relevance of that particular question to the issue we're dealing here today. What the Member for Turtle Mountain is dealing with is a matter of Capital Expenditures within a specific department from last year in making the suggestion that because we bought something last year, we have to buy something this

year. That, of course, is the very reason why there's a distinction between current and capital. You know, if you bought a house last year, you don't need another one to live in this year. It's sort of a foolish question that I think is getting the member off on the wrong track throughout in his speech and in the statements he's been making up until now. You see what he's been saying is that the Jobs Fund isn't there. We would have been doing everything we are doing whether we had that money in this Jobs Fund or not.

Now what he is saying is that he's the only person in the world who is smart enough to know that. The federal people who have put many millions into programs with us didn't believe that, because when we sat down and negotiated with them, they said, well, what will you do to create employment? We were saying the same thing and we worked out something, and they had to put money in. They wouldn't have put money into programs that we would have provided whether they were putting money in or not. What the Member for Turtle Mountain is saying is that the private sector is foolish enough to be bluffed into a position where they are helping us make capital expenditures that we would have made anyway and all we're doing in effect, according to the wisdom of the Member for Turtle Mountain, is bluffing the private sector into putting money into this Jobs Fund; we're bluffing the City of Winnipeg and the municipalities into putting money into this Jobs Fund.

With the expenditure of \$130 million we've got more than \$80 million from other areas into the Jobs Fund, and so it is no longer a \$200 million Jobs Fund. We can talk now about a \$280 million Jobs Fund, of which \$200 million, in fact \$190 million is direct from the government, \$10 million from the MGEA and now \$80 million from other sectors of society. Yet he is the only member, he's the only man who knows that we have fooled everybody. We've gotten this \$80 million on projects that we would have done anyway. That is utter nonsense.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Minister some questions. He seems to be very sensitive about providing answers. We've had difficulty getting answers about this Jobs Fund right from the beginning, and this has been put forward as a major thrust. The Minister of Finance said that we have faced the worst recession in 40 years and the Jobs Fund is their response. He also has justified the raising of taxes by saying that money was going into the Jobs Fund.

I have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, and I find that anyone who is objective about looking at this Jobs Fund sees it the same way, that a great deal of the money that's going into it is money that has simply been diverted from other capital spending; in most cases, capital spending of exactly the same nature into the Jobs Fund, and what I would like to do is have some answers from the Minister, not speeches, but answers as to what kind of capital programs were being undertaken last year and what's being undertaken this year. Then we'll know whether this is really a new thrust or not, whether it's being managed better as the Minister says, that through this committee it's being co-ordinated so that they are getting more jobs out of it than they were last year.

How much of this \$80 million that they have leveraged in from the outside, how much of that was matched

last year as well? Maybe the Minister can give us a copy of details of the \$80 million that he says he has leveraged out of the private sector and out of the municipalities and the Federal Government. But it certainly would be helpful to know just how this money was spent last year because, without that, it's impossible to know just how the Minister has come up with the money, whether it's justifiable for him to raise the sales tax and say that the money is going into the Jobs Fund, or not.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the member had asked specifically about Co-operative Development. Out of a \$200 million fund, he's found an area where there's \$50,000 less being spent on capital grants by the Department of Co-operative Development next year than last year. Now the fact of the matter is that there wasn't a requirement for those grants this next year. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Jobs Fund.

If he goes through the various Estimates, he will find that some Estimates have decreases, some have increases. It depends on the requirement for capital investment in a specific year. I believe he was asking as well about the \$80,985,000 that have been contributed by other levels of government and other organizations. I should be able to get that information to the member in a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list here that indicates the approved items, the current budgetary for '83-84. I might, just for the benefit of other members, read them all off: Manitoba Employment Action Program, approved for '83-84, \$4,400,000; there's private sector in amount of \$1,800,000 in that one. In Careerstart there's \$6,200,000 in private sector; \$9,100,000 provincial. In the NEED Program, there's \$7,700,000 provincial for '83-84; \$12 million other levels of government. Forestry Renewal, 305,000 provincial. There will be, in addition to that, \$396,300 from other levels of government; \$107,200 from the private sector. In Southern Sewer and Water, \$1.5 million from the Provincial Government; \$1.5 million from other levels of government, and that would be municipalities. Accelerated Capital Works, \$1,232,600 provincial; other levels of government, \$221,000. University of Winnipeg Field House, \$3 million provincial; \$259,000 from other levels. Crane River School addition, \$675,500; with \$250,000 from other levels. Portage Food Development Centre, \$499,500 provincial; other levels of government, \$306,900; and private sector, \$495,000. Dike Upgrading, \$800,000 provincial; \$3.4 million, other levels of government. Western Canada Aviation Museum, \$450,000 provincial; \$700,000, other levels of government and \$150,000 private sector. Urban Redevelopment, \$20 million provincial; \$20 million, other levels of government. Interlake Training Facility, \$35,000 provincial. City of Winnipeg Road Upgrading, \$3,200,000, provincial and, of course, the City of Winnipeg is putting in \$3,200,000; so the total on that is \$80,985,400, and I'll send a copy of that over to the Member for Turtle Mountain.

This sheet also lists the total cost to the Provincial Government. What I've read out is the 1983-84 cost. There are, in some instances, total project costs which are in addition to that amount.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'd like to ask the Minister then: What new cost-sharing features are there in this list

that aren't more or less standard in terms of cost-sharing for employment programs or with municipalities or with the Federal Government?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: First of all, the new thing about this is that, we indicated previously, \$165 million of the \$200 million is money that we have to vote in this Session. A second thing that we have to remember is that we had a program, and the member referred previously to the Homes in Manitoba Program where he suggested that we had promised to spend \$50 million last year; we did no such thing. We set up a new program and funded it with up to \$50 million in capital authority and set a deadline date. At that deadline date there was nowhere near that amount of money spent, nor would it have been spent had we just left it at that. We decided that, in order to create jobs for 1983-84, to continue that program on instead of eliminating that capital authority which we had every right to do.

In terms of how we went about cost-sharing, I don't know how many programs for job creation the member opposite was involved in with the trade union movement; I don't know how many job creation programs he was involved in with the private sector in all kinds of areas, such as the Western Aviation Museum and a number of those projects that I've just read off. It is true that occasionally different levels of governments get involved with cost-sharing programs, but they have to have money voted to do that.

On the one hand, we hear members opposite continually complaining about our spending and, on the other hand, they're saying, ah, but this is nothing, this doesn't count. I'm sorry. We are asking the House to pass \$165 million worth of spending Estimates in order that we can create the jobs that I referred to tonight, that the Premier referred to this afternoon, and more jobs as they are created over the course of this fiscal year. I don't think that we have to prove that we have come up with some magnificent new forum of cost-sharing with other entities as long as we are cost-sharing and as long as we are prepared to vote the money to do this. That's what we are prepared to do.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, do we now have a new standard from the Minister of Finance that he is now saying that he considers it to be a new and expanded program simply because you vote money each year now? He has a capital program, the government has had a capital program, and is he now going to say that every year you go back and start at zero and you vote new money for the capital and therefore he will now be terming that an increase in capital spending?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, obviously, the member hasn't listened to what I was saying this afternoon. I said, first of all, that one definition of new money is: Do you vote it? — (Interjection) — They were lapsing capital; they could lapse it. Sure they could; no problem.

A MEMBER: They made people lapse capital.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, they did. Mr. Chairman, I will give the member the list of the continuing programs

that are contained within this list as it has gone today. I want to make it very clear that this relates to the \$131.4 million that has already now been allocated. The other amount, we are not in a position to be able to outline at this time; but the amount that is related to the \$131 million, we can do. It totals, as I indicated before, as I indicated this afternoon, just under \$50 million; 62 percent is new money in any term of the word, even in I believe the terms of the Member for Turtle Mountain, although he's not prepared to acknowledge it.

The Manitoba Employment Action Program, there's \$4.4 million. Of that, \$1.504 million is continuing. NEED, of the \$7.7 million, we would say \$700,000 is continuing, although there were no actual expenditures incurred in 1983-83, but we'll show that as \$700,000.00. Northern Program, of the \$4.68 million, \$3 million is in continuing. Forestry Renewal, there's \$305,000, and we're showing as continuing \$305,000, although no actual expenditures were incurred in '82-83. Mosquito Abatement and Surveillance, \$374,000; of that \$24,000 is continuing. Accelerated Capital Works, \$1.232 million, and \$731,000 of that is continuing. Dike Upgrading, again there was no money flowed in '82-83, but there was an allocation of \$800,000 as there is for next year. Forest Nursery Expansion, \$767,000 for this year; 676,500 last year. University of Winnipeg Field House, \$3 million next year; \$2.3 million last year. Cranberry Portage School, \$1.040 million this year; last year there was \$560,000 allocated but none actually flowed. Crane River School, \$675,500 this year; last year \$595,500, but none actually flowed last year. Red River Community College Diesel Auto Shop Renovation, \$3.206 million this year; \$199,600 last year. Mental Health Centre Upgrading, \$1,700,000; last year, \$438,000.00. University of Manitoba Earth Sciences Building, \$3.5 million this year; \$250,000 last year. The City of Winnipeg Infrastructure, \$3.2 million next year; \$2.5 million last year. Homes in Manitoba Program, \$57,800,000; last year was \$34.8 million.

