

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 10 April, 1980

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on April 1, April 8, and on April 10, 1980, to consider the Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1979.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the Provincial Auditor and members of his staff with respect to matters arising from the Report.

Your Committee recommends that the salary level used to report employee salaries in the supplement to the Public Accounts be raised to \$15,000. This level would eliminate the majority of clerical classifications from the report and reduce the number of employees reported to approximately 7,500. There should be a procedure for reviewing this level every 3 to 5 years.

By resolution of the Committee the Report of the Provincial Auditor for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1979, was adopted.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement for the House and I have copies. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement regarding the prudential industrial benefits for Manitoba from the McDonnell Douglas Corporation F-18 Hornet which was chosen by the federal government today to be the aircraft . . . Mr. Speaker, the F-18A Hornet has been selected as a new light-weight fighter for the U.S. Navy. Canada will be supplied with a somewhat modified version for land base operations. The F18A is manufactured by McDonnell Aircraft Company in their plant in St. Louis, Missouri. It is a co-production arrangement between McDonnell Aircraft and the Northrup Corporation of Hawthorne, California. Northrup manufacture 40 percent of the airframe and McDonnell Aircraft 60 percent. McDonnell carry out their final assembly and test at St. Louis and are the prime contractors.

The F-18A has two General Electric F-404 engines made in Lynn, Massachusetts. General Electric also supplies their gun systems, electrical systems and flight controls. The radar is made by Hughes Aircraft Company in Culver City, California. Many other major sub-contractors are involved and we have been, and will continue to be, in touch with them as they all are required to make commitments to provide industrial benefits to Canada.

We had a well-developed contact with Northrup Corporation when they were in the contest, although on the F-18A they are sub-contractors to McDonnell and have not played an initiating role. Now that they are on the winning team we shall renew our contract with them to see that the offset activity can be developed.

The part that General Electric will play is important to Manitoba. With 130 aircraft there will be 260 engines plus spares which will be a major portion of the total contract. General Electric has no engine manufacturing facilities in Canada so our companies will be making a strong bid for engine work. Some of the industrial benefit activities we will be seeking for Manitoba include:

Final assembly and test of the complete aircraft - if this is to take place in Canada, Manitoba companies are making a strong bid to have it take place here.

Final assembly and test of engines - the same as the aircraft, if this is to take place in Canada Manitoba companies are going to have to go after this contract.

Components for Engines - Bristol Aircraft have already been awarded a substantial contract. This can grow to large portions now that the F-18 with General Electric engines has been chosen.

Airframe structures - although McDonnell Douglas have a plant in Toronto that makes airframe structures they have still put out bid packages for major sections of the fuselage, so we will have the opportunity to go after that work.

We have also have many discussions with McDonnell Aircraft about the establishment and/or transfer to Manitoba of advanced manufacturing techniques and high technology products and processes. McDonnell Douglas are committed to make direct purchases in Canada of about 650 million in goods and services, so we shall we seeking our share.

They have also said they will set up an export marketing program to use the worldwide connections, so we will want to take advantage of that.

Finally, we want to make a strong effort to get McDonnell Douglas, General Electric, Hughes Aircraft, and others to set up direct manufacturing facilities in Manitoba to make sophisticated high technology metal parts and electronic requirements for the aerospace industry in Canada and the US. McDonnell Douglas have committed about two and one-half billion in industrial benefits for Canada. The potential projects for Manitoba can add up to at least 10 percent of that figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, very briefly I want to thank the Minister for that information which at times sounded like a Federal Government announcement that was being repeated in the House here. I was looking and listening very much, very closely, but in vain I am afraid, for something concrete and specific that was about to happen in this province in the way of jobs in the aerospace industry.

As I see from the statement and as I listened to the Minister we are talking about something that has a potential, but nevertheless is in the realm of being hypothetical at this point.

MR. JOHNSTON: Do you want it or don't you?

MR. EVANS: Well, the Minister says, "Do we want it . . ." You know, yesterday the Minister in this House said he didn't believe in flag waving. Today he is waving a Federal Government announcement. If there isn't anything equivalent to flag waving, I don't know what we heard just now. Usually we get the Minister knocking the federal government and knocking the efforts of the Ottawa people in the area of economic development but today I gather there is some hope on the part of the Minister that some of this work may come to Manitoba. I want to say that when the New Democratic Party was in government, Mr. Speaker, we did indeed make every effort to get as much as we could in the way of aerospace activity in this province. It's a very difficult chore, a very difficult task. But, Mr. Speaker, we made some great efforts to get work for the aircraft industry in the province of Manitoba which is centered mainly in the city of Winnipeg of course. I only say, Mr. Speaker, that we do hope that some work will come to Manitoba, goodness knows we need more jobs, goodness knows we need good paying jobs and perhaps something good will come out of this. But recognize the statement, Mr. Speaker, for

what it is and that is a repeat of a federal government announcement with some hope that perhaps someday something might happen in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the first Annual Report of the Manitoba Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, and I'd also like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation for the year ending March 31st, 1979.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with questions I would like to at this time draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 35 visitors from Sacred Heart High School in Minneapolis of Grade XII Standing under the direction of Ms Karen Schjenken.

On behalf of the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Finance Minister. Since we received an announcement on February 15th, 1979, in the then Throne Speech, that the White Paper on Property Tax Credits would be tabled, would be forthcoming, in the '79 Session; and a later commitment on the part of the Minister of Finance that it would be again tabled soon and the suggestion there might be a special Session in the fall of 1979 to debate such a White Paper; and again this year's Throne Speech dealing with commitment to a White Paper; then yesterday's announcement taking out really the guts, insofar as any such White Paper by the announcement of significant increases in the Property Tax Credit, can the Acting Minister of Finance assure us that indeed this Session, 1980, unlike last year, 1979 Session, that we will indeed receive that long awaited promised White Paper?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that rather lengthy question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Government Services whether or not a decision has been made to date on the question of honouring flood compensation claims and moving claims on the Brokenhead River, it's a matter that was drawn to the Honourable Minister's attention some several months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correct, the subject deals with the expansion of the program now in effect in the Red River Valley to areas such as he mentioned and others, and the decision to expand the Flood Reduction Program to those other areas has not yet been made.

MR. USKIW: Well, perhaps the Minister could indicate whether or not his department is in a position to communicate with the person involved who had been promised an answer at that time, in about six weeks time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the person in question, indeed other people in similar circumstances on other lesser streams that have flooding problems in the

Ste. Rose du Lac area and the Dauphin River area, the Icelandic River, Interlake, have been given the same advice, that is that they should apply for assistance, but were also told that the program at this point did not include those areas, that when and if the province moves to expand the program now in existence - and I might say, Mr. Speaker, it requires federal co-operation to allow us to expand that program - that these claims could then be honoured.

For the further edification of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, I don't mind indicating to him that it is my intention to do so, and my express hope that we can expand the program to cover these other areas as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress upon the Minister and ask him whether he would not consider that to the extent that he is prepared through the Flood Compensation Program to compensate for damages done that, in effect, would be recurring again, that those dollars be allowed to be allocated for re-location purposes, notwithstanding the fact that he may not have an agreement early with respect to broadening the federal-provincial agreement on flood prevention.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have some sympathy with the honourable member's question but it's part of the unyieldiness of a bureaucracy, and all bureaucracies I suppose. The program that is currently applicable outside the Red River Valley applies only to repair of a damaged structure. The program that the honourable member wishes me to apply is a program which is finding a great deal of acceptance and success in the Red River Valley, of raising and/or moving away completely from the area is another program, and I will take the honourable member's good advice and attempt to convince my colleagues that we ought to be doing that.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Attorney-General. Before a licence to operate a casino is granted is there an investigation carried out, and if so, who is investigated, the corporation or group that will receive the revenue or the person, persons or corporation that will actually conduct or operate the casino, or both?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, casino licences are granted by the Manitoba Lotteries Licensing Board after detailed application forms are filed by the applicant with the board. Perhaps the easiest and quickest way for me to answer the question from the member, Mr. Speaker, would be to undertake to provide him with copies of the application forms and the information that is required and perhaps subsequent to that he might have further questions.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this would be acceptable providing my questions are answered. A blank application won't answer my question. If the Minister is taking that then could he also find out if there are any conditions that have to be met? For instance is a character reference from either the RCMP or the Police needed and for instance someone with a criminal record - could they receive a licence to operate a casino?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake to provide the member with all of the information that is required upon application.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. EDWARD MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition was directing some questions to this side of the House as related to the unemployment statistics and I certainly, in reviewing his questions, they

weren't answered thoroughly enough I don't feel. They were directed to the Minister of Economic Development. He did say the point that the Leader of the Opposition was making and his question was because the actual - he didn't use the actual number of employed month over year - hadn't increased, he was using the seasonal. I should tell him that the party that he belongs to when they were in government used seasonal for the unemployment stats; I want to get this clear. And you use actual at all times in this country when you are talking about greater employment. What has happened this year in actual and the way you work it out at the end of the year; last year there were 13,000 new jobs, the year before there were 11,000; this year to date on actual, in January over January there were five, February over February there was one, March over March there was one. Mr. Speaker that does not mean there's 7,000 new jobs. At the end of the year you divide it by 12 and then you get your amount of new employment in your province. So really if you follow the philosophy through and the theory through, and this isn't mine, this is one that's been used by government - five and one and one is seven divided by 3 if you want to do it on a quarterly basis, which again you don't normally do but if you did there would be 2,333 and a third new jobs in the province. I think that would possibly answer some of the confusion that was raised yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.. The interesting information that the Minister is giving us, it sounds as though he is trying to explain away the fact that there is really little or no growth in jobs in this province. Do I understand the Minister correctly when he says we shouldn't compare month over month but that it's more accurate, or more reliable, or more reasonable if you will, to take an annual average and - in other words take the total number for the year or the difference from January to January divided 12, get an annual average - and make that comparison? On that basis would the Minister, and based also on the information that he receives from his research staff which we don't have but which he has, can he confirm that the prognostication, the prediction for this year then, is that there'll be little if any new jobs created in the province of Manitoba in 1980.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, last year we heard a lot of those predictions too and I would think that the members in the opposition would be pleased that at the end of the year when it was calculated, there were 13,000 new jobs in the province of Manitoba. The predictions this year, I don't want to even live with them. I don't know what they are, how good they are or how bad they are. I hope they are greater than last year and I would think the Member for Brandon East would share that hope with me.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister, who is becoming well versed in these figures, so it's not unreasonable for me to ask the Minister, confirm that the rate of job increase in the province of Manitoba last year, for the whole year - so we're talking about an average of a 12-month situation - that the rate of job creation in Manitoba was the lowest of any of the 10 provinces in this great dominion of ours.

