



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 91B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 20 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 20 June, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - JOBS FUND

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are considering the Estimates on the Jobs Fund. We are now on Item No. 1.(b).

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had raised a question with the First Minister at 4:30 as to the probable allocation of the \$63 million remaining in non-budgetary capital authority. Perhaps the First Minister would have the answer to that question now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there have been no allocations yet from that \$63 million. There have been no announcements pertaining to that portion.

MR. B. RANSOM: When does the First Minister expect that some allocation will be made of that amount of money? My understanding is it will have to be identified in the Capital Loan Authority for the specific purpose that the Minister intends to use the money.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is the last major portion that has not been expended or committed and we are anxious to complete the allocation of the full \$200 million. I would think we would be in a position to have made its determination and made announcements pertaining to same July 15th to July 31st pretty well in total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one particular aspect of the Jobs Fund or, more specifically, how this Jobs Fund is not accomplishing what the government has said it's going to accomplish; and what it does accomplish, it's doing so by devious and deceptive ways.

It is truly a "fraud" fund, as we have described it on this side of the House, and I will draw to the First Minister's attention one department for which I have some familiarity, that being the Highways and Transportation Department, where the construction budget has been dropped, reduced by a full \$10 million this year. By his Minister's own admission, to maintain the same program as last year, an additional 10 percent would have been required.

So, to keep a status quo in terms of road construction, this government would have to have funded construction and upgrading of provincial trunk highways, provincial roads and related projects by \$110 million this year. Instead, we see less than \$90 million being dedicated.

It's not as if the government did not have access to the revenues to undertake this kind of construction, because the revenues directly related to the Department of Highways are in excess of \$171 million. That's from gasoline and diesel taxation, propane taxation, drivers' licence fees and registration fees. Their total expenditure on capital assets with the Minister of Finance's new definition of maintenance rolled in, still only come to some \$150 million. There is a full \$20 million of revenues to the Department of Highways that are not being spent in this department, as it should be, for construction of highways and roads in this province. So that the Department of Highways and Transportation has donated a full 10 percent of the \$200-million Jobs Fund - some \$20 million in revenues to the Department of Highways have been siphoned off by this government into the "fraud" fund - that's a full 10 percent. And in doing so, they are reducing the amount of programming and construction that will be undertaken by various private sector contractors this summer in the Province of Manitoba, and they have directly transferred layoffs to that industry by cutting back the highway construction budget. They have so little new work to go on this summer that contracts have only recently been started to be tendered.

So what we have here is a transfer of \$20 million out of the Department of Highways into the "fraud" fund. No new jobs, no new direction - just a simple reduction in the Department of Highways in a transfer to the "fraud" fund. The only catch is, I don't think they're going to undertake any road construction work out of the "fraud" fund. So that means the highway construction industry is going to be a net loser; it's going to be down in jobs this summer; there will be fewer people working in the private sector in the heavy construction industry.

So that, in fact, this transfer to the "fraud" fund has, in effect, caused unemployment in one private sector segment of the provincial economy. And the First Minister sits and wrings his hands, wondering why we are very upset with the kind of deception you're trying to pull on the people of Manitoba by the creation of this phony \$200 million Jobs Fund, when, in fact, you've done nothing but take it from one pocket, put it in another, in the majority, and in doing so a lot of that normal job creation that goes on within such line departments as Highways and Natural Resources is no longer going on, not being done. You are transferring unemployment to the private sector, to that segment of the private sector with this "fraud" fund. And if you think you're proud of yourself by doing that, talk to the heavy construction industry as your Minister has, and get the message directly from them and find out how little work there is for them to do, how much reduced the highway contracting budget is for this summer, and find out how many people haven't been hired on for their normal summer work in the heavy construction industry. You will find that the numbers vary in the hundreds, and that is a direct cause and

a direct addition to the unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. That's why your April to May figure did not take their normal decline because your Department of Highways, in some part, has contributed that through lack of work in the private sector industry.

That's why we say the \$200 million Jobs Fund is truly a "fraud" fund. It's fraudulent in the amount of money it's got. There is not new money and it's fraudulent by the fact that it is transferring unemployment to one segment of the heavy construction industry in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me the member should maybe spend a little less time talking and a little more time reading, and then he wouldn't come up with such nonsense. He talks about unemployment statistics. He doesn't state, as the fact is, that in the last year 12 percent of the increase in the Canadian labour force has occurred right here in Manitoba. We haven't had that kind of a figure in many years - certainly not under the Tory years. People were moving out of here. Those were the years when we had decreases in population; we had that. When he talks about the unemployment, it is true there are 52,000 unemployed and it is true that we're not doing enough. Nobody on this side suggests that we're doing enough, but let us look at what is happening in the rest of the country, because we are a part of this country.