Then, of course, there were a number of areas that we don't have any numbers for last year. Careerstart, \$9,100,000; Southern Sewer and Water, \$1,500,000; Portage Food Products Centre, \$499,500; Minor Projects - Government Services, \$2,083,000; Western Canada Aviation, \$450,000; Urban Redevelopment, \$20 million; Interlake Training Facilities, \$35,000; Northern Capital Program, \$1,485,800.00. I believe that totals the total announced programming to date.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions arise from the Minister's earlier statement.

First of all, he said that they really wouldn't have spent all that money in the housing program, that they were prepared to let that lapse. Can the Minister advise the House when there's last been capital lapse that was authorized by a Loan Act?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm trying to enter this debate while the Minister is looking for the information. It doesn't seem that it should be that difficult to understand. I think the main thing is getting jobs. We're looking at the situation and we need jobs. I think that's the main thing.

It was pointed out many times that in such a year, during the election, this is what we said and we're trying to do exactly what we said we would do, to try to make more jobs. I say that this program is understated and I'll tell you why. If you remember, during my Estimates, I announced a five-year capital program and I took the trouble of telling you how many staff years it would mean; how many hours of work that we give. That's not in there anywhere and it could have been. You say those are things you're going to look at. Well, of course you're going to look at programs that are going to benefit the people of Manitoba. Who would be the first one to criticize if we were having people putting sand on the river? Who would be the first one to criticize?

Look at the situation, 1977, the first year when you came in - and I'm not criticizing you; I'm saying that there were two ways you could go ahead - the economy wasn't quite as bad as it was when we took over in 1981. In 1977, what happened? Do you know how much we're going to lose from the Federal Government cost sharing - \$700 million in the next five years compared to the program you had. You had millions of dollars more - you weren't expecting . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: Do you want to get into that, Larry?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: As Minister of Finance, you said yourself. I'm not blaming you for that; I'd take that money if I could. But the point is the first year you froze all construction. It was your right, I'm not saying it was wrong. This year, there is not one suggestion that was made to Cabinet that was turned down. Why? Because they look at labour-oriented work. The construction industry was in a poor fix and we went ahead. That's not even here. The members made a statement, they said, what would you build anyway? It is very difficult to say exactly what you would build but I can assure you that we wouldn't have gone and got the kind of deficit we're having now if we didn't want to create jobs. If you want a cushion, use this five-year program for a cushion because look how much we're doing for the year, a year that we are in deficit. We can't have it both ways and neither can you. We admit we have a deficit and we took a choice of trying to get — (Interjection) — Let him worry about the numbers; I'm talking about the principle of it.

All right, there's more than one there. I'm not saying I'm more principled than you. I mean I don't have to say it; everybody knows it. But besides that, the point I'm trying to make is that is a cushion, if you will, because that's not mentioned anywhere and there is no doubt that we would have gone the other way and had very little construction if it hadn't been that we wanted to put people to work. I think that, in all fairness, you should realize that. I don't think that you should fault us for looking at the situation of trying to get certain things that will profit Manitoba.

You seem to think that anything that was done by any government before should not count, that it should be some far programs that are meaningless. Then we could point at it and say that nobody ever did that in Manitoba before so I think that we should all be fair when we look at this.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is, you see, that there has to be some reason why this Jobs

Fund is failing as badly as it is. There has to be some reason why there are still 52,000 unemployed in May when there were 52,000 unemployed people in April. There has to be some reason why there are 5,000 fewer people employed in construction this May than there was last May. Now, if there's a big job creation thrust going on here, what's gone wrong? The Minister of Health should be asking some of these questions. What's gone wrong?

He says the big deficit, the big deficit is due, in large part, to this kind of job creation effort? That's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister looks at how much money his government's expending in capital over what they did last year using the Minister's new definition, he's only up \$10 million over last year. Mr. Chairman, there's only \$18.7 million of additional spending that's either going into his deficit or into the taxes.

The Minister doesn't understand that the thrust isn't there; it simply isn't there. Maybe that explains why the job creation record of this government is as bad as it is, because this isn't as big a thrust as it's being made out to be. That's what I've been telling the Minister, and it's starting to become evident now because the jobs aren't there. There are still 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba. So what's happening?

Mr. Chairman, I placed a question to the Minister of Finance to ask him when was the last time that capital approved under a Loan Act of the Legislature had been allowed to lapse.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll just get into the trivia quiz; that's on the history section. I understand that that was approximately in 1980 or 1981 but we'll get the specific answer to the member. The Premier has some . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain obviously hasn't scrutinized carefully the latest data pertaining to unemployment figures or he would not have risen in his place to have made some of the comments which he did just a few moments ago.

In May of 1982, we are looking at a labour force in the Province of Manitoba of some 500,000. In April of 1983, that labour force figure stood at 503,000. By May of 1983, the labour force figure had risen to 519,000, so we've had an increase by way of labour force figures in the Province of Manitoba by some 19,000.

Mr. Chairman, it might be wise for us to place that in proper perspective for the advantage of honourable members across the way, and we'll note that 12.6 percent of Canada's growth in work force is in the Province of Manitoba. Again, I repeat, 12.6 percent of our population in relationship to the population of Canada as a whole would be in the neighbourhood of 4.5 to 5 percent, so labour force growth of 12.6 percent. What is the reason for that, Mr. Chairman? The reason clearly is that unlike the situation of a number of years ago when Manitobans departed Manitoba for employment opportunities in provinces further west of here, that is no longer the case. In fact there is a return insofar as many of those that went to provinces west of here a few years ago, returning to the Province of

Manitoba and as well of course we do not have the departing of Manitobans to provinces west of here but they're remaining in the Province of Manitoba; thus there is an increase in the labour force figures insofar as Manitoba is concerned.

I also understand, Mr. Chairman - I really don't understand this because my Minister of Labour advises me that while I was out in Beausejour and in Whitemouth and not here, that she explained carefully to the Member for Turtle Mountain that there had been an increase and again I guess we have to underline this; maybe a picture is worth a thousand words. I know not, maybe we should hold some responsibility for not preparing graphs. There has been an increase of some 5,000 in the number of employed in the Province of Manitoba; in May of 1982, 462,000 employed in the Province of Manitoba; May of 1983 the total is 467,000, an increase of 5,000 in the number of employed in the space of one year.

Now keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that that is during a year in which there is tremendous economic disorders throughout the whole of Canada and when indeed it is the worst year since the depth of the depression of 1932 and 1933. Despite that, May of 1982, let me underline May of 1982, May 1983, an increase of 5,000 employed in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, if we look - in case the honourable member should say, well what is the Canada situation. The Canada situation is that in May of 1982 - 10,704,000; May 1983 - 10,692,000. So rather than an increase as in the Province of Manitoba in the number of employed, there is a decrease in Canada as a whole. Two other pertinent points I would like to leave with the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that I would like him to record in his books there for future reference, this is demonstrated by way of an improvement insofar as other economic indicators. We recall very clearly when the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain was the Minister of Resources and later the Minister responsible for Finance that the economic indicators for the Province of Manitoba were unfortunately always down. The dominant indicators have placed us in an embarrassing position as Manitobans as I recall of either being in ninth or tenth position in job creation and other aspects.

A MEMBER: That's why people moved away.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The record of the previous Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba, to put it as nicely as I can, was far from adequate in view of the then circumstances that existed in Canada as whole.

The situation - and I would ask the honourable member to record these figures - the level of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba high, too high and that's why we have a Job Creation Fund and that's why we have especially zeroed in in respect to a Job Creation Fund this year because the numbers of unemployment are still way too high for the comfort of any Manitoban whether it be honourable members across the way or honourable members on this side of the Chamber.

But the position of Manitoba re unemployed has dropped from the third lowest traditional figure in

Canada to the second lowest figure traditionally in Canada. Investment intentions, public and private will be the third best in Canada as whole. Job retention 1982, the second best, second only to the Province of Saskatchewan in respect to all provinces.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned this only so that the honourable member can ensure that he keeps his analysis in proper balance. I think it's important that Conservative members in this Chamber, keep in proper perspective the situation as it presently exists. That deals, Mr. Chairman, with the general questions pertaining to employment in the province.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on a statement by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that this was charade. Mr. Chairman, if what we are doing is a charade, that charade is only in the mind of the Member for Turtle Mountain and it is only in the mind of the Member for Turtle Mountain because he wants to plant a picture within the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, it is no charade to the some thousands of Manitobans that are already enjoying employment because of the Jobs Fund and it is not a charade insofar as the many thousand additional Manitobans that will be employed in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a charade insofar as the Federal Government and the Municipal Governments of this province, that rather than denouncing what we are doing as charades are saying that we want to co-operate with the Provincial Government and are contributing millions of dollars . . . it is not a charade, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the private sector is concerned, the private sector that are contributing funds towards the Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I would ask honourable members to - I sense some . . .