MR. MacMASTER: No, I certainly can't confirm that. I'll get those comparisons for the member, but I know that at the end of 1978 there were 440,000 people employed in Manitoba, and at the end of 1979 there were 453,000 according to federal stats, that's averaged out over the course of the year. Why I'm saying this, I was trying to be open and reasonable with the members opposite, because in certain year-over-year months - now they laugh about this, maybe they don't want some honest facts or don't want to know how to deal with it during the course of the year, but they'll be year over year where there might be a boost of 9 or 12 thousand, and that isn't going to come from the lips of myself saying my God, Mr. Speaker, we've created 12,000 jobs in one month. It means year-over-year, that's the way it fluctuates, and at the end of the year is when you calculate it. It's reasonably simple and I don't think it's been explained in the House. That's the only reason I'm standing here, trying to explain it so we all understand what we are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: I understand, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is urging that we don't look at month-to-month changes but we take annual averages, so I would very specifically then, using the annual averages, and I have the statistics in front of me, could he confirm that in the year 1979 the average rate of job creation in Canada for the year 4.0 percent, and in the province of Manitoba it was 3.0 percent, making it the lowest of the 10 provinces in terms of net job creation?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll get those particular figures for the member, Mr. Speaker, and I'll get other years' growth too. I'm sure he'd be interested in them all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question to the Minister of Labour, a question that is also important to jobs for people in the province of Manitoba. I would like to ask the Minister, because of the urgency of this matter, and again it relates to the Port of Churchill, if the Minister can inform us whether or not he has received any further information from the federal government as to the settlement of the negotiations between the employees and the employers of the Port of Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I've been communicating with the federal Minister of Labour, federal Minister of Transport, and the federal Minister of Immigration and Employment, and I received a telegram yesterday from the federal Minister of Labour saying that he had directed his mediator to get both parties back together. Well, the member from wherever, across the way, doesn't seem to be interested. But the federal Minister has directed his mediator to get both parties back together and in communications this morning it's been confirmed that both parties will be back at the table at the first date that they both could possibly get back, and that will be May 5th.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I pose a supplementary question and I'm wondering if the Minister could inform this House as to whether or not the lateness, when he mentions May 5th, whether or not it will have any bearing in regards to the negotiations that may have to take place in establishing countries to purchase the grains that are shipped out of Churchill; and as well, what company will be making those dealing operations from the Wheat Board to the countries that may be interested in buying grain via Churchill?

MR. MacMASTER: Well Mr. Speaker, I have taken the position as Minister of Labour in this province that I will not involve myself in the intrigues of negotiations. I think I understand quite well what's taking place. Both parties have met last November; a settlement was close. The mediator got them together in February; I understand the settlement was close. Neither situation had a satisfactory conclusion. For whatever reason - and I leave it to the two parties to decide - for whatever reason they have mutually agreed that May 5th is the best date. I think as a citizen, and probably if I was one of the union members, or one of the management members, I would think all people would have been pleased if it had have been settled in November or February.

But that's not the case, Mr. Speaker, and sometimes that happens in negotiations. I hope that a satisfactory conclusion is reached rather rapidly; May 5th is getting late and I think that's the tone of the question - is it too late? I don't think it's too late, but it is getting pretty late, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Attorney-General. Approximately three weeks ago or so, I requested that the

Attorney-General undertake an investigation in regards to ownership of livestock in the Dauphin area. I wonder as to why criminal charges were not proceeded with in this case and I would ask the Attorney-General if he is able to report on any progress that he has made in this investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received that report. I'll make another enquiry as to the status of that matter and advise the member in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SYDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development. Mr. Speaker, will Manitoba companies, in dealing with the potential industrial benefits from the McDonnell Douglas Corporation, will they have to bid and tender the subcontracting that is referred to as notice to companies that are based outside of the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the federal government has, in many areas, control over where certain things will be done in the NFA program. Certainly they have indicated to us that the moneys will be spread economically, or favourably across the country, because it's a Canadian airplane and it's being purchased by all Canadians. There is a good possibility that Manitoba companies may have to quote to somebody in Ontario who happens to have a contract to do a specific job on the aircraft; that's not unusual and I think that would be favourable if we could get as much of that business as possible.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the practice that the Manitoba Hydro Board is following, the direction we know not whence it comes, of saying that it will not permit the contract to be let other than to a local company, other things not being equal, which is the way they are doing it - refusing to take a tender because it's not a local company - will that practice, if employed reciprocally by Manitoba companies who have to bid in Ontario, work against companies in the province of Manitoba and thereby, despite the Minister's great efforts, work against manufacturing in the province of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: I heard somebody on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, say "watch it". Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks a question about the aerospace industry in the first instance, tries to set me up on a question in the second instance, that would be for Hydro. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I think he's following up from some questioning that he has had with the Minister of Finance and with myself, I think last week some time. But I told him then, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the Department of Economic Development is concerned - and I don't intend here to speak for Hydro at the present time, but I would hope that they would do what the Department of Economic Development would do, and what I hope every department in this province does, is to invite proposals from people - and I use the word proposals - and all things being equal, Manitoba companies being used; if that's not the case, if it has to go outside the province, that we hope that there's Manitoba people used and we hope that we will gain experience from them on all bases. And our purchasing policy is, all things being equal, we look to the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Yes Mr. Speaker, the minister, having analysed the question, I wonder if he would now answer it? I've asked the question, will this practice, if used reciprocally by the province of Ontario, or companies in Ontario, as against other than local bidders, affect the Minister in his best efforts, Mr. Speaker, to try to get jobs for manufacturers outside of the province of Manitoba? And if so, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister see to it that that Hydro practice is discontinued

and that jobs be given to Canadians or, Mr. Speaker, to the best bidder under any circumstances?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member is still playing the same games. He's saying, if the practice is used. I have never said it was being used; I don't believe the Minister of Finance has. And as far as the question that he puts, would it be harmful to the province of Manitoba if that type of reciprocal arrangements took place - let me tell him Mr. Speaker, it would be harmful, just the same as it's harmful to the province of Manitoba when the province of Saskatchewan says, everybody else must be 5 percent lower to get a job in Saskatchewan. It would be very harmful if they were like B.C., that said you must be 10 percent lower in order to do work in the province of British Columbia. We have continually said that Manitoba does not believe in those practices. We have said our purchasing policy is, all things being equal, we look to Manitoba, other than that we look for Manitoba contract. And the member keeps saying, "Why is Hydro doing it?" You know, why doesn't he stand up when he is in the Minister of Finance's or the Minister of Energy's estimates and discuss it with them, because there is nobody ever stated that Hydro has done it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JIM DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question from the Member for Emerson some week or so ago in regard to the movement of grain out of the Red River Floodway. I am sure we are all aware of the fact from the report from the Minister of Natural Resources that there will not be a flood this year, but the situation as far as grain movement is concerned in the Red River Floodway as reported to me, after meetings with the Canadian Wheat Board, local municipal officials, and the Department of Government Services, Department of Agriculture, indicates that there were approximately 1.2 million bushels of grain in the area which was flooded last year. There was approximately one-half million bushel-storage in elevator space available. The Wheat Board and the people involved, the railroad, moved in some 528 cars or expect to have that many moved in by the end of this week that will facilitate the movement of approximately 1 million bushels, and would like to report that I believe that this kind of a plan is essential on an ongoing basis to protect the interests of the farmers in the Red River Valley.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a Point of Order.

MR. PETER FOX: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would be prepared to revert to Ministerial Statements so we could have a copy of what he has got and so we could reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a Point of Order. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. First of all, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, has the Minister now a demographer on staff, inasmuch as the government advertised for a population specialist for population studies last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we advertised for a demographer a year ago. We got a very very capable person, that person has been promoted up through the Civil Service Commission, has now got a promotion, and we are advertising for another one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Then I wonder if the Minister has been advised that, according to data released today by Statistics Canada, Manitoba received last year, the year of 1979, 23,443 people, but also lost 38,900 people, for a net loss of 15,45 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Has the honourable member a question to ask? Proceed with your question then.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I was asking for a confirmation or a comment from the Minister who has this expertise. I am asking the Minister if he has been advised that Manitoba had a net loss of 15,4 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member the Question Period is a time to seek information not to give it.

Does the honourable member care to rephrase his question?

MR. EVANS: Okay. Can the Honourable Minister, who is responsible for population studies, confirm that last year, 1979, that Manitoba suffered the greatest net loss since statistics have been compiled and perhaps the greatest loss since the Depression of the 1930s?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can reply to the Member for Brandon East. Yes, in fact, his figures are correct. People travelling across the country, that's the immigration, there was 23,443 stopped in Manitoba last year, and yes, in fact, there was 38,900 that left Manitoba last year. That is, 34,789 on an average has left per year since we formed the government; compared with 34,769 when my friends in opposition were in government, so that is talking about those that left the province.

Maybe the Member for Brandon East wants to ask questions about national immigration figures and what has happened to the province; or births, what has happened to the province. I would like to see him continue to get up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister was able to confirm that we have had the greatest net loss probably in our history.