We have an increase, year over year, of 5,000 people employed in this province, while the country as a whole has a decrease in people employed, and there he is suggesting that somehow we're not doing something. That is just the biggest pile of nonsense. Then he starts talking about numbers. He starts talking about numbers in terms of the use of gasoline taxes as though that tax has to go specifically in some kind of a trust-fund way to build highways. Well, if we were going to use that logic, then why don't we split it up one step further and say, well, how much of that gasoline tax is raised in the City of Winnipeg? If 60 percent of it is raised in the City of Winnipeg, then surely 60 percent of the road building would be in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. D. ORCHARD: City people don't use country roads?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, if you start itemizing out taxes in that way, you get to some ludicrous conclusions. That would be one of them, but that would be no more ludicrous than what the member suggests. We could take each tax and say, well, this tax has to be spent on that particular item as they do, for instance, in some states in the United States, where you wind up being tax poor in many areas and spending an awful lot of money on other areas because you have taxes put on specific items.

The members keep playing games with the people of Manitoba. The Member for St. Norbert is better at it than the Member for Pembina, because he doesn't come across quite as slick and underhanded. It's clearer, but he still stands up and talks about the Health and Education levy which, I'm sure, he will raise again tonight. The Member for Pembina did this afternoon.

They keep saying basically the same thing, "Oh, we don't like the tax."

I asked them, what do you want in its place? Which \$80 million worth of services or \$100 million worth of services do you want to eliminate? You're telling us that the hospitals are having it pretty tough; you're telling us that the municipalities are having it pretty tough; you're telling us that the school divisions are having it tough; you're screaming about Natural Resources not spending enough money; you're crying about Highways; you're crying about this, that and the other thing; and yet you're saying you don't want the tax. That's fine, but then you have to tell us where else you want to get the money. It's simply — (Interjection) — I think I hear an echo. But here we have these people who would be government who don't have the guts to say what they would do.

We could point to other provinces and say, yes, in Ontario if you're a married individual you pay \$648 per year for Medicare premiums. That's how we raise taxes in Ontario. Then we don't have to worry about the Health and Education levy, or we could go to Alberta and get a \$20 per person per day sick tax on top of their Medicare premium, of course, for people who have to go to hospitals.

You know, they don't like their tax. I'm sure the Government of Alberta didn't like imposing their tax. We didn't like imposing our tax. We think their tax is worse than our tax. I'm sure they think our tax is worse than their tax. The fact of the matter is though that we had to raise it somewhere. We were prepared to stand up and say, where?

Now the members opposite are continuously harassing us about our taxes. I would like to have them stand up sometime and say exactly what it is that they would do. But, you know, they talk about a "fraud" fund when they will have to vote for or against \$165 million of the \$200 million in new funding this year. They will have to vote for or against the \$165 million. That is up to them; they can vote for or against but if they vote against, and if the House were to vote against it, then that would be \$165 million less in employment creation in this province. But, in fact, it would be far more than \$165 million less, because although they say that we're not spending new money - the Member for Pembina has just referred to, which department was it, Highways? The Member of Turtle Mountain was referring to Natural Resources a little while back - what they're saying is there's no new money, but we got other sectors in this society to come up with \$80 million by our spending \$131 million. If they are correct, then we have managed to bring 80 million new dollars into this economy that we would otherwise not have brought in. If we would have just left our spending the way it was that \$80 million wouldn't have come in, because these people came in on the basis that they were getting us to do something that we would otherwise not do. Why would they spend \$80 million getting us to do something that we were going to do in the first place?

But that's the shallowness of the arguments of the people opposite. They haven't been able to get their act together. They're clawing desperately at renaming the fund when there are thousands of people out there who are collecting paychecks, real cheques, real money as a result of that fund. There are many projects that are going ahead that would not otherwise have gone ahead.

Let me give you one example - the fire college in Brandon. It was an election promise in 1977 by the Schreyer New Democrats. They said if we are re-elected, we will build it. The Tories kept it until 1981 and said if we are re-elected we will build it. Now we could have waited until three or four years down the line and said the same thing. There was no absolute necessity that impelled us to build it this year. We think it's a good idea, but it is being built this year and to suggest that somehow that is money we would otherwise have spent anyway is simply not a matter of factual correctness.