A MEMBER: Zip up your lips, your brains are falling out.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I am disappointed that during a discussion pertaining to the situation of unemployed that we admittedly say on this side of the House is away too high in the Province of Manitoba, unlike they when they were in government said and their leader said, "I am sleeping soundly at night." Mr. Chairman, we are not sleeping soundly on this side at nights because we know there are too many unemployed in the Province of Manitoba.

We are prepared to acknowledge that there is too much unemployment. We are prepared to acknowledge that we are still not doing enough for the unemployed in the Province of Manitoba, but we are prepared to work with other Manitobans in various parts and regions of this province to create employment.

Mr. Chairman, we have a number of programs in which there has already been the creation of employment. Our projections are to the effect that approved and announced funding to date is \$131,408,000.00. Estimated employment creation, 288,129 work weeks to date. These are the figures that I am providing with respect to work weeks created by way of employment in the Province of Manitoba; 288,129 work weeks are translated - depending on how you deal with it, those work weeks - 5,540 jobs for one

year duration; 11,081 jobs for six months duration. If we do it on the basis of the construction industry's general calculation, 14,406 jobs for a 20 week duration in the Province of Manitoba as of today, in respect to those announcements that have been made as of today's date pertaining to Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba.

In addition a number of projects have been announced that are in process of pre-construction, design tendering, in process of tendering at the present time. I would be pleased to go over these various projects item by item if honourable members would like to know as to where those projects stand; such as the Southern Sewer and Water, various stages of pre-construction; accelerated capital works, various stages of pre-construction; the University of Winnipeg Field House in construction; the University of Manitoba Earth Sciences Building in process of design and finishing touches in respect to architectural work required in respect to the Earth Sciences Building; Cranberry Portage School addition presently being tendered for the receipt of bids pertaining to the construction of same; Crane River School addition presenting being tendered; Portage Food Development Centre in process of design preparation; the Red River Community College Auto Diesel, Auto Shop Expansion, presently being tendered; the Red River Community College Auto Diesel, Auto Shop Renovation in process of design; Selkirk Mental Health Centre renovations presently in process of design leading up to tender; nursing station upgrading pre-design; the forest nursery expansion in process of design; the dike upgrading pre-construction. It's already going ahead.

You see my information is a little behind schedule. The Minister of Natural Resources wants to discuss with honourable members what is taking place in respect to his department in this area. Northern Capital Program in various stages; Western Canada Aviation Museum pre-design work; urban redevelopment pre-design work; Interlake training facility pre-construction stage; City of Winnipeg road upgrading, that was the announcement yesterday by the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs, pre-construction stage. Homes in Manitoba, of course, proceeding through various stages and the Brandon Fire College in process presently of design.

By the way, the Brandon Fire College, I believe, was a college that was announced back in '80-81 — (Interjection) — or was it — (Interjection) — how many times was the Brandon Fire College announced by honourable members across the way? A \$2 million Capital Works Program. Was it announced by the former Member for Thompson, or was it announced by the Honourable Member for Economic Development? I know it was announced on a number of occasions by honourable members across the way. — (Interjection) — Well, we're proceeding with that construction, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the government was spending some money last year. They had budgeted money last year for capital items. They had a program last year. I think they called it a Career Internship Program. How many jobs - in order to make some judgment of how successful the program has been this

year, how many jobs were created last year by the Career Internship Program and by the capital expenditures that were ongoing last year in the Department of Natural Resources, and in the Department of Highways, and in the Department of Education where buildings were being put together - government services and so on - how many people were employed there? That's really the only way that one can make a judgment about the additional impact of what the Jobs Fund is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Chairman, while I'm waiting for the actual figure from the Career Internship Program, I noticed that on the document that was tabled, that indicates contributing funds, there's one figure that should be added there. This is the Estimate under the NEED Program of private sector involvement. In a number of the projects under the NEED Program, there is a contribution by the potential employer or agency. We estimate that number to be \$10 million.

The Careerstart Program this year as opposed to the Career Internship Program, there were 3,981 positions approved under Career Internship Program; the summer of '82. The Career Internship Program was different as members know from the Careerstart Program. The Careerstart Program is similar to a program that they had in place the year previous to our attaining government, and it is also similar to the Career Internship Program. I have gone into it in some detail from time to time being questioned here in the House and to a certain extent during my own Estimates. I think it is certainly not a correct statement to say that it is the same program in place.

As the members know, the program has met with a great deal of success. There are a number of people in the private sector; farms, businesses, as well as the public sector who wish to take advantage of wage assistance to provide for jobs for young people, ages 16-24. The work weeks created this year are 76,600 for more than 6,000 positions for young people.

MR. B. RANSOM: So it's plain to see then, Mr. Chairman, that job creation efforts in the past have created jobs and in order to know what impact this new Jobs Fund has, one has to subtract the number of jobs that were created by the other programs that were in place previously.

Just as this so-called leverage of the \$80 million, that's no different than the fact that in the old private sector Youth Employment Program, the government paid half the cost of a new job and the private sector paid half the cost. So that was being levered then, just the same as it is now.

I have three fairly specific questions. When was the NEED Program announced by the Federal Government? I take it now under the current budgetary items listed on the sheet distributed, it would appear that the operating money budgeted in the Jobs Fund has been almost totally committed and that the budgetary capital in the Jobs Fund has also been almost totally committed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MS. M.B. DOLIN: I'll start answering those questions, Mr. Chairman. They were somewhat unrelated, I think, and it may take several of us to deal with them if we can remember all of them.

First of all, the statement that the Member for Turtle Mountain made about summer employment programs being the same or very, very similar or having to subtract one from the other to see how many new jobs were created is a bit misleading, in that this year we had very strict beginning dates and deadlines for the Careerstart Program which did not exist last year. Last year, all of the applications that came in were dealt with.

This year we had a deadline and the number of projects that came in within those dates were the ones that were funded, not any that came in after that and there certainly were those that came in late. Even with tripling the funding for that program, we found that we were only able to deal with those that came in within the deadline date. So the willingness to co-operate with the government in creating jobs for young people, for people of any age, is certainly there and that has to be taken into consideration.

The NEED Program was announced on January 10, 1983. There was a joint announcement by myself and the Federal Minister and after that announcement, there was a time during which the Advisory Committee was put together, a negotiated Provincial-Federal Advisory Committee, when information was sent out to people and when the applications finally began to come in. It's designed to be an 18-month-long program; it covers actually three fiscal years for both governments, and as the member knows, the \$17 million allocated to Manitoba by the Federal Government had a \$12 million component that was matched by the Provincial Government, that was offered for matching by the Federal Government and which we did match, so that makes the \$24 million of federal-provincial funding within that program. It is ongoing; it's an 18-month program, as I said, running into the next fiscal year. So the information that we give you on the NEED Program is information from a program that is in progress, not one that is completed yet.

The other questions that the member had are not related to these particular areas and if anybody over here remembers what they were, we could perhaps proceed to answer them.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify something here with the Minister on the answers she just gave. She said that the NEED Program was announced in January by the Federal Minister and by herself, so that was done before the Jobs Fund was even announced. There was a commitment made by the Minister with funds attached to it. Now it appears under the Jobs Fund. She said the funds were offered by the Federal Government and that the province agreed to match them.

Now, from the Minister of Finance we hear that it was the other way around, that it was the province that levered the Federal Government into it. But the Minister of Labour announced the program in January before the Jobs Fund was even made public and announced funding for it so it's one more example of something that was already under way. If the Minister of Labour

wants to get up and say that the NEED Program would have been terminated if it hadn't been for the Jobs Fund, then let her say so, because otherwise the facts are that it was announced beforehand and it was under way and the government made a commitment to it.

The other two questions had to do, if one of the Ministers wants to take note of it, the question was, is the Current budgetary money, under Operating, almost totally committed now as the budgetary Capital, is it almost totally committed?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, let's go over the history of that NEED Program a little bit. Let's go back to December of 1982 and November of 1982, and the negotiations between this government and the Federal Government with respect to job creation. This was the province that was saying that the important need in this country is job creation. We were getting the Federal Government and some of the other governments to come along with that position during that period of time and we were negotiating with the Federal Government with respect to joint funding of job creation programs.