I wonder if the Minister can also confirm that Manitoba's total population has dropped as of January 1, 1980, has dropped from January 1, 1979, from 1,031,200 down to 1,026,200, a drop of 5,000 people, being the only province in Canada which is registering a negative rate of population change, which never ever happened under the New Democratic Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member's question was out of order. It was not a question. I am sorry. May I point out to the honourable members that the Question Period is a time for seeking information, not for making statements; there is a place to make statements. The use of the Question Period is the responsibility of the members, I can only adjudicate, there are other people that are waiting to ask questions. If members seek to use up the time of the House in making statements, I suggest they do it during the period when there are statements to be made. The Question Period is a period that is forty minutes duration. It is available to all members of the Assembly. When some members start to abuse it, then I have a responsibility to protect the rights of the other members.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a Point of Order.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, if you will recall the Honourable Member for Brandon East asked, and I repeat "asked" that the Minister confirm some information he wanted an answer for. That is the proper use of the Question Period and I would suggest that if you are not happy with the way the member phrased the question, you ask him to rephrase it, but he is entitled to get information and that is what he was trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the honourable member wants to challenge the decision I make, he has the right to challenge it.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that you give the honourable member for Brandon East another chance; if not, then I must respectfully ask that your ruling be challenged.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is highly improper for any member of the Assembly to give instructions to the Speaker of the Assembly.
The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a Point of Order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Sir, I indicated I was asking, I was not instructing, again it is a matter of the use of the English language. Therefore, I challenge your ruling at the present time since you are not prepared to consider what I was asking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Speaker cannot argue with members of the Chamber, it is highly improper for him to do so; I refuse to do so. If the member does not like the manner in which I have suggested the member's question as being out of order, he has the right to challenge that.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I have asked, and I am indicating again, that I challenge your ruling in respect to the question being out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A VOICE VOTE was taken.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the ayes have it.

MR. FOX: Yeas and Nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is whether or not the ruling of the Chair shall be sustained. All those in favour please rise.

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

YEAS

ANDERSON	EINARSON	KOVNATS	MINAKER
BANMAN	ENNS	LYON	ORCHARD
BLAKE	GALBRAITH	MacMASTER	PRICE
COSENS	GOURLAY	McGILL	RANSOM
DOMINO	HYDE	McGREGOR	STEEN
DOWNEY	JOHNSTON	McKENZIE	WILSON
DRIEDGER	JORGENSEN	MERCIER	

NAYS

ADAM	DOERN	JENKINS	PAWLEY
BOSTROM	EVANS	McBRYDE	SCHROEDER
BOYCE	FOX	MALINOWSKI	USKIW
CORRIN	GREEN	MILLER	WALDING
COWAN	HANUSCHAK	PARASIUK	WESTBURY
DESJARDINS			

MR. CLERK: Yeas 27, Nays 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for The Pas: That an Order of the House do issue for a Return of the following information:

1. The cost involved in the utilization of the services of Thorne Riddell and Company respecting McKenzie-Steele Briggs Ltd. from the date of retention to the present.
2. The cost involved in the utilization of the services of Aikins, MacAulay and Thorvaldson from the date of retention to the present.
3. A copy of the reports and recommendations presented to the responsible Minister by Thorne Riddell and Company and by Aikins, MacAulay and Thorvaldson.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Brandon East, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that an Order - the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no problems with the first two items with regard to the costs involved for the retention of the services of Thorne Riddell or the costs with regard to Aikins, MacAulay and Thorvaldson. However, I would not at this time accept the third clause, and I cite Beauchesne, Citation 390, Mr. Speaker, the second paragraph: "The following criteria are to apply in determining if the government papers or documents should be exempted from production. Papers containing the release . . ."

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

MR. FOX: Yes. Would the Minister indicate whether he will or will not accept the Order for Return. If he won't, then it will be placed over for debate. If not, then we will proceed with it as normal. There should be no debate by the Minister now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't believe the Minister is debating. He is giving some reasons for acceptance or non-acceptance.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to do was show that the particular item that I was not prepared to accept was out of order according to the rules, and I was trying to cite a Beauchesne citation. If that is not allowable, Mr. Speaker, then obviously I can't continue and I cannot accept the Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this matter could therefore be put over for debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked that the matter be set over for debate.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, just as a - and it may only be an academic question, I certainly don't pretend to be well versed in this particular point, but it seems to me, Sir, that on occasion there will arise a double question, No. 1 as to whether the question, ab initio, of itself, is in order, and I think that really that is what the Minister was attempting to indicate, that under the Beauchesne citation, the question is not in order of itself. Now whether or not that, Sir, is then capable of being debated, is a matter that, of course, you have to decide. But I am asking the question, rather than making a statement, Sir, as to whether or not it is not always in order to quote a Beauchesne citation to indicate that the nature of the question is not one admissible in a certain circumstance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in discussing the point of order raised by the First Minister, I believe that the more appropriate approach on the part of the Minister would have been to have raised first, on a point of order, and dealt with the matter as a point of order, not as part of his general discussion and response, in response to the Member for Brandon East. In view of the route that the Minister has adopted, then, Mr. Speaker, I believe the matter clearly should be put over for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find myself in a rather difficult position, that I have not looked carefully at the Order for Return as such. I do know that if any portion of a motion is out of order, the entire motion is out of order. I would hesitate to make a ruling on this at this time. If it's agreeable with the House, I'll take it under advisement and take a look at it. Is that agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return of the following information: A copy of each bid submitted in 1979 to the Government for the purchase of McKenzie-Steele Briggs Ltd.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: On a point of order then, I wonder if you could take this matter under advisement for the same reason that you've taken the other one under advisement, and that is basically because I believe it is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I wish the Minister would either indicate whether he is willing to accept it in its present form or not. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be dealt with on the same basis as the other one was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I have looked at this Order for Return and as far as I'm able to ascertain, I find it to be in order. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept the order and would then ask it be turned over to debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I presume that matter will be put over for debate. Have you agreed that it be put over for debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for The Pas, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return of the following information:

- 1) A list of each person or firm in receipt of financial assistance under the Rural Small Enterprise Incentives Program since the inception of the program up to March 31st, 1980, showing the location of the enterprise, the type of manufacturing or processing involved and the number of jobs by occupations.
- 2) The amount of financial assistance provided to each person or firm listed above with an indication of the specific terms.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's nothing more than an annual report that I receive monthly; that's public knowledge, and I will give it to him with pleasure because I would like him to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services: Resolved that the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Legislature on Monday April 7th, 1980, be concurred in.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe this appeared in Votes and Proceedings for Monday, April 7th. Is that the document? The one concern I would like to express, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion here, that although this year there'd be no change in the introduction of the estimates by the Minister, that we deal with that last, and that would be continued, but next year there would be a desire to drop the entire administrative section, to break it out and deal with that at the end of the estimates so that the estimate procedure would be pretty well to deal with the details and then to deal with the Minister's Salary and his office, that's including the Deputy Minister.

But what concerns me is this - I don't see it here, but I'm concerned the direction it may be going. It is normal for the Minister to make an opening statement, and I think it's only proper that he should when he introduces his estimates, his or her estimates. So I agree that statement should be made. But if I follow the wording here, what discussions that have apparently taken place, my concern is that the opposition would not be in a position to respond to that opening statement. In other words, if the Minister makes his opening statement, immediately that is done with, the committee would have to go down to the next line which would not be dealing with the administration of the department or his office, and would have to then deal with some branch of the office not relating at all to the Minister, so that the opposition would not be able to respond to the Minister's opening comments.

My concern is that this should not occur; that if in fact there is an opening statement by the Minister, and I think there should be, then there should be an opportunity - it could be a limited time, it could be 20 minutes, 30 minutes, whatever it is - for the official opposition to respond; one member perhaps, just as only the Minister can make the opening statement, one member would respond from the opposition side, and then the business of the committee could carry on. So it's that concern that I have and which I wish to express to members of the committee when they deal with this again and when next year they come up with a new format for the presentation of the estimates, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to what extent the committee has grappled with this particular aspect of it, and I'm not sure whether or not this particular piece has to go to Committee of the Whole House. My understanding was that by moving it as the House Leader did, and it was accepted by the House, this would become the procedures which we would follow in the future. That's why I made the comments at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from members of the committee who dealt with this to see whether they share my concern and whether in fact my concern is justified.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to speak on a point of order. I am trusting to my memory that when Rules Committee reports had come to the House previously, they did go to Committee of the Whole House, so that the kind of thing that is being raised by the Member for Seven Oaks could be discussed. As it is,

the only thing that members could do is get up and make a 40 minute speech which I know the Member for Seven Oaks has no intention of doing but it's my recollection that Rules Committee reports were at one stage considered in Committee of the Whole House so that they could be discussed clause by clause. Now the Clerk will be able to confirm that or not, I'm just trusting to my memory because I did bring in several Rules Committee reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I can't recall. The Honourable Attorney-General on the point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if I can speak on the point of order - the report, as it appears in Votes and Proceedings in the third or fourth paragraph, indicates that, "Your committee recommends that unless otherwise ordered by the House for the balance of this Session the Rules of the House be changed as follows . . . " The intention was that these rules would be adopted on a trial basis, and for that reason, it was the view that this could be the procedure we could adopt in this case to approve by resolution rather than moving to Committee of the Whole. If there is disposition to do that, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection if that would expedite the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster, on the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the fact is, that although there is a Rules Committee, there is sometimes misunderstanding because the entire discussion didn't take place between all honourable members, and that's not my position, at this time. I am merely indicating that the Member for Seven Oaks' question cannot be dealt with at the present time because there is no way of giving a question and an answer, and therefore it would be preferable if the report was referred to the Committee of the Whole House and there could be quick questions and answers and then the resolution can be pursued. My recollection, and it's only recollection, is that is the way in which we dealt with Rules Committee reports in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I don't think it is within the power of the Speaker to order that the matter be referred to Rules Committee, I think a substantive motion from the floor would always be in order. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that this matter be referred to Committee of the Whole House.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, then, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Rules Committee.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the report of the Rules Committee, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson).