We can go through these projects, project-by-project, and show you how we did not have to proceed this year, or if we were going to proceed, we could have proceeded at a slower rate. We clearly indicated right from the start that some of the funding was coming out of departments in order that we could put it all in one nice pot where you had a central group being able to administer it and have a Minister responsible for it, and rather than having people who are looking for funding looking at nine different departments, they could come to one place. That's why the construction industry is telling us that they're happy with the Jobs Fund. They don't call it some silly name, they call it the Jobs fund. When the members opposite quote from the documents of the construction association - I noticed the other day the Member for Turtle Mountain quoted a statement in one of the documents that indicated it was the provincial government that had requested them to refer to Jobs Fund items as Jobs Fund items, but he didn't refer to the paragraph that was really vital in that document.

The document said things were well in terms of what had happened last year. They were predicting a 47 percent increase in construction activity. That's not something the opposition wants to talk about. All they want to talk about is doom and gloom. All they want to talk about is those areas where we have cut back and, yes, there are areas where we are not going to be spending as much money as last year but overall in terms of job creation, we will be spending double what we spent last year and we will be putting many thousands of Manitobans to work with that money. Notwithstanding all the predictions for terribly expensive jobs, we will find at the end what the cost was, and I think some of the pessimists on the other side are going to find that they were pretty wrong and they will be very embarrassed when next we meet in February or March of next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he has any of the information that I asked him about this afternoon that he took as notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is the piece of information the member was requesting or not because I did indicate prior to 4:30, I'm not sure that the member was present at the time.

Insofar as the City of Winnipeg is concerned in the North Portage development, the estimate from

construction industry sources is that insofar as the \$20 million contributed by the province, some 16,700 work weeks would be created. That's a tentative early figure that, of course, may vary upwards or downwards depending on the type of project that is eventually arrived at by the three levels of government as a result of the task force that's presently under way and to bring in its report to all three levels of government, but the best - and this is a very approximate estimate that we can provide the honourable member - is 16,700 work weeks or \$20 million based upon the projections by the construction industry itself.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we have listened for days and weeks and months to the government expounding the virtues of the Jobs Fund. We have heard the Minister of Finance in one of the two introductory statements to this item indicate that the Jobs Fund has created some 5,400-and-some jobs. Yet we have, Mr. Chairman, the latest unemployment statistics that indicate that Manitoba . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: A clarification anyway. I just want to make it very clear the number I used, this 5,400 or something like that, that was jobs that will be required for the projects that we have announced. That doesn't mean that those people are already working, but that \$131 million would provide that number of the one-year jobs.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think we clarified that earlier on this afternoon when the First Minister indicated that the commitment to spend \$131 million would produce an estimated 5,400-and-some jobs.

Mr. Chairman, we have the latest unemployment statistics which show that of all the provinces Manitoba is tied with the highest seasonally adjusted unemployment increase in the month of May, 1983, with Prince Edward Island at .7 plus increase in the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, whereas in the whole of Canada the seasonally adjusted rate was reduced by .1 percent. Mr. Chairman, the number of unemployed remain constant at 52,000 in the month of May, 1983, the same number as were unemployed in the month of April, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, we know that in the month of April the labour force grows significantly with large numbers of students coming onto the job market. That happens not only in Manitoba, it happens in every other province as well, Mr. Chairman. Yet in every other province the record is better. We have gone back to at least 1977, comparing May to April; in every one of the months the number of unemployed has reduced from April to May in every one of those years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, supposedly some \$131 million has been committed during this period of time. The Careerstart Program has come into existence during that time. We have in the month of May, 1983, 20 percent unemployment among males, 15 to 24 years of age, Mr. Chairman, despite a Careerstart Program which

supposedly is employing some 6,000 people. While it may be true that the government is spending money in the area of job creation, we would certainly question and continue to question where that money came from.

Mr. Chairman, could the First Minister indicate why the seasonally adjusted rate in Manitoba has the highest rate of increase with Prince Edward Island? Why have the number of unemployed remained constant at 52,000 from April to May?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member obviously is indulging some very selective reading of the statistics, and I would like to place on record very clear, very precise figures insofar as the unemployment situation is in the Province of Manitoba and what our experience has been this past while.

Between the preceding two months - and the member is dealing with the month of May only and has in his observations singled out one particular month and making some comments pertaining to that month - February to April of 1983, unemployment decreased by 3.7 percent or some 2,000 unemployed in Manitoba, the largest decline of any province in Canada. That, I think, is a figure that we can feel some justifiable pride that, insofar as those two months were concerned, the number of unemployed in the Province of Manitoba decreased by a larger number than any other province in the whole of Canada, bear no exception.