In January, one of those programs was announced and it's money from both the Federal and Provincial Governments. We had told the Federal Government, you come up with a program and boy, we're going to get right involved with you and we will help you; we will come up with our money; if you want to do it on a national basis, if you want to do it on a regional basis, we'll look at that too, as we are with the Urban Affairs Program. We were prepared to look, in any way, nationally, because we recognized that it's a national and international problem and should be attacked internationally and nationally, but if nothing was going to be done on a national scale with Tory Governments, then at least it should be done here locally and we started in on that. Near the end of January, the NEED Program was announced. On February 24, we had our Budget prepared and delivered to this Legislature.

If the member now says that because it was announced then, we're not supposed to include the money we intended to spend in 1983-84, as new money, that is pure nonsense. Where does he think we would get the money from, out of the sky? Does he think that Social Credit is alive and well here in Manitoba? We're going to find the money, we're going to print it somewhere in the back room? We have to come to this Legislature and say, this is what we want to do and we're going to ask you to vote the money. That is new money.

I indicated to the member before that we had expected the cash flow - some what, \$800,000? - on that particular program, or \$700,000 in 1982-83 and that we were prepared to . . . well, in that case we would have been prepared to Special Warrant it if necessary, it wasn't necessary because we didn't cash flow it. But for next year, surely it is incredible logic to say that because we were thinking about it in January for next year, that we can't include it in a Jobs Fund.

Mr. Chairman, we announced it; we announced that we were prepared to go in dollar for dollar with the Federal Government. We would surely have to come to this Legislature to get approval for that and surely it is legitimate to say that that is part of our job creation

effort. It may not be for the Member for Turtle Mountain; it is for everybody else in this province.

Let's just use an example of the logic that the man is using. He is saying that because at some time in the past, something was promised. Somebody said, we're going to build something. Therefore when we decide to build it this year, not being required to build it this year, but because we pulled things forward and said we're going to build them this year because we need some job creation efforts, he says, well that doesn't count because we announced it. Every time we made an announcement there for awhile, we had a string of Tories standing up and saying, this was our program. Can we add it on to their deficit? If they want to take credit for it, can we add it on to their deficit? They don't want to do that. We didn't have to say this year that we will proceed with the construction at community colleges, universities, in rural areas, in urban development, and that sort of thing. We didn't have to do that. It is true that some of it was on the drawing board, but they know as well as we do, that you don't have to go ahead with things that are on the drawing board.

The item the Premier was referring to, the Brandon Fire College, was announced as a specific program of government back in 1977. Then along comes the Conservative Government and cancels it, and they have a right to do that. I don't suggest that they didn't. We may have disagreed with them on that, but for them to say now, when we decided this year to build it, that it doesn't count because it had been announced previously is sophistry, pure sophistry. I just find it incredible that members opposite would use that kind of an argument. We are the people who have to go to the Legislature to ask for the money. We are the people who are saying we're going to build it now. The people outside in the construction industry well know that there is something happening now, and that is why the Premier could read off the comments of Mr. Greasley and of other people who are out there in the real world. They like the program; they think that they're getting something out of this that they couldn't have gotten; even using the same \$200 million, they recognized that it's very handy, sensible, practical, to have one source to go to rather than running through nine particular departments of government or more - I think there's more than nine departments of government to go to - to just to come to the Jobs Fund. They appreciate that and they're saying that. The members opposite don't seem to be liking that.

The Member for Turtle Mountain before was concerned about the rationale for the Jobs Fund. That surely is a rationale, and I just want to deal with that for a second. The objective of requesting approval of The Jobs Fund Act was to streamline financial and ministerial related procedures for purposes of expediting job creation projects approved by the Jobs Fund Board.

The Act, as the members know, makes a number of provisions. One section, for instance - well, existing legislation with a few exceptions - for instance, Agriculture only permits Ministers to pay grants that have been approved by Cabinet through Order-in-Council. Existing legislation does not permit the delegation of authority to Ministers by Cabinet to make grants without this approval. That particular section

would permit that delegation where it was felt by the Board it was necessary for the expeditious approval and payment of grants related to programs approved by the Board.

Another section permits the establishment of trust accounts and the transfer of monies to those trust accounts where these funds have been approved for transfer to the Jobs Fund by another Act of the Legislature.

We were told by our legal counsel that there was good, logical, sound rationale for that. So when we looked at the amount, and the member again, he's come up with some items which were comparable for last year. I remind the committee that before he did so, I had referred very specifically to the fact that last year we had spent some comparable money in that area. We're not hiding that. In fact, we said that it was just under \$50 million that was comparable last year to the \$130 million that we have spent so far this year. That \$50 million last year would have created as much employment as the first \$50 of the \$130 million would have created this year, maybe even more because there's been inflation since then.

The other \$80 million is very clearly new money, very clearly creating employment, and that has levered another \$80 million, which is worth a little bit; in fact, not only a little bit, but an awful lot to those people who are not unemployed Manitobans or won't be unemployed Manitobans because of that \$80 million.

The member asks whether we are running out of budgetary funding. He can do the calculations himself as easily as I can. Obviously, the \$200 million will run out; obviously, we're running short on budgetary funds as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I am not really surprised, disappointed, that we're not dealing with the issue of jobs. We're not dealing where those jobs are being created; we're not dealing with the various projects that were listed a few moments ago by both the Minister of Finance and myself.

What is the view of the honourable members across the way in respect to public monies being committed as they were committed yesterday by the Minister of Urban Affairs in respect to road upgrading in the City of Winnipeg? Are honourable members in favour of urban redevelopment and the some \$20 million that's committed from this program toward development north of Portage, teaming up with some \$40 million from other levels of government? What is the point of view of honourable members across the way in respect to this initiative? What is the view of honourable members across the way to the announcement today in respect to the Earth Sciences Building? What is the view of honourable members across the way in respect to the Western Aviation Museum and the substantial sums of money . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'd like to answer that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me say I am delighted if my comments are going to spur honourable members to talk about jobs and where the jobs are being created, and the kinds of projects that are being initiated. I am delighted that finally we're going to get honourable members to talk about jobs in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have finally reached that point in the Session, June 14th, when the First Minister and his government are prepared to talk about unemployment in Manitoba. We tried to do that months ago, Mr. Chairman, and the First Minister and the Minister of Labour and his government prevented us from discussing unemployment and jobs in Manitoba. We've finally reached the point . . .

MR. G. LECUYER: They do something about it.

MR. G. MERCIER: They do something about it. The Member for Radisson, Mr. Chairman, says they do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, in November of 1981, when the First Minister was talking about turning the economy around and putting Manitobans back to work, the unemployment rate was 6.1 percent. There were 461,000 employed persons at that time; 30,000 more than when we had taken office. In 20 months, Mr. Chairman, there are now some 467,000 employed; just 6,000 more in 20 months. We created 30,000 during our term in office.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: What percentage of Canada's increase did you have?

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister of Finance wants to talk, Mr. Chairman, about comparative figures. This is where, as I said yesterday, they take their refuge, Mr. Chairman, in comparative figures. Well, look at the comparative figures and the most recent statistics, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rates across Canada, the rate reduced .1 percent; Manitoba's rate went up .7 percent. The highest seasonally adjusted rate increase in Canada tied with Prince Edward Island, Mr. Chairman. That's what the members want to take credit for. This is what the so-called Jobs Fraud Fund has done for Manitoba. We've got the worst rate of increase of unemployment seasonally adjusted across Canada, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what is worse, as I tried to point out to the Minister of Labour - the First Minister wasn't here and perhaps he will comment on this - the Member for Turtle Mountain and I have looked at the figures - in April of 1983 we had 52,000 unemployed; in May of 1983 we have the same number of unemployed, the same constant figure. The Minister of Labour says there are more people coming on to the job market. That's true, that's the same in every province, Mr. Chairman. But this is the first time going back to at least 1977 and that's as far back as we have gone in every other year, Mr. Chairman, the number of employed persons from April to May has decreased. This year it has remained constant. Those two statistics, Mr. Chairman, are very disturbing for Manitobans.

The seasonally adjusted rate of increase, last in Canada and the fact that there has been no decrease in the number unemployed persons from April to May of 1983, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister and the Minister of Labour have produced some statistics that indicate of the \$131 million committed to date, that this has the effect of creating 5,000 full-time jobs, annual jobs. That still leaves 47,000 unemployed people in Manitoba. They've committed \$131 million, they've committed it without any advice from their supposed Jobs Advisory Fund which they promised on February 25th and it took them over three months to appoint mainly because, I think, as the Member for Turtle Mountain has said, the funds have been committed to ongoing programs.

The disturbing point, Mr. Chairman, for us on this side of the House and why we call it a Jobs Fraud Fund is this Minister and this government promised to put Manitobans back to work. They have been totally unsuccessful and they have developed a charade by which they hope to pass off to the people of Manitoba that they're really doing something about this problem. They're continuing ongoing programs, they've increased a number but the basis upon which this government and any government must be judged is economic development and the development of employment opportunities in this province. They have been a miserable failure, Mr. Chairman.