MR. CHAIRMAN: This Committee come to order. It's been suggested that we go through the report page by page. (Agreed) Page by page, report on page 1--pass; page 2--pass - the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in the very last of the paragraph it states, "your committee recommends that the current practice whereby a Minister introducing the Estimates of a department is permitted to make his introductory remarks on the item Minister's Compensation and that a discussion on the item is then deferred until debate on all other items of the department estimates is concluded, and that that be continued for this session." My concern was the implication that it be continued for this session and implies it will be changed next session.

Your committee recommends that consideration be given for the next session of the Legislature to the rearrangements of the estimates book so that only the Minister's compensation and the executive salaries are included in the general administration item and that the entire resolution be discussed at the end of the departmental estimates. So my concern is this, that's why I'm putting this forward, if that occurs, I can understand the Minister rising, when his estimates are called, making an opening statement, perhaps half an hour or whatever the time permits; immediately on sitting down the Chairman of the committee then would simply call the very next item, which did not in any way relate to the Minister's office, so that the opposition would be ruled out of order if they attempted to respond to the Minister's opening statement.

So what I would ask the committee of the Legislature to keep in mind is, if there is an opening statement by the Minister, and perhaps there should be, that in fact the official opposition should be able to respond a limited time, one member only perhaps, but there should be a response and then the committee could get down to the nitty-gritty of the department and then come back to the Minister's Salary at the end of the process. Otherwise, as I say, I'm concerned that the Minister would have an opening statement, and the opposition could not respond, could not deal with it, could not react to it, at all, except perhaps a week or two later, which is really a useless exercise at that point in time.

So I would ask committee to bear this in mind when they meet again to deal with the recommendation that consideration be given, etc., etc., to the reordering of the estimates book, and at that time, they would then have to determine what the procedures will be and what procedures will be followed. I make these points in order to bring this matter to the attention of committee and to request that they keep in mind my comments to avoid the possibility that the recommendation from the committee might be challenged in the House. Usually we work by consensus, we always have in the past, and with those few comments, and the only question I have on all the other clauses here, as far as I am concerned, the rest can pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2--pass - the Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, again let me point out that the recommendation from the committee is that the actual changes in the rules, which doesn't include the matter referred to by the Member for Seven Oaks, be adopted for the balance of this session only, and if it's the wish of the Rules Committee and the House to continue these rules for another session after the experience we have during this session, the committee will have to meet again before the next session of the Legislature to make another recommendation to the Legislature.

It was certainly the intent of the matter that is referred to in the Rules Committee for consideration that this kind of procedure that's referred to in the report could not be adopted at this session of the Legislature, because, for example, in my own Attorney-General Department's Estimates, under General Administration, we had a number of items, for example, --(Interjection)-- not just the Deputy's office but gun control came under General Administration, along with two or three other significant matters that members may wish to comment on. So it was felt by the committee that it would be unfair, at this session of the Legislature to drop those matters down immediately to the end to be considered under Minister's Salary because they were specific items. So that's why we recommended that in the preparation of the Estimates for next year consideration be given to only including in the general administration item the Deputy Minister's Salary, etc., and it not be expanded upon to include other significant aspects of the department.

The practice, as I foresaw it then, certainly would be for a Minister to make an opening statement and then to proceed immediately into the next specific item.

The Member for Seven Oaks has raised a concern which I suggest, in view of the fact that the rules are only to be adopted for this session of the Legislature, that it is something that we might consider at Rules Committee before making another recommendation to the Legislature for the next session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I appreciate the item I raised is not affected for this year at all. My concern was a direction which it might go and I wanted to bring this to the Minister's attention. I think he understands what my concerns are so that when the committee meets again they'll take into consideration the matter that I pointed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to add any controversy to this matter, but I would like to suggest that there's possibly a solution to this temporarily if the House Leader and myself, with the concurrence of our caucuses, could designate maybe one or two departments on which we could have a trial basis of what has been suggested by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, then before this goes into effect next year, the Rules Committee would have an opportunity to meet, it could discuss and see if there's a consensus on the trial of one or two departments. The remainder would all go through as we have been practising up to date.

If that's a solution, and if the members of the House are prepared to look at it, I think we could probably work something out on that line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that in fact, I think is the essence of what was agreed to at Rules Committee, that we would look at some of the individual departments coming forward, where in fact Item 1.(b) only included the Deputy Minister's salary, for example, we would try a few out on a trial basis and see how things worked out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2--pass; Bill be reported. Call in the Speaker. Committee rise.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I take it then, Mr. Speaker, I am concluding debate on the motion that was moved. --(Interjection)--

Just to make sure, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that the Report of the Rules Committee be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Could the Honourable Attorney-General tell the House when he anticipates that this rule will come into effect for the new sitting dates? Tomorrow or Monday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the rule changes could not come into effect tomorrow.

QUESTION put, MOTION Carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal grievance.

Mr. Speaker, during the past question period I attempted, and at times it seemed to be somewhat in vain, to obtain confirmation of certain very pertinent, very fundamental information for this House, and indeed for the people of Manitoba, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, I felt very very frustrated in this entire exercise, very frustrated, but I do have a sense of satisfaction inasmuch as at some point the Minister of Labour, who has the demographers on staff or does have responsibility for population studies, was able to stand up and confirm the data that was released only today by Statistics Canada in Ottawa.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it must be a very sensitive matter indeed --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm reminded it he could have released it as a Ministerial Statement and would have not therefore required a number of questions on my part. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I observed that this must be, indeed, a very very sensitive matter because lo and behold the Premier showed up. He wasn't here during the question period, and some other Ministers were not here during the question period, which incidentally . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's highly improper for a member, in debate, to refer to the presence or absence of other members of the Chamber and I would ask the member to withdraw that.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if that is not parliamentary I withdraw it. But I hope the press gallery isn't blind, that's all.

Mr. Speaker, I say it's a very sensitive matter because, in the process of attempting to get this information, we had Ministers of the Crown standing up, all of a sudden ready to make statements or answer questions that have probably been hanging fire for weeks; goodness knows we had backbenchers hopping up while I'm trying to put my question, and indeed, I would say that I got the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposite side really didn't want me to be asking these questions. It's something they would like to forget about; something they'd like to ignore; something they don't want to be reminded of; because, Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a very sensitive matter, it's a matter that concerns all Manitobans to see the deterioration of our population base and of course, the deterioration in some instances, of many communities and many towns in our good province.

I even noticed, for the vote, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. Matthews was here to vote with us today, and I consider that an accomplishment and I congratulate the Member for St. Matthews for being here today to vote on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again, I must remind the member that it is improper to refer to the presence or absence of a member in the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I thought congratulations were in order and I am always pleased to see the Member for St. Matthews. I didn't like him to vote against our particular position in this matter, but nevertheless I congratulate him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, in my grievance, because this is very fundamental, very vital information. I'd like to point out that apart from all the fudging that goes on in some of the answers of the Minister of Labour, that indeed it is very clear that when you look at the pattern of interprovincial migration, and that's what we're talking about.

First of all I want to talk about interprovincial migration. When you're talking about the pattern of interprovincial migration, you have to look at the number of people who come into Manitoba, of course, and you look at the people who leave the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate it's the bottom line that's important. It's that bottom line there, the net. Is it a negative figure or is it a plus figure, and all the speaking and all the fudging of the issue by the Minister of Resources or the Minister of Labour or anybody else on that side, cannot take away from the bottom line the fact that that bottom line, unfortunately for this province under this government, unfortunately shows a negative figure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the negative figure, from the research that I have done, indicates to me that this is the greatest net loss in interprovincial migration that we have experienced in recorded history. I have statistics back to 1961 --(Interjection)-- a result of Lyonomics I am told by my colleagues. My figures go back to '61. Maybe there are figures earlier than that, but from the figures that I have and that's quite a period of time, that's two decades, 20 years or so, there's no other figure, no other year which reaches the net loss that we have achieved this year. So I believe that it is quite possible that this net loss, in the year 1979, was the greatest net loss through interprovincial migration of people than has been experienced in this province since the dirty '30s, the great depression of the 1930s.

Mr. Speaker, I let you in on a secret. I have been doing some forecasting. I have been doing a little bit of forecasting of population trends and I know members opposite are always interested in my economic research, they make enough reference to it, or they have so far during the House, and my forecast for 1979, net loss, and I thought, well, maybe I'm going out on a bit of a limb here because you see last year we lost 10,493 people, I mean 1978. Well, let's go back. 1977, we lost 5,685 through interprovincial migration; 1978, the net loss was 10,493, and I forecast, based on the first three-quarters, that our net loss would be 14,000. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit I was wrong, the net loss was not 14,000; I was, if I may use the term, on the conservative side in my estimate. I was too cautious, as I said the net loss was 15,457 people.

The shocking thing, the disturbing thing, about this therefore is that the information that we have on the fourth quarter indicates an acceleration in loss. In other words, using the first three-quarters and projecting that on a straight line you get 14,000, but with the information that came in on the fourth quarter we have got a bigger figure, a figure of about 1,500 people higher. So therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is very disturbing and that is that the data shows an acceleration in the net loss of people in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I would make is that this net loss is so great and I say it is a net loss that has occurred incidentally, a net loss that has occurred, as I said it was about the greatest probably since the '30s. But you take that into consideration; you take births over deaths, which is the natural rate of population increase, bring them together, then you look at what happens to the total.