No. 2, the number of Manitobans unemployed remained, it's true, virtually unchanged since last month, because of an abnormally large increase in the number of job seekers. We have discussed earlier the fact that many in earlier years had gone to British Columbia, Alberta and to other parts of Canada and are returning to this province. Employment in Manitoba actually increased by some 16,000, April to May, in one month. I find that indeed quite amazing that in one single month employment in Manitoba increased by 16,000. I wonder if the honourable member was aware of that vital and important figure. He's indicating negatively that he was not conscious of that. Employment, perhaps due in part - and I only say probably due not in a major way but I think in an important way - to the development of the Jobs Fund and the beginnings of the Jobs Fund and not just in reference to the direct jobs created, but in respect to the spinoff of activity generated in the Province of Manitoba by way of dollars pumped into the economy by way of the Jobs Fund as a result of an activist approach insofar as the operation of government.

In addition, the province's labour force also increased by 16,000 due primarily to an unusually large jump in participation rates, perhaps due to discouraged workers returning to the labour force as economic conditions appear to be improving. The honourable member might like to make note of that, so that we would have reference of that important information for further comment at a given opportunity.

In addition, last month's 16,000 labour force increase in Manitoba, April-May, is the largest such increase since 1973, if the honourable member would make a note of that, because that is important information for the honourable member to keep in mind. And as you

note, did it happen in 1977, '78, '79, '80 or '81, when indeed there was prosperity all around us, when indeed the world economy was doing much better despite the fact there was national and international economic growth in the main. In contrast to 1982 and '83, the Manitoba economy was in a Conservative swamp, Mr. Chairman.

Last month, 16,000 employment increase, by contrast has only been exceeded in six April-May periods since 1966, and during the past year, May 1982 to May of 1983, employment in Manitoba has increased by 1.1 percent, 9,000 employed, compared with a 0.1 percent decrease in national employment during the same period.

Mr. Chairman, we have been swimming against the tide. There's no question that the waters are rough insofar as all in Manitoba during these difficult times. They are difficult for the unemployed in Manitoba, they are difficult for the unemployed in British Columbia and Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. There is no question that there is vast economic and human waste in this land, and that vast economic and human waste is a result of tight money, high interest rate, restrictive Conservative monetary policies that have dominated the economic thinking of too many political leaders in this country and elsewhere.

MR. H. ENNS: That's why it's so much better in France.

A MEMBER: Hit them again, Howard.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Reference is made to France, Mr. Chairman, and I only wish that President Mitterrand of France had not stood all alone at the last conference at Williamsburg; all alone, surrounded by those that worship at the shrine of Conservative economic theories. Let's talk about France and let's talk about the kind of leadership that was provided by President Mitterrand when he said there is need for a change insofar as the economic policies and approaches of governments of the western world.

I make no apology to honourable members across the way for Mitterrand because I can look, Mr. Chairman, at the sad record of Reagan, of Thatcher, of Trudeau and other conservative thinkers insofar as the Western World economy is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, the increase has not been one that we feel happy about, the increase has been but very small - 1.1 percent. There are 52,000 Manitobans out there that are presently suffering from the human and economic waste of unemployment. We recognize that and we care about the lot of those that are included in those numbers.

But the point, Mr. Chairman, is that we have been swimming against the tide, because while there has been that slight increase in Manitoba, there has been a decrease at the national level. So, Mr. Chairman, what we ought to be discussing tonight are the kinds of projects that have been initiated by this government, projects of a lasting nature, projects that are contributing to the assets of Manitoba, contributing to the future investment of Manitobans, assisting insofar as the future development of our present generation and future generations of Manitobans, and I only mentioned some of the projects so that they be again

clearly placed on record because I would like honourable members to tell us which of these projects they would scrap, which of these projects they disagree with.

I note, Mr. Chairman, they have been very very careful not to take issue with any of the actual projects that have been announced by this government in respect to their Jobs Fund projects, and I wonder what the reason for that is. I wonder why we're not dealing with the projects that have been announced. Why have we not been debating whether the monies that we have announced for various projects have been wisely allocated or not? Why have we not heard accusations that we should not have made an announcement, for example, pertaining to the Earth Sciences Building that was made last week? I've been expecting some debate as to whether that project was wise spending or not on the part of honourable members across the way.

Have we heard comments in regard to the monies spent on southern Sewer and Water Program? Have we heard comments in respect to the University of Winnipeg Field House? We know how they dragged their feet. They dragged their feet, and did they ever drag their feet on that Winnipeg Field House, Mr. Chairman.

Have we heard anything from the honourable members across the way about the Cranberry-Portage School addition? Have we heard about the Crane River School addition? Have we heard from the honourable member for Portage la Prairie about the Portage Food Development Centre, some approximately half a million dollars? Is the Honourable Member for Portage opposed to that? Is he opposed to that? I would be interested in knowing during this debate. Are honourable members opposed to the announcements that were made by the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Minister of Education pertaining to the auto-diesel auto-shop expansion at the the Red River Community College? Is there opposition across the way to those announcements? There may very well be.