Despite any additional money that may be spent under this program we still have, in May of 1983 some 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba at a time when the number of unemployed people should be dropping significantly in the spring.

Mr. Chairman, the First Minister has passed out statistics which indicate, and he took great pride and the Minister of Finance took great pride in saying they had leveraged some \$81 million, as he called it in his introductory statement, by other governments and by the private sector. When we look at the sheet we see that breaks down to \$62 million by governments and \$18 million by private sector, but the bulk of that coming from the Careerstart Program, an ongoing program in which the employer has always been asked to make a contribution towards the wages of people employed under those student and youth employment programs. So there is, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the very statistics that the First Minister and the government have given to us little basis for suggesting that there has been great leverage of investment by the private sector in job creation in Manitoba.

What is disturbing more, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that despite their so-called economic summit, we have people like the President of the Chamber of Commerce citing this government for their anti-business attitude. — (Interjection) — They don't like it, Mr. Chairman. It's a fact of life. I didn't tell him to say it; he said it on his own. He said it on his own and I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that that combined with a pro-union leadership sentiment on that side, not pro-union, Mr. Chairman, because if they were pro-union they would be really concerned about the 52,000 unemployed people and they would be concerned about putting those workers back to work rather than listening to and catering to the wishes of union leadership.

They're going to find and Manitobans are going to find over the coming months that investment in this

province as a result of that attitude, Mr. Chairman, is not going to occur in Manitoba with that kind of attitude. We're going to find and the evidence is going to suggest clearly and publicly that investment is going outside of this province because of the attitude of this government. They should remember, we have to compete with the province next door, the Devine Conservative Government that is mounting a massive campaign on behalf of the Province of Saskatchewan. They have reduced income tax rates and taxes significantly in that province, Mr. Chairman. This province is going to have to compete with them.

I simply put it on the record now. The First Minister is very concerned now, Mr. Chairman, but that's who he has to compete with. We have one or two more years while they hold office and the evidence will be there. The evidence will be there as to how they compete with the Province of Saskatchewan and the Conservative philosophy in that province and in other provinces. I am afraid that for Manitoban's sake they are not going to do well, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the First Minister says he's not sleeping at night, that may very well be true and it may very well be right, but the problem seems to be that he and his colleagues are sleeping during the day, because with 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba and with this so-called great emphasis on job creation, their total program of government is not very effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think I heard a question in this speech. I think that the honourable Labour critic across the way was asking how we are creating jobs; how we are effecting unemployment; how we are going to help those who wish to find work find jobs to go to? I am going to ask the Minister of Government Services to describe some of the ways in which we are putting people to work because the entire government is involved in this effort. The Jobs Fund impacts on all of us and the Minister of Government Services, because of the kind of Ministry he has is involved in the delivery of a number of these programs and can articulate the answer to the question that I know that the Member for St. Norbert was asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether the honourable members will have the patience to go through all of the detail that we have here. I hope that they will be able to follow along and have some patience because we have some detail here that I think would be helpful to the honourable members in getting a grasp on how jobs have been created through these special initiatives that we've taken in the Jobs Fund in initiating projects that otherwise would not have gone ahead in Government Services, initiating programs that would have otherwise had to have been stalled off, the worthwhile projects, important projects that have to be built, facilities that have to be built, infrastructure, improvements for fire regulations, improvements for energy conservation that would otherwise have not been able to proceed at this particular time.

We can look at at some major ones such as the Portage addition to the Food Products Development Centre; total number of work weeks, 190 work weeks created in developing a project for expansion of the Food Products Centre in Portage la Prairie. That was done through the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, Mr. Speaker. It certainly is going to provide a large number of work weeks of employment, and is going to provide the food industry and the food service industry in Manitoba with a wide range of technical support, advice, and assistance in product testing and evaluation here in Manitoba, a much-needed project.

We can look at the Red River Community College Diesel Auto Shop Expansion which will provide 1,179 work weeks of employment that otherwise would not have been created, Mr. Speaker. This diesel auto shop expansion will meet the needs of students in Manitoba so that we will have trained people to fit into the jobs that are available for them.

Mr. Chairman, we can look at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre reception and building renovations that are taking place there; 781 work weeks of employment created through the — (Interjection) — the Minister of Health is just encouraging me there on that one. He's very proud of this particular one. He's been anxious to get this particular project under way and he finally was able to do that because of the Jobs Fund, Mr. Chairman, and we're very proud that we were able to finally undertake this project. It has been a long time in coming, and has certainly been something that has been facilitated, because we have the Jobs Fund in place.

We can look at the Neepawa Land Titles Building, the renovation for the Assistance Deputy Registrar there. You can go into a lot of these smaller projects that add up, Mr. Chairman, and provide employment for Manitobans. These projects, Mr. Chairman, were done, not in a haphazard fashion, but were done in a scientific way. These projects were arrived at after looking at the unemployment statistics across Manitoba dividing the province into regions to determine those areas where employment was the greatest and where we had to target employment opportunities.

We also looked at the labour intensity of these projects to determine whether they would create jobs with few dollars. In other words the more jobs created per dollar, per \$100, the more labour intensive it would be, and the more apt we would be to include it in our program, and we did that, Mr. Chairman.

We have looked at the unemployment. We have targeted the labour intensity and then we've looked at all government agencies and Crown corporations to determine the projects and the capital program that they have in various regions of the province so that we could organize and synchronize the employment targeting that was taking place, so we could get a picture of what was being done in the public sector in these various areas of the province. Then we went ahead and targeted these projects for those areas.

We can look at the Winnipeg Land Titles Building which needs to be begun in terms of design. We can look at the minor renovations for the Winnipeg Law Courts Building; the number of rural courts, the minor renovations in them; the Brandon Court House; the renovations to the Sheriff's Office; construct the juvenile

holding room, and so on. We can go through those, the Portage la Prairie Court House; the Sheriff's Office construction there.

Mr. Chairman, we can go to the buildings on Evanson Street, The Manitoba Government, 189 Evanson, and renovations that are taking place there. At Easterville, the nursing stations upgrading and renovation of those. The Selkirk Provincial Building, renovations taking place there. The relocation of the Community Mental Health Care staff in Dauphin. Mr. Chairman, I could go through a great number of others.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The Headingley Correctional Institute, Mr. Chairman, a number of work weeks created there through a number of renovations that are taking place that would otherwise not have been taking place at this particular time because of the Jobs Fund and because we believe that jobs have to be created now and these were worthwhile projects that had to take place now.

We'll look at the Winnipeg Public Safety Building and the work that had to take place; the Remand Centre. We can look at the Portage Correctional Centre for Women and the number of work weeks that were created in a number of renovation projects there. Again, I'm skipping over a lot of the detail, Mr. Chairman. I'd be pleased to provide much more detail for the opposition if they would like to have the detail there.

The renovation of the former diesel auto shop at Red River Community College, 190 work weeks there. Nursing stations upgrading in a number of locations in Manitoba. The Fire College at 693 Taylor, Mr. Chairman, 150 work weeks there. Red River Community College, insulate the court room windows, diningroom lighting, heat recovery for the kitchen exhaust, 100 work weeks there, Mr. Chairman.

There's been many others at The Pas, in Selkirk, in Brandon, in Boissevain, Swan River, Thompson, the Keewatin Community College. The list goes on in Portage, in Winnipeg, and so on and so forth, Mr. Chairman.

Those add up to, that I just mentioned, over 6,000 work weeks on just those ones that I mentioned just now. Just an example of the emphasis that we're placing on capital programs in Government Services in addition to the regular program that we have in place, the regular program that was discussed in our Estimates only a few short weeks ago, these are additional projects that would otherwise not have found their way into activation this particular year.

I think the honourable members should look at those efforts and realize that there is a sincere effort made by one department, Mr. Chairman, of this government to create work when we need it the most, and to provide worthwhile projects for Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting dissertation by the Minister of Government Services, very interesting. Interesting in that it misses the entire point of the debate; interesting in that it speaks to the classic, traditional, NDP socialist

philosophy; interesting in that he describes not a single permanent, real job in that entire list; interesting in that it never addressed the issue of enterprise and investment and the private sector; interesting in that it ranged only, Mr. Chairman, across a broad spectrum of state-supported jobs; state-funded, temporary jobs; makework projects. The point at issue here, Mr. Chairman, is that this government has not created — (Interjection) — a recognizable number. I hesitate to say they have not created a single real job, but I think that may be closer to the truth, but I would say that to avoid hyperbole on the subject, let me say in a conservative way, Mr. Chairman, that this government has not created any identifiable, significant number of true, permanent jobs in this province in their one-and-a-half years in office.