There is one other factor, Mr. Speaker, and that is immigration, possibly immigrants coming from wherever they come from, Vietnam or whatever, may have helped keep up our total population, the flood of recent refugees that came into Manitoba. But when I take the immigrants, when I take the net migration figures, and I take births over deaths - natural rate of increase - put them together, I come

to what is happening to the total level of population in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the end result is that the total population in Manitoba is dropping. In fact, according to the information I have, we are the only province in Canada at the present time who is suffering a drop in total population. In other words, our rate of population change is negative and our population drop, I believe, according to my calculations was 5,000. In other words, as of January 1, 1980, compared with January 1, 1979, the total population in Manitoba is 5,000 less.

Now I want to make another very important observation, Mr. Speaker, at this point. I would like for us to refer a moment to the province of Saskatchewan, our sister province, which has something of a similar type of economy as we have, and is much maligned by members opposite as being a socialist government or social democratic government or what-have-you. But, Mr. Speaker, last year, when Manitoba's population dropped 5,000, the province of Saskatchewan increased by 12,400 people. The total level of people in the province of Saskatchewan rose by 12,000 people. Mr. Speaker, this is something that I am prepared to stand up, assuming present trends, assuming there is no major change in the trends, assuming the Conservative Government stays in office and doesn't change its economic policies, I would say that, based on present trends, by the year 1983 the province of Saskatchewan will be larger than the province of Manitoba. By 1983 the population of Saskatchewan will have superseded the population of Manitoba, and it doesn't take any forecast wizard to come to that conclusion, just straight-line trends. In fact, it may happen sooner, but I will say a cautious estimate would be the year 1983.

Mr. Speaker, why are we losing people? Why is the Manitoba population dropping? Incidentally, true there has been negative net migration for many a year, but, Mr. Speaker, it was never as bad under the New Democratic Government, never as bad to the point that Manitoba's total population dropped. Our population level on an annual basis, January to January, as we have got the figures here, at least was expanding. We didn't show a situation that we have today and which we also had in 1978, for part of 1978.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, why does this phenomenon occur? Why do we experience this very serious population loss? There are a number of reasons. I know you will say, well, we don't have the resource package, the resource development that they have in Saskatchewan and Alberta and they are attracting people, and that is true. You could argue some other reasons that have been put forward, but, Mr. Speaker, when we were in government and anything went wrong or the economy didn't perform as well as all of us would have liked it to, you know it was the NDP Government's fault; it was always our fault. So I say, Mr. Speaker, if it was our responsibility, if any failure of the economy during the years of the New Democratic Party administration was to, at least in part, rest on the shoulders of our government, then I say at least in part this government must take the responsibility for the loss of people from the province of Manitoba. The fact that we don't have the oil, the gas and the potash just will not wash; it will just not wash. I say, therefore, as far as the impact of government is concerned, I say categorically it is the Conservative economic philosophy, the set of economic policies that this government is following that has contributed to the loss of people in our province.

There are a lot of other symptoms, as we know. There are symptoms in the housing market; there is the gloom and doom psychology in the business community; the unemployment figures are not that great. You talk about being the third lowest, we were always the third lowest. In fact, I recall when we were in government we sometimes were the lowest level of unemployment in Canada, if not the lowest, the second lowest, so we are the third lowest. But, Mr. Speaker, even though we were the third lowest in the last month, our position did worsen along with Ontario and our position worsened more than Ontario's did. In terms of employment growth, the Minister of Economic Development can get up and talk about the terrific number of new jobs. Yes, there are some new jobs, but then we look at this last month and we find, my golly, month to month, March last year to the month of March of this year and there is indeed no change, using the seasonal figures, the one year compared to the next, there is not one more job in the province of Manitoba. So where did all the jobs go?

Well, there is no question that yes, there may have been some jobs created, but the rate of job creation in Manitoba, there is no question about it, falls below par, falls below the Canadian average and certainly falls below most of the provinces in our country.

There are other pieces of information that would indicate, to me at least, that the year 1980 is not going to be very good either. I am prepared to predict, and again I am going out on a limb, that there is going to be very little, if any, new job creation in the year 1980. I am willing to predict that the rate of job creation is just about going to flatten out and this is based on forecasts that have been made by other organizations, including the Conference Board in Canada. It could also be gleaned from some of the investment statistics that have been put out by the Minister of Economic Development. He puts out these press releases from Information Services and so on, and picks out the figures that look pretty good and tries to make us all believe that all is well in the provincial economy. But, Mr. Speaker, the situation, the investment situation in Manitoba is very very weak. Investment, I might add, is probably the most critical factor in determining the rate of economic development. What is happening to investment spending is a very key item in economic development and economic change.

I say, other than the province of New Brunswick, which is in that traditionally depressed economic region of Canada, Manitoba will have the lowest rate of increase in capital spending in the year 1980. According to the information that was just given out a couple of days ago, the rate of capital expenditure increase will be 5 percent in 1980 in Manitoba, less than half of the Canadian average.

But do you know what that means, Mr. Speaker? It was 5 percent this year and last year it was 0.4 percent, and the year before that it was 6.4 percent. The point is, Mr. Speaker, of all this is that even though you say, well, at least it is positive, it is plus, it is 5 percent, it is not negative, but I say, Mr. Speaker, take a look at what is happening to inflation in this country of ours. The rate of inflation is between 9 and 10 percent. So the if the rate of inflation is between 9 and 10 percent and your capital spending is increasing by 5 percent, Mr. Speaker, do you know what is happening? There is less investment spending that is going to occur in Manitoba in real terms in 1980 than occurred in 1979. In real terms, in the number of machines that are put in place, the factories that are put up, or whatever happens, there is less that is going to happen in 1980 than happened in 1979. So I say the investment picture is very bleak and very weak.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day that the Winnipeg Free Press would write an editorial urging the government of Manitoba, the Conservatives of Manitoba, to change their economic policies. Because, Mr. Speaker, the economic policies of this government is, of course, to reduce the size of government, to cut taxes, to stand back and let the marketplace take over, let the private sector alone, leave the private sector to itself, and of course then all the good things will happen, just get government out of the way. Mr. Speaker, here you have the Winnipeg Free Press, which I have always considered to be a fairly right-wing organization to say the least. --(Interjection)-- Right, Winnipeg Free Press, Wednesday, February 13th, 1980, and they say, "Figures compiled by the Canadian Association of Movers may be enough to convince even Premier Sterling Lyon that Manitoba's loss of population last year is something more than a figment of Statistics Canada's imagination. People, it appears, are moving away in increasing numbers and that fact ought to inspire our provincial government to thought."

It goes on to talk about the resources and all the rest and so on, but that is says to cope with that situation, that is our less than adequate rate of growth, "To cope with that situation the Manitoba government is going to have to overcome its abhorrence of the public sector involvement in the economy." Get that, I am going to repeat that because that is a pretty . . . I've got to get it to sink in. To cope with that situation the government of Manitoba is going to have to overcome its abhorrence of the public sector involvement in the economy."

I just about fell through my seat when I first read that. I am going to frame it and maybe I will make a thousand copies or something and spread it around, I don't know, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, they have hit the nail on the head. The government philosophy has not worked. The Tory economic policy has failed. The private sector was put on trial by the First Minister of this province. At least that is what he said, that he is putting the private enterprise on trial, and I

say, Mr. Speaker, that I am ready to predict that the verdict is going to be pretty bad for the private sector. Of course, I don't whether the Premier would follow through in any way, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, in order for this province to get going, in order for this province to be at a higher level of economic activity, I suggest with all respect, Mr. Speaker, that the public sector must play a key place, must play a vital role, that we must indeed follow policies that were followed by the New Democratic Party when it was in government. I say look to our policies, look to what we tried to do in order to stimulate the economy of Manitoba, and I think that we had some measure of success.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development likes to make us think that there are great things happening in manufacturing and we all want to see the manufacturing sector expand, and so on. He talks about huge percentage increases and so on, but you know, Mr. Speaker, the total investment in manufacturing is only 6-1/2 percent of the grand total of investment spending in Manitoba for all sectors: Agriculture, primary industries, service trades, transportation and so on. So if you take the entire basket of investment spending dollars, you'll find that manufacturing is only 6-1/2 percent. So you can double - never mind a 27 percent increase or whatever the Minister of Economic Development talks about - you can double it, you can triple it, and it still will not have that much of an impact on the level of economic activity.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we are indeed in a very very sad way. So the solution is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. It's for this government to recognize that their policies are not working, that they should put their dogma aside. Let's not have this dogma interfere with reason. Let 's not . . .

A MEMBER: Let sleeping dogs lie.

MR. EVANS: Let sleeping dogs lie. Maybe I shouldn't give any advice, but I think the government across the way knows full well that their political fate rests on what's going to happen in the Manitoba economy. They know that full well and they're beginning to realize that the Manitoba economy has not taken off, that we have not reached this great state of economic opulence and affluence that was supposed to happen when the Conservatives came to office. They were going to stem the so-called flight of capital; they were going to remove the dead hand of state interference and the private sector would march in and bring the Manitoba economy back to health. Well that's their philosophy and I guess they won't give it up, but they're in a real bind because they really don't know what to do. They're in a real bind and we're going to continue to have economic stagnation, Mr. Speaker. We are going to continue to loose people in this province as long as this government continues to follow the policies that it espouses and that it's prepared to carry through and it has carried through in the past two years or so.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I may have a few minutes the next day. I'm quite prepared to go beyond into the Private Members' Hour but I don't know whether that's in keeping - or is after 8:00 o'clock . . . I'm not sure whether it's 4:30 or not, but I'll carry on just in case.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish the Premier were here to listen to this because I always enjoy his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The hour being 4:30, we are now in Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item of business in Private Members' Hour on Thursdays is Private Bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, Bill No. 17, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: The second item is Bill No. 24, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: The next item is proposed resolutions. Resolution No. 18. The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

RESOLUTION NO. 18 - "Enterprise Manitoba" Program

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill:

WHEREAS sufficient time has now passed since the commencement of the Progressive Conservative Government program known as "Enterprise Manitoba" to assess its impact on our economy; and

WHEREAS during the lifetime of that program out-migration from Manitoba has increased rather than decreased to a point where it is now at the highest rate in our history; and

WHEREAS the give-aways of millions of dollars to certain select business friends of this Government deprive other business people of a source of capital; and

WHEREAS it would be in the public interest to utilize the funds received by the Province from the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion in order to insure loans by local lending institutions to viable Manitoba businesses in need of financing in order that such financing can be given and in order that interest rates can be reduced to a minimum;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government be urged to renegotiate its "Enterprise Manitoba" program with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to the effect that funds be obtained for the purpose of insuring loans to viable locally owned businesses. Such loans would be repayable at reasonable interest rates, generating revenue to create further businesses.