Selkirk Mental Health Centre renovations - well, I don't know, probably because that's in the Premier's constituency there may be some sphere of opposition across the way in that regard.

Are honourable members opposed to nursing station upgrading? What are the comments?

Are members opposed to the forest nursery expansion program that the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources announced just last week in The Pas, a well-developed program of reforestation in regard to tree nurseries in The Pas area, thinking in terms of future generations of Manitobans? What are the comments of honourable members in regard to forestry development in the future insofar as Manitobans as concerned?

A MEMBER: You can't see the forest for the trees.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The dike upgrading announced by the Minister of Natural Resources, are there no comments? The Northern Capital Program that the Minister of Northern Affairs has been very very much involved in respect to.

There were a few nit-picking kind of questions about the Western Aviation Museum earlier this afternoon.

Are members for that, or are they against that? Or are they sitting on the fence? I know that honourable members across the way are prone to sit on the fence, but we would be interested in knowing where honourable members stand on the Western Aviation Museum.

A MEMBER: Do you think it'll fly?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The urban redevelopment, Portage North. I am proud of the leadership that has been demonstrated by the Minister of Urban Affairs, working in concert with the City of Winnipeg and with the Federal Government to revitalize the area north of Portage; trying with great difficulty to bring all parties together in a true co-operative spirit of three levels of government working together.

You know, honourable members didn't know what co-operative federalism was. Co-Operative federalism wasn't in their dictionary, Mr. Chairman. It was dog-eat-dog, and survival of the fittest.

Mr. Chairman, you would not believe this, but there were Ministers that in fact, were not even talking to Federal Ministers when we assumed office in November 1981.

Mr. Chairman, Interlake Training Facility. The Minister responsible for Agriculture could speak to that.

The City of Winnipeg road upgrading. Let's talk about the heavy construction industry, a major commitment in regard to City of Winnipeg road construction.

Let's talk about the Homes in Manitoba Program. Did I hear correctly when the Home Builders Association of Manitoba describes this as the best housing program in the history of the Province of Manitoba - in Canada - I apologize. The reference by the House Builders Association of Manitoba was the best program in Canada, not in Manitoba. Why have we not heard such comments from honourable members across the way?

What about the Brandon Fire Hall, Fire Training Centre? A project close to \$2 million; a program geared towards training those that are engaged in firefighting activity; a project which will draw to the City of Brandon firefighters from all over the Province of Manitoba; a project that will leave in the City of Brandon a great deal of economic wealth within the business community; a program that will inject economic life into the Brandon area. Now, I know that honourable members across the way supported the Brandon Fire College because they announced it. I think they announced it not once, but twice or three times. We've announced it once and we're proceeding with it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I could carry on to talk; I would like to carry on — (Interjection) — I don't want to bore honourable members across the way with this data. The interesting information the Minister of Labour provided us earlier today when some 370 or 380 permanent jobs were created. I was surprised because I want to tell you that I had my reservations about that program. I had my reservations. I had some arguments with the Minister of Labour pertaining to that program. I was wrong. Permanent jobs have been created in that program. Careerstart, NEED. Well, Mr. Chairman, I listen to logic, and my Minister of Labour is a very logical person.

Forestry renewal, mosquito abatement surveillance, and the innovative program by the Minister responsible

for Environment, \$374,000; 1,400 work weeks. Honourable members, the Minister of Environment will be delighted to speak for 40 minutes if you so desire, describing the detail of that program.

Forestry nurseries - and the Minister of Natural Resources is having difficulty containing himself in his seat from seizing the opportunity to discuss the initiatives that he has undertaken pertaining to forestry nurseries.

Mr. Chairman, what do honourable members ask across the way? Do they ask for the same kind of restrictive cutbacks that have been taking place in other parts of the country? Are they asking, indeed, that there be no money spent on job creation funding? Are they asking for a program of withdrawal? Are they requesting a program of mindless restraint that generates and creates ever more unemployed in our midst, creating even more economic and social and economic waste in our society?

Mr. Chairman, I read an interesting article in Saturday's Free Press, and that article dealt with the first socialist Pope. I think honourable members had an opportunity to read that article on Saturday's "Focus" page. That present Pope talked about the dignity of work, the dignity of labour, that the first and foremost responsibility of any state was to insure that humankind be given the opportunity to contribute to society; that humankind be given the opportunity to construct and to build and to develop. When His Eminence dealt with the indignity of unemployment, and the moral and social wrong that occurs from the present economic system. I noted that the Pope, I think very accurately categorized the two great isms of this world, unbridled mindless capitalism, and totalitarian state communism as really leading us very much in the same direction, along the same path, the path towards the indignity of men and women in our society.