It is very close to reality to be able to say that they haven't created a situation or a climate in which any additional jobs of a real nature have developed here. The entire thrust that the Minister of Government Services talked about has dealt with state-funded, taxpayer-supported, temporary, make-work jobs. What we want to see in this province, what a million Manitobans want to see, what 52,000 unemployed Manitobans want to see, is an atmosphere and a climate that enables real jobs to be created.

Mr. Chairman, it wasn't so much the remarks of the Minister of Government Services that induced me to enter the debate at this juncture although, as I say, I found them particularly interesting and provocative, but it really was the remarks a few moments ago of the Minister of Health that prompted me to enter this debate at this particular moment, because the Minister of Health said, if I am not misquoting him, that he believes that the Jobs Fund is understated, or at least the rationale for the Jobs Fund, and the initiative that it purportedly represents is understated. He said that we - and I'm quoting him - we, meaning the NDP, said during the election that we were going to try to create jobs, and that's what we're doing. That, I think, is a reasonably accurate representation of the Minister's statement, Mr. Chairman, in this debate a few moments ago.

I have to ask him, if that's what they're doing, then why do we have the payroll tax? Why do we have a \$200 million Jobs Fund when we have got a payroll tax that, in a good year, on an annualized basis, was designed purportedly by the First Minister and his Finance Minister to raise \$110 million? So we're raising \$110 million, presumably, ostensibly, through a payroll tax and directing, re-directing, developing, attempting to generate \$200 million for a Jobs Fund.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot argue that what this government is doing is attempting to create jobs and, at the same time, introduce a 1.5 percent tax on every job in this province, because the Health Minister knows, and the Finance Minister knows, and the First Minister knows, whether they care to admit it or not, that that 1.5 percent payroll tax on every job in this province is what is inhibiting job creation, is what is contributing to unemployment in this province. So what they're doing, Mr. Chairman, is saddling us with a double burden; they're producing the burdensome load of a 1.5 percent payroll tax on every job in the province, and then they are turning around and saying we have to have another \$200 million and we're going to find

it somewhere, to create state-funded, state-supported, temporary make-work jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is the most ludicrous approach to development of a province, and the resources of a province, and positive achievement and positive hopes for a society that has been concocted in this country in my memory. They saddle us with a double burden and try to argue that what they are doing is creating jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the payroll tax on job creation in this province, and on the spirit of this province, has been widely reported, has been extremely widely felt, is known to all Manitobans who will honestly admit what's at stake and what's involved in our condition at the present time, and no amount of smoke screening and sidestepping and denial by the First Minister is going to change that fact.

My colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, mentioned the position articulated recently by the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Lloyd McGinnis, and I quote for the record, for the First Minister, for this committee, Mr. Chairman, a recent report from the Winnipeg Free Press, March 22nd, 1983, in which Mr. McGinnis is quoted directly as saying that, "Manitoba is increasingly perceived, by potential investors, as having declared open season on business," and he attributes that, in large part, to the payroll tax.

Continuing from that article briefly, Mr. Chairman, because this should be on the record and I commend it to the Minister for nighttime reading. If he's having so much difficulty sleeping he might want to re-read some of this, or for the first time, read some of this material that has been widely disseminated for Manitoban's benefit, but doesn't seem to be getting through to the First Minister and his Finance Minister.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody on the other side ask whether I believed McGinnis. I would remind that questioner that his First Minister, his Executive Counsel, invited Mr. McGinnis, as President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, to their so-called Economic Summit which they held in Portage la Prairie and, ostensibly, perhaps it was all deception, perhaps it was all smoke and mirrors, but ostensibly sought his opinion as an opinion worth having on what was the condition of the economy in Manitoba at the present time, what was the prognosis for that economy, and what were the remedies that he would suggest.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote you directly from that article: "McGinnis said during a panel discussion on government intervention in the economy the perception is being caused by a number of the Pawley Government's actions. In particular he attacked the 1.5 percent payroll tax, pension reform suggestions, and talk of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation entering the life insurance business."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Premier on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think on a point of order it would be only wise and appropriate to point

out, because the honourable member may not be aware of this, that Mr. McGinnis is a Member of the Advisory Committee pertaining to the Jobs Fund that we're dealing with at the present time; and Mr. McGinnis does believe in the Jobs Fund, and I think that should be clearly on record, particularly in view of the games that it appears the honourable member is trying to participate in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see where the First Minister had a point of order. The First Minister has offered his early contribution to this debate; he has been involved in this discussion, in this debate, up to this point in time. I sat quietly and listened to him and if he's attempting to create fictitious, imaginary points of order, in order to interrupt my opportunity in this debate, then I think it ill behooves him and is uncouth, to say the least. Mr. Chairman, I'm fully aware of Mr. McGinnis' position, both with respect to the Advisory Board to which the First Minister refers, and with respect to the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce.

I am re-reading, for the First Minister's benefit, the report by a Free Press reporter by the name of Mr. Greg Bannister on March 22, 1983, which is only a few months ago, having to do with what Mr. McGinnis had to say with respect to the perception that business and enterprise and investment now has of Manitoba because of the business-destroying posture and the anti-business flavour and anti-business attitude of this government. Whether Mr. McGinnis supports the concept of the Jobs Fund is entirely irrelevant to what he is saying about the payroll tax and the pension reform suggestions, and the talk of Public Insurance Corporation intervention in the life insurance business and the impact that has on the business atmosphere of Manitoba and the business atmosphere outside Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a couple of other newspaper reports and comments from letters with which members opposite I'm sure are familiar but have obviously totally ignored — (Interjection) — Certainly, I'll table them. I don't mind tabling them; they all appeared in the newspapers. The Minister of Government Services shouts table them — (Interjection) — Well, not the Minister of Government Services, but the Member for Inkster who aspires to be perhaps either the Minister of Government Services or aspires to some other portfolio which I can assure him will long exceed his reach and will forever exceed his grasp.

The Member for Inkster is not likely, Mr. Chairman, to accomplish that in our lifetimes, but I will give him the recognition of acknowledging his interruption in this debate in any event and apologize to the Minister of Government Services who did not make that interjection. But to the Member for Inkster, let me say I am perfectly happy to table them. As a matter of fact, he and his colleagues should have read these things in the newspapers. All of them have received these same letters which went in copied form to all members of the Legislature, so there's no need for me to table them but I don't mind doing so. If the Member for Inkster and his colleagues, particularly the First Minister and the Finance Minister, would read some of this

material and if they would accept the fact that some of these commentators have a perception of the problem and a view that is worth taking into consideration, it wouldn't be necessary to read the material into the record at this time, Mr. Chairman, but they've obviously missed it or ignored it or failed to pay any heed to it, and I therefore want to underline it for them and hope, as I said, that the First Minister and his colleagues will read this material and digest it and understand and comprehend the message involved.

From a recent issue of the *Winnipeg Sun*, there is a report on the effect that the payroll tax is having on the province's hospitals. The fact that, and I quote directly from the article by John Bertrand, *Sun City* Editor, "Several hospital administrators said yesterday that the payroll tax is swelling their deficits and they don't know where they're going to get the money. The 1.5 percent payroll tax is killing us."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, in the hospital's opinion, it received a letter from the Manitoba Health Services Commission saying that they will get — (Interjection) — Yes, all right, I am making a statement of correction. — (Interjection) — It is a point of order. Mr. Chairman, a point of order — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, they're saying that it's not a point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The member does not have a point of order. If he wishes to clarify, he can clarify at the end of the presentation. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suggest things may be difficult for you in caucus with the Minister of Health tomorrow, but I appreciate your integrity, your honesty and your approach to that issue. The Minister of Health did not have a point of order.

I am reading to the Minister of Health and to the First Minister a report from the *Winnipeg Sun* by John Bertrand, the *Sun City* Editor, and I am reading it to them in case they did not read it or ignored it when they first saw it. That requires to be on the record and the Minister of Health certainly did not have a point of order. One administrator in that article is quoted as saying that the 1.5 percent payroll tax is killing us. "Taxpayers aren't going to be happy about seeing a hospital tax. Carman Memorial Hospital . . ." - and my colleague, the Member for Pembina, has raised this in the past - "Carman Memorial Hospital is typical of what is happening in many facilities across the province. The hospital pays \$1,000 each month in payroll taxes, and that only adds to the burden of a deficit hovering in the range of \$50,000.00."

Mr. Chairman, a letter with which I am sure you are familiar and the First Minister is familiar; it was addressed to you with copies to others of us from Advance Avionics Aircraft Ltd. "The recent 1.5 percent employer tax is not appreciated, but rather another reason for us to wind down our business in this province

and move out, including my family. I personally feel that this tax is a deterrent for us to expand or employ people. We have reduced our staff because of the above."

Mr. Chairman, a letter from the Pedmac (phonetic) Corporation addressed to members of this House. I am sure the First Minister is familiar with it. "The election of the NDP in this province has destroyed any initiative a businessman may have had to expand in this province."