MOTION Presented.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This matter was placed on the Order Paper back on March 17th, 1980. On that particular day I also had placed a resolution on the Order Paper dealing with the property tax credit system, requesting that the property tax credit program be updated and in response to that I was pleased to note that in fact part of that property tax credit updating took place by announcement yesterday. I was hoping that a similar announcement would be made prior to the commencement of debate on this resolution with respect to this resolution, but that has not happened. Therefore I would hope that I will be able to convince members opposite that this resolution has merit.

In dealing with the matter of the change of mind of the government on the property tax credit, I refer the House to the February 4th, 1980 issue of the Brandon Sun, "Federal Tory Budget Not Tough Enough, Lyon." That's the headline. "Premier Sterling Lyon said Saturday that if he had any criticism of the proposed federal Progressive Conservative budget, it would be that it is not tough enough." So I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the announcement yesterday must have been made because he's been convinced by that resolution with respect to the property tax credit program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the government does have a responsibility to promote growth in the economy of this province, and that includes assistance to business and especially support to local business enterprises. There are many ways of encouraging business and promoting business in this province. One could, for instance, assist in product research. There can be information to business regarding market conditions inside and outside of the province. There can be promotions of tourism, especially outside of the province and that has been going on for many years and it is a commendable program. Another way of assisting business is to provide a market for the product and that occasionally happens for instance with government programs which fund repairs of homes; government funding which provides insulation for homes, government funds providing vacations for underprivileged children in our resort areas; and those things all assist business in this province.

What we are dealing with in this particular resolution is another form of assistance to business, and it's a question of grants versus loans. We assume that both allow government to provide funding to projects which would otherwise, without any other government intervention, not have proceeded. The difference between the two is that grants need not be repaid, loans should be repaid. There are advantages to grants. One of the advantages is that it eliminates the cost of administering the loan, obviously, that saves . . . There is another advantage, as the Minister of Government Services points out. If you get a grant you don't have to pay it back, certainly. Theoretically I suppose it might even make a difference as to whether a business will go ahead or not, although I do not really believe that a matter of a \$30,000 grant will make that kind of difference to a manufacturing or processing concern. When an individual goes into business, he expects to earn a profit and if he is going to be at a point where \$30,000 is going to make a difference, that is that he may or may not have to repay that \$30,000, I would submit that the project is so marginal that it would not proceed whether or not it's a grant or a loan.

Another advantage of the grant system, and this is especially an advantage to government, is that it means that government will not be embarrassed. Now I don't really understand this, but somehow there is nothing embarrassing to a government to have its Minister of Economic Development going across the province, having his picture taken, handing out money, hard earned taxpayers' money to other people who then don't have to repay it. I would think that's embarrassing, but it isn't. When you have to repay a loan and the business fails, you find the opposition making a certain amount of hay and therefore and it is I suppose, to a government's advantage to some extent to operate by way of grant and if anything goes wrong with the company, well, the government had nothing to do with it.

Now there is a disadvantage to that as well, to that whole aspect of the government giving the money and running, because then the government has no incentive whatsoever to stay with that particular company, to stay with them to assist in some other, not necessarily monetary ways. There are disadvantages such as less global funding because there is only one amount, and if no money comes back into government coffers, if none of that money comes back in, then of course fewer people will receive those funds and that means that fewer businesses will be established in the province. Similarly, there will be less funds available to the individuals who are provided with those particular funds. If you have a program under which the money is returned at a reasonable rate of interest, then one would assume as well that each individual business qualifying would be able to receive more money and possibly we could wind up with larger and more enterprises in the province.

Basically, my opposition to the idea of grants is that it offends, I submit, the rules of equity. It is unfair as between businesses of a similar class. It is unfair for instance if you have a manufacturer of widgets who is already in business, struggling, who suddenly finds his neighbour setting up another widget factory using his tax dollars free to compete against him free. Well it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite should be called the free-prize party because that's what it amounts to, to the guy who gets the free prize. The other guy struggles. He has to go to the bank and pay 20 percent on operating loans right now. I didn't hear the news this afternoon, it might have gone up, but that's pretty tough and that is not fair. That is simply not equitable between two businessmen in the same class, in the same industry. It is certainly unfair as between businesses of a different class. You have the widget manufacturer as opposed to the individual who is operating a tourist camp. The operator of a tourist camp under this program does not qualify for the funds. They certainly provide jobs. They certainly provide a net economic benefit to the province but they don't qualify and that is not fair. Why should one group of business people qualify, people who hopefully will produce jobs, and another group of business people, who would also produce jobs if they had the wherewithal, doesn't get the money, not even a loan?

That's not fair. Now it's not fair in terms of, not only resorts - I understand that there may be some legislation forthcoming which will provide some assistance for resorts - but it's also unfair, for instance, to communities where some individual might want to set up a repair shop and it's socially worthwhile, an important function for the community because if it's not there the people have

to go elsewhere. Well under this program there's no funds available, absolutely none for these individuals but there is money available if you happen to fit into a certain pigeonhole and if, of course, your total investment is under \$60,000. Any other amounts, of course, would be handled by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. --(Interjection)-- I'm not sure as to whether there is a program dealing with canaries. This particular program is not only unfair as between businessmen of a similar class or a different class, it is also unfair with respect to businesses versus other individuals in our society, take students. Students going to our universities are pursuing a socially accepted goal. They're pursuing the goal of learning which, hopefully, they will be able to assist the people of this province with. They get no grant whatsoever unless they can prove their financial situation, the fact that they are financially strapped. If they're strapped they can get some financial assistance after they have put a huge investment in. Percentagewise there is just absolutely no comparison. This particular program, Enterprise Manitoba, you have to put in 50 percent of the equity; the other half is given to you. The student foregoes a year's salary; the student frequently is required to come into the city and pay for extra lodging; the student must pay for books, tuition, that sort of thing - he has to prove need. Before he can get the grant he has to take a loan from the government. So he's in a different position. Percentagewise there is just absolutely no comparison. And that's unfair, it's unfair as between two different taxpayers, both of whom are pursuing a socially acceptable, a good goal, a goal which all of us apply.

It is unfair, as between the business person and, for instance, individuals who wish to improve themselves. I'm going to give a specific example of a woman who lives in my constituency. She owns a home, she is separated from her husband; her husband is not paying maintenance; she is on social assistance; her children are now in school; her children are taking various extracurricular courses such as swimming and piano and she decided about a year ago that she should get back to school to retrain herself to get into the job market. She applied to the University of Manitoba. She was accepted and she then contacted the Department of Health and Social Development. She asked for a loan, not a grant, she asked for a loan. She said, what I need is several thousand dollars to buy an old clunker of a car which will allow me to drive my kids around to their various places where they are taking these extra curricular activities and in this way I'm not going to rob my kids while I'm going to University. And she said, look, I've got this house - when the husband left, he left this house - you can take the house as security. There's no problem; there's no question that you'll get your money back, you'll get your money back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes. There's no question as to security. But the government said no, it's not in our plans, I presume that if she would have applied five years ago under the former administration there was probably enough red tape then too and she probably wouldn't have received the money then, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't be changing.

A MEMBER: Has she applied lately?

MR. SCHROEDER: She applied a year ago and she didn't get it and she's not in school, and I ask the members opposite whether you really think that the people of this province are better served by having this woman at home on welfare, not taking upgrading, rather than lending her some money so that she can buy that car and have her kids do the things that they were doing before.

Again, that's a loan as opposed to a grant. There's no means tests involved with these Enterprise Manitoba grants. There certainly is with many other programs in this province.

A MEMBER: Maybe she should go to the Minister of Economic Welfare.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, whatever she should do, certainly when you consider the lost - probably the potential lost income to the province - we don't

even have to talk about the loss of self-esteem to that woman or the damage to her kids. It's just unfair, as between different taxpayers, and that is why I certainly would suggest that it is more fair to deal with loans.

Guidelines could make for fairness as between different businesses. There could be moratoriums, for instance, on interest and repayment until such time as a business is making a profit. If the business is profitable immediately I can see no reason why the people of this province shouldn't be repaid immediately, together with reasonable interest. If, on the other hand, the business is going bad I certainly don't suggest that we should be coming after the individual's other assets. I'm just asking for a reasonable investment by the people of this province, a fair investment by the people opposite, by the trustees of the public funds. They have a responsibility to the public and they have a responsibility to the business people involved. And again, I don't say that there should be repayment if the business fails, absolutely not, there shouldn't be repayment.

Again, the purpose of this resolution is to bring back a certain degree of fairness as between businesses, one business of the same class as to another business; businesses of different classes and business people as opposed to other taxpayers, and therefore, I would urge the House to accept this resolution. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the honourable member has been put in the position of a new MLA, that his leader wants to take a shot at the Enterprise Program and didn't supply the new MLA with the kit that every member of this House was supplied with explaining the whole program. It was sent out to every MLA in this House when the program came up. It explained thoroughly how the program operates. And one of the reasons why the Leader of the Opposition wants to take a poke at it and doesn't have the courage of the convictions to do it himself, and I can understand that. The Leader of the Opposition says anything anytime, about anything, without looking into anything.