So I ask honourable members to look at the complete picture, the total picture. I ask honourable members to look at the individual and the individual's potential and the need for us to liberate the individual so that individual can contribute the fullest to one's society. I ask honourable members for a few moments to indeed reflect and to realize that there are priorities that we must commit ourselves to.

I'm not saying that we have the answers. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we are not doing all that good a job, because we're working against very tremendous odds. We are fighting worldwide odds. We're swimming against the tide. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Chairman, but at least we're swimming. We refuse to drown. We will continue our efforts to swim against the tide to improve the provincial community.

MR. B. RANSOM: Watching the First Minister's performance leads me to a better understanding of why this government stands in the polls where it does today, because what we have seen from the First Minister is really - his presentation parallels the entire Jobs Fund in that there really isn't very much in it that's new. We have heard it all before.

That's the same way with the Jobs Fund. That's the same way with the projects. We haven't belittled the projects that the government is undertaking. We don't say that there is anything wrong with putting an addition

on the Red River Community College, but they have been making additions to community colleges for years. That's been part of the ongoing expansion program.

MR. H. ENNS: We built it. We built the college.

MR. B. RANSOM: We built the thing. We put additions on to the community college in Brandon.

MR. H. ENNS: Along with every other college in this province.

MR. B. RANSOM: That's nothing new. Money has been taken from the Department of Highways and put into other projects. Not necessarily anything wrong with the other projects, Mr. Chairman, but where the money came from on the one hand, there now has been unemployment created. There are now assets that are not created, because money has been taken from the Department of Highways or from the Department of Education or from the Department of Natural Resources. Assets are not being created there. They're being created somewhere else.

That's why the fundamental question really hinges around how much of a thrust this is. How much new money is involved? Because if it's simply redirecting or putting through a new channel, it doesn't make much difference. One has to begin to wonder if this program isn't failing when one looks at the unemployment situation that there is today. How does one liberate the individual person when you have burdensome taxation in the province, unprecedented deficits and huge unprecedented levels of unemployment at the same time? Surely the First Minister has to become concerned about that.

When he proudly stood here a few minutes ago and told us about the increase of the numbers of employed from April to May being up 16,000, we would expect that, Mr. Chairman. We would expect that, because that's been going on for some period of time. In 1978, between those two months, it went up 12,000. In 1979, it went up 17,000. In 1980, it went up 15,000. In 1981, it went up 17,000. Then it dropped last year under this government to 10,000. So that's not new, Mr. Chairman. That is simply the pattern that has been going on. What isn't new is that the numbers of unemployed people have not declined, and that should be starting to cause the members opposite some real concern.

Does it not cause them concern as well, Mr. Chairman, when we have a situation in the construction industry, for instance, where in May this year the numbers of people employed in the construction industry are only 16,000? Last year, it was 21,000; the year before that, 24; the year before that, 24; the year before that, 28. Where is the fast tracking that Mr. Greasley talks about and that the government talks about?

There is a problem out there, Mr. Chairman. These basic industries are not doing very well. The number of people employed in manufacturing is down 10,000 over what it was two years ago, a very slight increase from last year. Perhaps that's an indication of things turning up, but that really isn't in the area that the government is making a thrust.

Don't forget, Mr. Chairman, this entire thrust of the government is based on tax dollars. These are tax

dollars. Make no mistake. They are either being borrowed in the short run or being taxed from people, but in the long run people are going to have to be taxed. Those same people that the First Minister wants to liberate are going to have to be taxed to pay for this.

What the province really needs is some kind of economic strategy, some kind of investment climate that will see some real development taking place. It's fine to talk about these projects and about adding capital assets to the base of the province. That's fine, Mr. Chairman, but that alone is not going to be enough. If one looks at the figures, one has to become concerned about where the increases are taking place in employment in this province.

From April to May in public administration, it's up 5,000. Well, public administration has to be directly employed at the expense of taxpayers. The other significant increase which hasn't occurred from April to May of this year but has occurred, say, over the last two years is in the service industry which has risen, say, in May of '81 from 134,000 to May of '83 to 149,000. That's 15,000 more people employed in the service industry. Well, that's fine for the people that are employed in the service industry, but you don't make a living doing each other's washing.

Somewhere there has to be the basic wealth created that allows us to purchase services. I don't see that when I look at the statistics. Surely, those are the kinds of things that the government has got to be concerned about.

I know they like to have a little fun when the First Minister stands up and somebody gets him plugged in and he really gets the troops going and he's pounding the desk and so on, but what's really going to stand as a monument to this government is what the record is going to look like at the end of this year and at the end of next year. We'll see just how well this Jobs Fund is going to do.