This particular writer, who was the president of the Pedmac Corporation here in Winnipeg, goes on to comment about the harmful or the deleterious effect and difficulties that were created for his business by the increases in the minimum wage because he operates in a fast food field and had extreme difficulty offsetting the burden of the minimum wage increase, but that really is not his primary concern. He says in the letter, "That, however, was not enough for the NDP. Next, they came along with their 1.5 percent payroll tax. I recognize the potential of this tax as being a devastating blow to most employers and could readily see its effect on me."

Mr. Chairman, the examples, the letters and the reports are legion. They go on and on. Not only do the letters and reports of that nature go on and on, but spokesmen such as Mr. McGinnis, whom I have quoted, and MCC executive director Norm Bergman, quoted in a recent *Free Press* column by Frances Russell, argues the same case. He warns that there is a strong undercurrent of objection to this tax within the businessmen of Manitoba because it represents a real threat to many small businesses who are struggling to stay afloat. Their feeling is that no matter what the government says, this payroll tax is a tax on employee payrolls and on employee paid cheques. He predicts that the passing of the tax back to employees will become a lot more common.

So, Mr. Chairman, over and over again, the evidence is there that business is being hurt and jobs are being wiped out by that payroll tax, and for the Minister of Health to say that the Jobs Fund is the structure in which the government is attempting to keep an election promise to create jobs and to say that's what they're doing, creating jobs, is just ludicrous.

The Minister of Health is the one person on that side of the House, Mr. Chairman, who knows better than that. He's been in business and he knows that statement is absolutely ludicrous. He's been a businessman. I can tell you this, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Health had been out of politics and in business at a time when a measure like that payroll tax was introduced, you would have heard him howling from here to the border in English and French. You can be sure of that because he knows as a businessman that tax inhibits business, inhibits enterprise, discourages investment, discourages individual activity, and kills jobs.

Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) — not only do we have that kind of a situation which is contributing to a soul-destroying unemployment total in this province, but we've also got Winnipeg's very poor current showing in terms of the consumer price index. We have Winnipeg, the main urban centre in Manitoba showing a very unfavourable comparative increase in the current consumer price index in relation to other major cities across Canada. So there are the two vivid and

undeniable pieces of evidence that this government has failed totally and abysmally and dismally in terms of creating jobs here. We've got a soul-destroying unemployment total and we've got a very poor current relative position where the consumer price index among Canada's major cities is concerned.

So those two undeniable facts of life I suggest, Mr. Chairman, give the lie to all of the government's smoke screens and protestations, and particularly to those arguments, contrived by the First Minister to attempt to fool the people of Manitoba into thinking that his government is hard at work and being successful in creating jobs. The fact is, Sir, that no real permanent jobs are being created at all. This province is in deep job-creation trouble because there are no real permanent jobs being created at all. The make-work jobs that the Minister of Government Services talks about aren't the answer to the problem.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal briefly with the weak excuse that's repeatedly offered by the First Minister for this terrible unemployment toll that exists in the province at the present time, and that is namely his tiresome excuse that some Manitobans are returning home from Alberta and other provinces in Canada, and that's what has swollen our unemployment rolls. The fact that some Manitobans are coming home and it's a difficult time economically, and therefore they are winding up on the unemployment rolls and so our figures are up.

Mr. Chairman, what the First Minister surely must realize, I don't know how long he has to operate and live and breathe in the real world before he comes to the realization - I would have thought he would have come to it long before this - what he surely must realize is if there were business enterprises being launched in this province, if there was any enterprise in the private sector whatsoever, there would be more jobs and as a consequence the returnees would be going into the work force instead of onto the unemployment rolls. There are no jobs being created of a permanent meaningful nature, of course, returnees and everybody else bumping up against the economy in Manitoba today is in danger of winding up on the unemployment rolls. Of course they're in danger of turning up as a statistic in the jobless figures because the private sector is absolutely stultified by the anti-business atmosphere and attitude that has been created and is continually being fostered and perpetuated by the policies of this government.

If there were a climate for enterprise and investment and effort, individuals like many in this Chamber and thousands beyond it would be doing things that were creating real job opportunities in the economy. Then the returnees would not be winding up on the unemployment rolls, and then the jobless statistics would not be in the awful shape that they are.

So, let the First Minister not try to deceive Manitobans with that argument. Sure the returnees are coming home and swelling the jobless ranks, but they're swelling the jobless ranks because the man and woman who want to invest and build a business in this province have thrown up their hands and said there's no point in doing it.

So let us — (Interjection) — address honestly and realistically the basic problem, Mr. Chairman, and while attempting to marshall the limited resources of

Manitobans in a way to fund and provide a multi-million dollar Job Fund initiative which is highly arguable and highly disputable at the best of times, let us look beyond that into the real potential for job creation, and let us look at those inhibiting factors like the payroll tax.

If this government would eliminate that payroll tax and say to those persons of energy and enterprise in our society and beyond it, not only inside our borders but those beyond it, that we want you here in Manitoba; we want you to build, and we want you to make a profit; we want you to make a dollar because when you make a dollar, we'll make a dollar. Then we would have some progress in bringing our unemployment totals down. Then you'd see some progress in improving our economic picture. Until then, Mr. Chairman, those people who want to make that kind of effort are going to continue to avoid us and ignore us. All we're going to get are those artificial, summer, part-time, temporary jobs that are created by the kinds of things that the Minister of Government Services is doing by resorting in a knee-jerk fashion to the old socialist NDP conventional technique of creating state-funded employment.

Let us encourage that rigid, doctrinaire government over there, Mr. Chairman, to cast off that old mantle and discard those old shibboleths and get on with the job of helping Manitobans in a pragmatic way. They can do that if they will abandon their doctrinaire policies such as the payroll tax. They can do that if they will reach out to the person who wants to make a dollar and encourage him and her to make that dollar. That's where the answer lies. The arguments offered tonight by the Minister of Health and the First Minister that they are creating jobs are just totally ludicrous in the face of the policies and programs of this government that are represented by such onerous and burdensome and anti-enterprise measures as that infamous payroll tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a great pleasure to get up here and to respond to the kind of garbage that we've had tonight from the members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: They're misquoting . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: . . . them, conveniently quoting these little snippets of information that come out of media releases, from people at the Winnipeg Construction Association, misinterpreting statistics. Whatever you want, leave it up to the opposition, they'll try and do a smear job on anything under the sun.

A government when they were in office, and you see from the tables that the present Minister of Government Services, the Member for Brandon East when he was in opposition and he was following the patterns of the government opposite, when he was following the great performances put forward by the infamous former

Minister of Economic Development, the former Minister of Finance, the bumpkin of Highways here. Mr. Chairman, if one looks at the population growth in Manitoba you see the population growth of Manitoba bouncing up and down under the NDP years, but under the Tories you see a steady decrease. A decrease in 1979 of 2,500 people, when population decreased, 2,500 in 1979; 1980 increased to 3,800; 1981 they weren't giving out hardly any visas, 1981, Mr. Chairman, there is a small population growth of 1,400 people in their last year of office. That wasn't even making up for the recovery, or half the recovery, that they had lost in 1979 or in 1980 individually in those years. About one-third or one-quarter of the number of people that left in the two previous years.

And when the NDP gets in office, in the 1982, we have a population increase in this province, Mr. Chairman, for the first time in three or four years; how long since the first time that the Tories took office. They didn't mind people leaving this province, Mr. Chairman. The leader of the government at the time - the present Leader of the Opposition and other members on his side as well - they just said it's just a bunch of socialists leaving this province; good riddance to them, a bunch of welfare bums. They didn't care about the people who left.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think secretly, knowing how they chuckle to themselves, that they were probably chuckling when people were leaving because it had less of an impact on their unemployment rates, on the unemployment rates that they had a good role in creating, the increases in unemployment when they were in office.

You had population decreases in Manitoba in '79 to some 3,000; in 1980 over the previous year, another decrease of 5,100 or so from January of '80 a decrease over January of '79; in '81 it's still decreasing at 700; in '82 started moving up, we're up to 6,900, an increase in '82; in January of '83 we're up about 12,600 over the previous year. It's exactly opposite, the trend in population in this province from when the Tory Government in this province took office. There you had populations falling steadily in their term, and here after one year in office, we even have a net immigration, a net provincial migration toward Manitoba, for the first time since back in, I don't even know when it was, it's an awful long ways ago, back before my records show here.

Manitoba traditionally had a slight population loss to other provinces. We might add, as well, that's always been a factor of life in Manitoba; Saskatchewan much more so than us. But when you see when the Tories take office, and within a year of them taking office, the net provincial out-migration from this province doubles; goes up to over 10,000, almost 11,000 people left, interprovincial migration out of the province.

In 1979-80 the people still hadn't had enough, they were still leaving. We lost another 3,000 over the previous increase of last year where we lost 13,000, almost 14,000 actually, 13,800-and-some, almost 14,000 in the year '79-80, after they were well in power, after their acute protracted restraint was well in place, and after their acute increase in migration certificates, or whatever they issue to the people who left this province.