I guess it's because in Selkirk, that great Conservative constituency, that there were three loans passed out in Enterprise Manitoba and during that day that I was out there - and obviously it's because my picture was in the paper in Selkirk because the member mentioned the Minister wandering around the country getting his picture in the paper. While I was there we made the presentations this day and the Leader of the Opposition couldn't be there in the morning, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Uskiw, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, was there in the morning and on every occasion I said I would like the Member for Lac du Bonnet, representing the Leader of the Opposition today, to say a few words and he'd get up and say how marvellous this business was and how he supported the fact that the government was helping small industry to get moving in the rural areas of the province of Manitoba and he expounded very greatly on how much he liked it. And surprisingly enough, Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the last one where we were at the Frandsen's business; I had the privilege to introduce the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and say I would like him to say a few words. He got up and said how marvellous the plan was and how he supported the government's efforts to increase small business within the province of Manitoba and he thought it was just great. And there's been five, under the Enterprise Manitoba Program, we've had some very excellent applications from the Selkirk area; we've had excellent applications from all over the province. Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to giving the Member for Brandon East the list; I look forward to showing him that it's produced 380 new jobs in the province and I assure you that the businesses are either expanded businesses or new businesses.

Now the Honourable Member for Rossmere should have done just a little bit more research. The Enterprise Manitoba Program, and he's right, we have a program that says we will grant a forgivable loan up to 50 percent, up to \$30,000, on a new business in the rural area of the province of Manitoba. And we will grant 50 percent, up to \$18,000, for expansion of a business in the rural area of the province of Manitoba. And the businesses that are in existence must not be businesses that are exceeding \$500,000 a year sales, so we are helping to expand small business.

But the main part of this whole Enterprise Manitoba Program is not the small enterprise business forgivable loans, Mr. Speaker. Enterprise Manitoba is a

program that is not the provincial government, and when he says we're going around giving away the people of Manitobas' hard-earned taxes - I know the people of Manitoba pay federal taxes - but it's a federal provincial program that the federal government pays 60 percent of. The program was designed because there is in place, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, many programs where people of the province of Manitoba can request assistance from the federal government. So then, we said, but you don't really have anything to help that little man. You don't have a DREE grant that would really support this small person in rural Manitoba. So we set up an arrangement where there would be a program to assist people who apply in the province of Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, the federal government and the provincial government jointly came together and said there will be \$5 million over five years for the forgivable loan program; Mr. Speaker, \$5 million over five years. Mr. Speaker, the total program of Enterprise Manitoba is \$44 million and \$5 million is in the loan program. Now, Mr. Speaker, that means that the province of Manitoba puts up, over five years, \$2 million to help support and advance small business in rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the applications, and according . . . Right here - I'll send the member the kit after - right here in the agreement, we have to set up individual committees in three parts of Manitoba of businessmen in the area to first take a look at the loan and think of its viability, and will it be effective in that area, will it hurt other business in that area? It is then sent from there to the Research Department, to research out whether it's viable, whether there's markets, whether there's transportation, and everything, whether there are people available, can it be done. From there it goes to a committee of the federal and provincial government, Mr. Speaker, who make the final recommendation to myself, the Minister.

The application forms for every one come in that thick. We have within our department a person who has been in banking for years that we brought in to take a look at the loans, and everything is done properly to help the small businessman in the province of Manitoba. I don't have any shame in saying that we have developed a program which is part of Enterprise Manitoba, that may give those students he talks about a job some day, that may be able to produce more money in the economy of this province to help everybody, but most of all, it helps towns. There are towns in this province, Mr. Speaker, who could be dying, but we've come along and we've said, we will take a look at small business being developed in these small rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the rest of the Enterprise Development Manitoba program. Mind you, this doesn't double up on anything. There are lots of programs, there's the Industrial Development Bank and all the rest of them, and DREE and everybody who make grants, but this program doesn't pile on top of anybody. It was a program to help rural Manitoba and small businessman in rural Manitoba and, by the way, was approved by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Industrial Commercial Support, Program 1. \$5 million over five years. That is used, Mr. Speaker, for people who make applications to us, the applications are looked at and they usually are applications to have a feasibility study as to whether a product should be developed in the province; whether an expansion should go on; whether it's feasible to do it; whether there are people available. That is there for some of the larger companies that don't have it.

And if you think, Mr. Speaker, in this province, that the businesses all have enough money to go out and hire consultants on your own, you're wrong, because 80 percent of the businesses in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not inferring what you think or what you don't think, but I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the opposition thinks that, 80 percent of the businesses in this province, Mr. Speaker, are less than 50 employees, and about 60 percent of that group are under 25. They don't have the funds to go out and do some of this research that they require for expansion. So we've said in this program, we can assist on research with them to see if there's a viability.

We can take a feasibility study for whether it's a good market in Manitoba, or market in western Canada. We can do that under this program and that's what we have been doing. \$5 million over five years to do that. And that's what governments should be doing, according to the honourable member.

The honourable member - I asked him again about the technology assistance, \$16 million, over a five-year period, 60 percent paid for by the federal government. I will invite the honourable members opposite to the opening of the Winnipeg Technology Centre. That centre, Mr. Speaker, is there again for small business. And if a man can weld those two pieces together and have a good product, he might not know how to weld it, but at that Technology Centre, we're not doing research, we're going to help small business with technology. In fact, he may be able to go there and have a man lift a book off the shelf and say, this is your reference, this is how you do it. He may be able to go there and set up a small production line, as we are presently doing in Portage la Prairie.

Part of that \$16 million, Mr. Speaker, and I will invite honourable members opposite to the opening of the expansion of the Food Technology Centre in Portage la Prairie, 60 percent paid for by the federal government. The Food Technology Centre in Portage la Prairie will set up a production line on white onions, how they're bottled. Would it be feasible to put those products that are grown in Manitoba into a production line? Would it be feasible, Mr. Speaker, to come along and have somebody pick a product off the shelf at a supermarket in Manitoba, and it's made in California, and walk into the Technology Centre in Portage la Prairie and say, look, I can grow this, can you help me put it in a box so it's marketable? Can we do this in the province of Manitoba? That's what the Technology Centre in Portage la Prairie does: Manitobans helping Manitobans build their industry in the food technology; where we have the Minister of Agriculture working on added value crops, we now have a Food Technology Centre expansion going on at 60 percent expense to the federal government.

The next part of the program, Enterprise Development Centres, 5. Mr. Speaker, it was the NDP government that started the Enterprise Development Centres in the town of Dauphin. We looked at it, and we said, you know it's not a bad idea. It is not a bad idea, and I will invite honourable members to the one that opens up in Winnipeg. I'll invite honourable members to the one that opens up in Winnipeg and I'll invite honourable members to the one that opens up in Brandon. And the technology centres, the small development says we take a guy that's got an idea and we might find some space for him, and in there we'll have business development officers, we'll have a production person, and we'll have all of these people available to help. In those centres they will have a group of men who will really be small business consultant centres. That's what that does.

Industrial and Commercial Promotion will be taken care of under Enterprise Manitoba. Co-ordination and Assessment, the whole program has to be assessed. The development officers have to go out and take a look at these new businesses continually to make sure that they are doing properly and they are not getting into trouble.

Small business incentives is the next one, Mr. Speaker, and we come back to what the honourable member was speaking of. \$5 million out of \$44 million, and all of the rest of the money has been used to help develop small business in the province of Manitoba.

The honourable member has the gall to mention tourism. Again, being a new MLA, they didn't tell him what they did. Mr. Speaker, you see this graph? Right there is the number of people coming to the province. Right there. In 1970, they started out and the spending on tourism moved up to 1974; pardon me, the spending is here, the bottom, it moved up to 1974, and you know, Mr. Speaker, as they spent a little more on tourism on that point, the number of people coming to Manitoba moved up. In 1974 to 1978, the number of dollars dropped right down to \$350,000 approximately. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, what happened after that? At the same time, the number of people coming to the province dropped. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Tourists. In 1978 and 1979, we started to put more money into promotion of tourism in this province, and the number of people started to rise.

The previous government used to have an attitude, we don't want tourists. Why should we open up our province to people to come in and fish our fish out and do those things? Mr. Speaker, there is an honourable member on the other side - and I'll get it from Hansard if I have to - he said, you know, I don't know whether we want these people coming up into our province, fishing our lakes, etc.

Mr. Speaker, the number of people that come to the province is obviously directly related to the amount of money spent and the people in tourism spend a lot

of money. People coming to the province spend a lot, and we haven't scratched the surface. Nowhere in Canada or the world are there more lakes, rivers, streams, sand, than there is in the province of Manitoba, and quite frankly, they just ignored it. Talk about tourism.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say this: That a program that went through my estimates last year and was explained, a program that is right there in the contracts with the federal government, a program that's \$44 million, and \$39 million of it is spent for the benefit of research development technology, working with business sector boards and everything else, that's what it all is about, \$5 million to help businesses start up in the rural area of Manitoba: \$2 million over 5 years is what the province has put in, and these gentlemen on the other side get a green MLA to get up and make a speech on it because they haven't really told him what it's all about.