I would predict, Mr. Chairman, that it is not going to make much of an impact, because there is not very much that's new. It has been going on before. Well, he can say that it's Jobs Fund, he can ask the Construction Association to identify the Jobs Fund projects, as they have done. There they are listed; Interlake Training Facility, (J.F.). I guess the people in the construction industry are supposed to applaud and say, good for the government, they have taken money and they've fast-tracked these projects and everything, but the figures speak for themselves.

That is where this government is really going to be judged, on the figures, on the numbers of people that are employed, on the kind of costs that are incurred in creating these jobs and as it compares to the promises that the government made. Because this government made some pretty far-reaching promises, Mr. Chairman, some pretty far-reaching promises to the citizens of Manitoba.

We're going to have an opportunity, all the citizens of this province, are going to have an opportunity to judge that record within the next two or three years and then we will know how well the Minister's Jobs Fund has done. But for my part, Mr. Chairman, I regard this Jobs Fund as largely a manipulation of funds, a manipulation of projects. Some projects that are good, no doubt, but nevertheless largely a rehash of things

that have been there before and I simply don't expect it to have a major impact.

As far as we're concerned, we're prepared to pass the item, Mr. Chairman, and let the government get on with it. We were prepared five or six weeks ago to pass The Jobs Fund Act and let the government get on with that, but it sat on the Order Paper for five or six weeks since. Maybe now we'll get it cleared off and we'll see if the government can create a little action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass.

Resolution 145: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum . . .

The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest while former Ministers of Natural Resources have vilified our efforts in respect to the Jobs Fund, and they've drawn passing reference to the variation in funding within the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Chairman, they highlighted the fact that the capital funding provided for in my department, as shown in the Estimates Book, was \$11,386,100 as against the year ending March 31, 1983, at \$17,943,000.00. They made much of that, Mr. Chairman. What they did not recall in debate was what I indicated during the course of my Estimates that the actual spending for that year approximated \$12 million to \$13 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about the Jobs Fund - or is he estimating his department?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm talking about the arguments addressed to the appropriation of monies in the Jobs Fund in respect to the Department of Natural Resources and the comments that were made across the Chamber in respect to those items.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that in the Department of Natural Resources Estimates, as I pointed out, in addition to the capital funding that's indicated there, monies were appropriated and voted under this Jobs Fund. The Premier has quite rightly highlighted the fact that discretionary spending on the part of our government, a significant amount of money is being invested not in routine matters but in matters that have a basic need in our province for fundamental infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, in respect to forestry, as is pointed out in the remarks already made by the Premier, we have an industry - forestry - that accounts for \$440 million in gross revenues in this province, much larger than agriculture, \$440 million; and we've gone through a period, Mr. Chairman, of neglect in respect to our forest industry in this province. We have taken decisive steps and the Jobs Fund spending reflects on investment in the forest industry that's unprecedented on the part of members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the forest nursery at The Pas when fully operative will produce over 400 million seedlings for reforestation in Manitoba, reforestation that was absolutely vital if we were going to continue to be able to feed the mills at Manfor and in southern Manitoba, Abitibi.

Mr. Chairman, the investment in The Pas is a very significant investment. When fully completed that forest

nursery will employ 240 people, 20 people full-time and 220 part-time. Mr. Chairman, this is a major infusion of economic activity in the North in The Pas. Mr. Chairman, included in the funds for the Jobs Fund are many hundreds of thousand dollars more in respect to Natural Resources funding.

The Premier indicated that there were extensive monies to be spent appropriated in a Jobs Fund for parks development. We didn't get any questions about that, \$600,000.00. I can go through the detail, Mr. Chairman, of vital investment in park infrastructure, discretionary spending, Mr. Chairman, which we are making to ensure that our vital resources essential for tourist development and the satisfaction of our own people that that resource is protected and upgraded.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable members say, well, you know, they call it a - oh, I hate to use the word, I won't even use the word. They use a dirty adjective in respect to the fund.

A MEMBER: Say it.

HON. A. MACKLING: All right, they call it a "fraud" fund. They are the frauds, Mr. Chairman. We have said from the outset, Mr. Chairman, that employment at this time is critical and we are going to organize the activity of government to address the problem of unemployment. We didn't say it would be all new money, but we said we were going to carefully ensure that the activities of government were so organized to ensure the maximum development of jobs. Mr. Chairman, how far have we succeeded? Well, the honourable members may not want to hear the statistics, but they are impressive.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to look at sectors, in the agricultural sector just what's been done to date - an investment of \$8,733,000 with an expected return of 4,165 work weeks. How about education? - \$8,215,000; work weeks, 4,757 and so it goes on. In Natural Resources, \$1,872,000; 2,178 work weeks. That is not all, as I indicated, Mr. Chairman. How about the responsibility of government in respect to job creation to make sure it's fair, to make sure that it's not all in the City of Winnipeg, or that it's not all in Selkirk or, heaven forbid, in my constituency of St. James? How fair have we been, Mr. Chairman, and is that a responsibility of government? Certainly we are charged with that responsibility to make sure that job creation is fair and appropriate.