I don't know if they sent them Christmas cards and what-not, but I know that at the end of their office they

recognize it was such a problem they started putting ads on television telling people what a great place Manitoba was, telling Manitobans who already knew that. I think they were trying to convince themselves. I don't know if they were trying to stop the out-migration at that point, or what the purpose of those ads is, but from — (Interjection) — There's one we could stand to lose.

Mr. Chairman, the year 1982 was the first year we started having a turnaround, the first year in years that we had a turnaround, that we actually had a corridor where people were starting to have a net in-migration into this province. — (Interjection) — Coming in to get government jobs the member says, they're coming in to get government jobs. They're not coming in simply to get government jobs; they're coming into Manitoba because they recognize there's a future here in Manitoba. Many of them are coming back to their home; they've gone abroad; they found that the places in the other provinces that they have gone to, and it's not just ex-Manitobans coming back, it's many other people coming to Manitoba for the first time.

I can tell you in my conversations with them, and as my only example itself, this is one heck of a fine province. It's a province that can and will attract in the future more people coming toward us.

We heard talk tonight from the Member for Fort Garry about fewer jobs coming into Manitoba; of less capital investment in Manitoba; of less entrepreneurship in Manitoba; and yet we see in Manitoba, in 1982, the only province in this whole country, Mr. Chairman, that had significant increases in new corporations; whereas across Canada we had a reduction of some 17.6 percent in corporate registrations. In Manitoba that was turned around completely, and we had an increase of 4 percent of new corporate registrations in this province. Maybe that doesn't mean anything to the members opposite. They would rather not look at figures and just stand up and go off on their own personal assumptions and their own personal ideological views of what is happening in Manitoba, without taking the time to look at some statistics, without taking the time, or the effort, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to actually look at what is happening in the province and to look at some of the good sides as well.

I can appreciate it's a job of a government's opposition, the opposition party to do some criticism, and to critique the government's operation; but is there anything at all you had to offer positively? Was your example of office was the acute protracted restraint, and the cutback of Capital construction, and the virtual dissemination of the construction industry in this province, under the Tory Government that we had, and we suffered under their rhetoric, their redneck rhetoric that we suffered under for a few years.

I could spend a minute or two on construction, Mr. Chairman. This is the immediate release from the Winnipeg Construction Association. The title of this is: "Survey Indicates a 47 percent Growth in Construction in the Coming Year," 47 percent growth in dollar volume, for projects scheduled from May '83 to May '84. Here is the people, right on the front if you wish, the Constructors Association themselves, the employers, not simply the employees but the employers in this instance, recognizing the role that the Provincial Government has played in the revitalization of the construction industry in Manitoba.

What did we have here tonight? We had the Member for Turtle Mountain get up and quote from one line in this thing or two lines in this thing, trying to accuse the province and the Jobs Fund being responsible for it. Well, Mr. Chairman, I accept that accusation of the Member for Turtle Mountain because I think without the Jobs Fund efforts, without the efforts of the Province of Manitoba, without them trying to tie in and coordinate some construction activities in this province and across the whole province not just in particular areas or specific projects or projects covering the whole broad spectrum that Manitobans have had in the past and expect in the future.

We have an identification of some 176 projects valued at approximately \$250 million compared to only 116 projects and \$170 million for the previous year. Yes, it's half of a so-called mega project I guess, but, Mr. Chairman, as far as the economy is concerned, it is much more healthy to have a number of small projects going, benefiting a far broader spectrum of the population than trying to soak hundreds of millions of dollars into one big and often subsidized basket. We've seen that happening. We saw that happen. We saw what happened when the Tories were in power in the late '60s in the sort of economic development and mega projects that they wanted to run ahead with back in those years. — (Interjection) — A bunch of mega-maniacs I guess.

When we talk about employment growth and employment growth in Manitoba, we see the labour force in Manitoba actually grew in the past year, grew by some 5,000 people when at the same time the labour force in Canada as a whole, Canada's complete country dropped by some 12,000. So here we were going once again, the same as with business registrations, totally opposite to the Canadian trend. The Canadian trend was going down, Manitoba is going up.

Do the members opposite recognize that? Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable Premier, as the other Ministers and responsibilities in various sections of the Jobs Fund have already indicated today, we have no pride and take no pride whatsoever that there are some 52,000 people unemployed in this province.

Mr. Chairman, that hurts us far more I think, than it hurts the opposition not to gloat on such figures, who like to gloat and continue their gloating on such figures. Even when we have a participation rate in Manitoba, a participation rate that is almost 2 percent higher, almost 2 percent higher, Mr. Chairman, than a participation rate for Canada as a whole, We've also got in Manitoba a participation rate compared to last year where we've gone up 1.3 percent where the whole country of Canada the participation rate has increased but one-quarter of that by .3 percent. But do the members opposite recognize that? No, they won't recognize anything at all of the accomplishment that we are receiving and achieving in this province and so much of it is based on the responsibility tied to it of efforts like the Jobs Fund, of efforts of this province to build Manitoba and not to stand by and watch some of the industrial structures crumble around us.

We encourage new businesses, Mr. Chairman, and that is only too clearly indicated when you look once again at the entrepreneurship of people in Manitoba and the smaller entrepreneur, it's the partnerships this year in Manitoba increased some 8 percent compared

to a national decrease, just a slight national decrease of .1 percent or .01 percent. Nationally it didn't grow at all; here in Manitoba we have an 8 percent increase.

In the corporations where it is a 17 percent decrease in new incorporations in Canada, a decrease of 17 percent; here in Manitoba we have a 4 percent increase. Where in across the country and you look at other jurisdictions as well, Manitoba's almost an island, Mr. Chairman, of sanctity in this age when you have Tory Governments across the country wanting to slice this and slice that, to knock off jobs. Jobs don't matter that much, is their opinion I think, at least when they're in government. When they're in opposition, there's quite a different song that they sing.

In looking at other factors of the comparison of the growth rates of industry and the growth rates of population in this country and the growth rates of housing starts in particular, we had under the Conservative term a continued decrease in housing, and yet this year, Mr. Chairman, you have Manitoba leading the whole country in new housing starts.

We've got for the first five months of this year actually, Mr. Chairman, you have a rate of housing starts in Manitoba of 5.5 percent of the total housing starts in all of Canada. That compares to the highest we've had since 1970 of 4.6 percent. Mr. Chairman, we have the most successful housing program in the whole country, and yet will they recognize that? No, they won't recognize that, Mr. Chairman. They'll get up, they'll criticize us for building houses. They'd criticize if we weren't participating in building projects.

In my own constituency — (Interjection) — they're not temporary, Mr. Chairman, they're whole new developments. We had the Meadows West development. We've sold, up to a couple of weeks ago, there was 282 lots have been issued to people, 80 of them sold, 202 leased on a long term basis by the residents. Very successful program. We have the Infill (phonetic) Housing Project. It's the first type of its kind right across the whole country of infill housing, of building good quality housing for older parts of the city to try and refurbish those older parts of the city, and to assist people into good housing, and also to assist in the reconstruction and the rehabilitation of older neighbourhoods; neighbourhoods which were totally ignored by the opposition when they were in government.

The only thing that they did is they carried on one very good program, and that was the Neighbourhood Improvement Program in Brooklands after it had already been started, already under way, it was too late for them to cut that one out. They accepted that and let it continue. It was a very successful program and it certainly did not have the imprint of the Tory Government on it at all. They had no choice but to continue with the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a litany of mistruths, of half truths. We have a litany of bad news by the members opposite. That's all they are I think, Mr. Chairman, bad news, that are the bad news bears, not the good news bears, the bad news bears.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few short words I would just like to once again commend the wisdom of this government in recognizing its role as a partnership in industry; its role as a partnership in the construction industry in Manitoba, as well as other industries, its

role in assisting and encouraging development in Manitoba. We may not be leap-frogging ahead, Mr. Chairman, in comparison to what happened in the '50s, the '60s or the early '70s but we are making progress; we're making progress at a better rate than any other province in this country and yet, what do we have from the Tories, a litany of nothing. They haven't given one constructive comment that I've heard here tonight of what we should be doing.

We know that they did absolutely nothing. They didn't institute a Job Creation Program; they instituted acute protracted restraint. They did nothing of the sort to try and stimulate the economy of Manitoba during a tough time and it is tough times now, not only in Manitoba,

but across Canada and throughout the Western World. Yet you had, the members opposite, no alternatives, no ideas, just a litany of nay sayers. What was that expression — (Interjection) — that's what I think I'll finish with, Mr. Chairman, what we have opposite is a group of nattering nabobs of negatives. That's a tough one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise? Order please. It has been moved that committee rise. All those in favour? All those opposed? In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Committee rise.