Mr. Speaker, to the Page, would you please take this to the Member for Rossmere with my compliments? And tell him that that's the Enterprise Manitoba program. I'll be very pleased to discuss it at any time during my estimates, and again I repeat, just very briefly and quickly, Mr. Speaker, it was a program designed because it does not piggyback on any other type of program that's available in this province. This is one that's working.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of participating in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, until I heard some of the remarks, as acerbate and abrasive as they were, directed by the Minister to my colleague from Rossmere.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, indeed the truth that the new Member for Rossmere is perhaps a novice to the proceedings of this House, and it may well be that he is colloquially "somewhat green" in comparison to the Minister, but I would indicate, at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that he will certainly not learn anything about the decorum or courtesies of this House from the Minister through that sort of presentation, as personal and full of invective as it was.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister stands in his place and he proudly pronounces that his government has reinstated the economic climate of this province to some sort of vigorous health. He states with some assurance and confidence that by contributing more money to the tourist sector, that somehow this will lead us to some sort of nirvana; this, in itself, implies some new, enhanced, heightened scaling to the economic heights.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that sort of trivia, that sort of approach to economic development is essentially what will always impale the members on the other side. It is that approach, that rough and ready approach that essentially let them down the garden path to CFI, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it's not a method that is conducive to the sort of growth that this province needs. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, is because it lacks any sense of social purpose.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I, too am concerned as to the well-being of people who are in the tourist-related industries. Certainly I am concerned about them. They deserve the support of this government. But Mr. Speaker, there are other ways, and perhaps better ways, of stimulating the Manitoba economy. And Mr. Speaker, in doing so, we can address ourselves to prevailing social problems. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite and the Minister of Housing and Economic Development knows that in this city alone, there are thousands of units of inner-city housing in the core of Winnipeg that need immediate attention.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member he keep his remarks to the subject matter at hand.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about direct loans and reasonable interest rates to business, and that is exactly what I am going to be addressing my remarks to. That is precisely what I will be addressing myself to, the thrust of this resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that, rather than as the Minister is suggesting, that money be invested in some sort of direct subsidy fashion to the tourist

industry bringing in necessary dollars, but not necessarily having a social purpose, that we would better turn our attention and our heads to ways in which we can invest money in economic development that will spin off social benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in doing so, I am suggesting that one of the ways we could do that is looking at two problems we have in Manitoba today. Two prevailing social problems. One of them has economic implications. The very poor state, the sad state of the construction trades industry in the province and particularly in the city of Winnipeg, and also the associated problem we are having with respect to housing. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago the Honourable Leader of the Opposition addressed my honourable friends' attention to recent CMHC statistics which indicated that we are in a critical decline in the new housing trades industry in this particular city. We are facing a situation where the number of building permits in new housing has declined to all-time lows, I think within this decade, but certainly within the past five and six years.

Mr. Speaker, correlative to this and corollary, we find ourselves dealing with an unemployment rate in the construction trades industry in this particular province that has reached astonishing rates. Referring to statistics provided to us by the Winnipeg Construction Association, Mr. Speaker - certainly I don't think a partisan socialistically-inclined organization - we find that in 1977, just to use some basic statistics, in March of 1977, and that was the last year in which the former government's economic development policies pertained in this province, we had unemployment rates in the construction industry of some 14.2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in 1978, under the new improved economic development strategy mapped out for us by members opposite, we had a rate, a comparable rate, of some 28.8 percent. We had a doubling of the unemployment rate in just one short year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, the Honourable Minister outdid himself. He managed to drive up the previous high of 28.8 to 34.1.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have listened very closely to the words of the honourable member and I wish he would return to the subject matter of the resolution before us.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I heed you admonition, but I advise you that I am working towards it because, Mr. Speaker, what these figures prove is that there is need for government intervention . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he deal with the subject matter at hand or else I will have to rule him out of order.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order in terms of the content of what the speakers are talking on. We have just finished hearing the Minister talk for 20 minutes about all the other parts of Enterprise Manitoba Program, not dealing at all with the portion which is the giveaways to private industry. He was talking about agreements with Tourism, he was talking about all kinds of other things and he didn't deal with the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. If the honourable member wanted to raise a point of order he should have raised it at that particular time.

The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Whereas sufficient time has now passed since the commencement of the Progressive Conservative Government Program, which is wrong, it is Federal-Provincial, known as Enterprise Manitoba, that is what I spoke of, Enterprise Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Has the Honourable Minister got a point of order?

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting to you and to members opposite is that if Enterprise Manitoba and the provincial government could take the initiative in directing federal funds in this regard and the provincial funds, if Enterprise Manitoba could take on a more constructive social posture, one that recognized and realized that there were ways of developing the Manitoba economy that would also have socially redeemable purposes, and I have suggested --(Interjection)-- The Minister opposite says we have a program and I presume he means the Critical Home Repair Program, Mr. Speaker. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I hope all members would give to the honourable member the courtesy of allowing him to make his remarks.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, members on his side would prefer that moneys be invested in the Manitoba economy in such a way that there would be socially redeemable spinoffs and benefits . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Again, I must ask members to allow the Member for Wellington the courtesy of the floor.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, we are suggesting that there are initiatives in the housing area that could now be taken that would put these thousands of Winnipeg and Manitoba construction labourers to work. These tradespeople, Mr. Speaker, needn't have to go to Alberta, Saskatchewan, and places in the United States in order to obtain employment. There should be a place in the Manitoba economic climate for these sorts of people.

Mr. Speaker, it is of some concern, I think, to all members of this House that we while we are failing to address ourselves to problems that pertain, problems that are not going away, problems that do indeed have very distinct ramifications for the future of Winnipeg and Manitoba, we are on the other hand losing the capacity to address ourselves to them in the future, namely the workers, the working people, the skilled accomplished tradespeople that have the competence and the capabilities to do the job that has to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that as a result, as I have said, of the low activity, the absolutely unprecedented low activity in the new building area, both housing and commercial, that there is some need for the government to take some direct interventive approach in order to develop and incentive the building trades growth and the participation of working people in that sector of the economy.

We're suggesting that Enterprise Manitoba, as it is presently constituted, is incapable of doing that; we're suggesting that there are no other initiatives that seem to have been presented, or that have been presented by the members opposite, in order to address the government's attention to that problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're asking the government - and I think my honourable friend from Rossmere has simply made a good point. He asked that some assurance be given that funds will be made available to locally-owned business, in order to make them more viable - and that, of course, includes building contractors and such - and that emphasis be given to this sort of economic promotion.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to be concerned about the performance of members opposite and the Honourable Minister with respect to economic development.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member opposite has risen in his place and he's indicated whenever members on this side castigate or chastize the government for lack of creative policy in the economic development area, he has indicated that the manufacturing sector is in a state of seemingly unparalleled boom.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that the manufacturing sector is anywhere near an all-time low and we all know that it is, and always has been, a fairly vigorous part of the Manitoba economic climate. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is

that if that sector is at all enjoying any stability in growth, it's largely because of the unprecedented state of the Canadian dollar. It has very little to do with the economic development policies of members opposite. --(Interjection)-- I often wonder whether the Minister is supporting a higher interest rate or a lower interest rate, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure at times when he contemplates the sorry state of economic development and his one sole promise in the manufacturing sector, one must wonder what his position is on the question of interest rates. --(Interjection)--

But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is that an economy such as Manitoba's is indeed predicated on some mixed basis. It's my thesis - and I'm not an expert, Mr. Speaker, I'd be the first to acknowledge it - it's my thesis and it's always been my belief that Manitoba's economy is dependent upon strong interventive action of the part of the public sector. I would encourage members opposite to consider programming that will provide that sort of milieu, that sort of environment for future development of the Manitoba economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of directing loans to the business sector, as the Minister has indicated, the tourist sector, I would suggest that perhaps he should contemplate directing loans to consumers. Perhaps he can concern himself about unreasonably unconscionably high interest rates and in doing so he can decide to allow the consumer to determine what his or her priorities will be. And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that with respect to the inner city of Winnipeg, if the consumer facing unparalleled high interest rates today is given that sort of discretion, if subsidized loan rates are provided to consumers, I'll tell you that their first and foremost priority will be the rehabilitation of their communities and neighbourhoods. Mr. Speaker, they will take that money and they will invest it in housing. What I am suggesting to members opposite, is that it is time that they provide the financial wherewithal in order that people can exercise that sort of discretion.

Mr. Speaker, the people I represent don't care if more tourists from Florida or California or New York come to the Convention Centre and the Holiday Inn. I wish they did. I wish they were people who owned small businesses. I wish they were people, Mr. Speaker, who could participate and share in that sort of growth and perhaps indirectly it could be argued that they do. But, Mr. Speaker, what they really need and what they really want, is they want a way simply to maintain the dignity of their lives. They want a way to assure in their retirement the dignity of a home, a safe street, a clean environment. They're more concerned about the quality and the amenity of their district. And, Mr. Speaker, is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything that any member opposite would say to rebut that proposition?

It seems to me that the very purpose of government is to provide ways and means in order to afford our people ways in order to assist themselves to cope with the exigencies and difficulties of life. And, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I would suggest that money such as is being invested now in programs such as Enterprise Manitoba would better often be spent in a manner that was consistent with personal needs and personal requirements. We would better provide the money to people, to taxpayers, to homeowners, in order that they can make the consumption decisions that are so fundamental to the economic theory of members opposite. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, having listened for the past three years to members opposite languish and lamenting about the need to provide and reinstate more economic independence on the part of individuals. They want to free people in order that they can participate supposedly, hypothetically more personally, in a more individual way in the economy of Manitoba. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there'd be no better way than to provide subsidized loan funds to individual citizens in order that they could afford to rehabilitate and renew their own housing and their own neighbourhoods.

Mr. Speaker, members on this side took some initiative when we were on the other side. We put in place, instituted a Critical Home Repair Program. Granted it was, when we left office, only in its initial stages; it only pertained in its provisions, its subsidy provisions and grant provisions to pensioners and to indigent people. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure in these pressing times faced with the high unemployment statistics and figures that now pertain in Manitoba, faced with the housing crisis in the inner city of Winnipeg, that we would provide the money.

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

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I know you've admonished the Member for Wellington and he has a speech on housing and cares of his constituents that he wants to get off his chest, but I suggest there are other ways he could do it. He has his grievance and whatnot to use and he's used the time of the committee on this particular resolution to talk about something that has absolutely nothing to do with the resolution whatsoever.

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

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, but that member isn't listening very carefully. He may think that all members of this House should be . . .
--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 o'clock. When this subject next comes up, the honourable member will have one minute left.