Well, let's look at the facts. The projects organized to date - Brandon, \$1,988,000; the work weeks, 991. That's just what we've done to date, Mr. Chairman. Churchill, a very small amount, \$38,040; but 244 work weeks, just a beginning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would table the document that he's reading from. We've been seeking for some time to get some work weeks attached to the expenditures of money the Minister seems to have.

HON. A. MACKLING: The notes have been provided to me and I'm sure that copies can be made.

Now let's look at Dauphin, \$84,035 - 335 work weeks; but, Emerson, \$20,000 - 102 work weeks; Flin Flon, \$1,047,000 - 373 work weeks; Gladstone . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the Minister agree to tabling the document?

HON. A. MACKLING: I said that these were my notes, Mr. Chairman, and I'll be happy to make a copy of same available when I have completed. I would like to be able to use the document, Mr. Chairman.

Gladstone, Mr. Chairman, \$20,000 - 156 work weeks. How about Interlake, \$35,000 - 160 work weeks; La Verendrye, \$193,000 - 320 work weeks.

A MEMBER: Aw, come on . . . don't lie to us.

A MEMBER: Don't try to cover it up.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, someone is accusing me of lying. I want that withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has the floor. The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I heard someone accuse me of lying. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, I choose to ignore those words then, but I ask you to note my concern.

Lac du Bonnet, \$23,000 - 150 work weeks. Let's look at Minnedosa, \$58,000 - 560 work weeks. Let's look at Portage la Prairie, \$879,000 - 396 work weeks. Well, look, we haven't even forgotten Rhineland, \$14,000 - 130 work weeks.

MR. R. DOERN: How much in Elmwood?

HON. A. MACKLING: Let's look at Rupertsland, \$870,000 - 200 work weeks. Selkirk, well there was a big job to be done there, Mr. Premier, they have been neglected for four years remember, \$1,775,000 - 976 work weeks. Springfield, we didn't forget Springfield either, \$42,000 - 294 work weeks. And you know in the Ste. Rose area, that's Neepawa, Ste. Rose dike upgrading, NEED and the Crane River School Division, \$1,020,000 - 812 work weeks; Swan River, \$10,000 - 70 work weeks.

MR. C. MANNESS: How come your members get more work than we do?

MR. R. DOERN: It's just a coincidence.

HON. A. MACKLING: Easterville, \$195,000 - 95 work weeks; Moose Lake, \$237,000 - 744 work weeks. And of course the Premier had mentioned the Clearwater Nursery so I won't repeat those statistics.

MR. R. DOERN: Pembina, \$1.95.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Pas Area, all told, \$1,310,000 - 1,751 work weeks; Thompson, \$141,000 - 781 work weeks. Oh, we've got Turtle Mountain, it's over \$7,000

- 64 work weeks. In the Winnipeg area, Mr. Chairman, \$43,219,000 - 77,394 work weeks.

Mr. Chairman, we have accepted the obligation to try to organize our economic activity, discretionary economic activity, to provide the maximum employment opportunity in the province and from the other side of the House we get charged with . . . Mr. Chairman, the frauds that exist in this province are the members opposite.

They, for years, have said that you know we just fuel the engine of private enterprise and everything will look after itself. That's what they did for four years. They turned off government activity and what happened? We suffered a recession early in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. What we have done is use government to assist our economy, assist - yes, assist - private enterprise because private enterprise needs help at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, we have shown leadership, initiative and dedication to the No. 1 problem that faces Manitobans today and they are the naysayers on that side of the House. Mr. Chairman, we will not be deterred. I will table this document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 145 - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the members opposite had their opportunity to pass the Jobs Fund and they passed it by.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources has referred to the boldness and the initiative of this government. Let me cite to him some statistics on business bankruptcies in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. Let us compare 1981, '82, '83.

In March of 1981, there were 14 business bankruptcies. In 1982, under this government that promised to get the economy going, to stop plant closures, there were 42 business bankruptcies and, Mr. Chairman, in 1983, there were 46 business bankruptcies, both of those were increases over the 14 that occurred in 1981 in March. In April, 1981, there were 13 business bankruptcies when this government was campaigning on their promises to get the economy moving again. When they took office in April of 1982, there were 30 - the 13 had gone up to 30 - and then in this year another 15, Mr. Chairman, in the month of April. In May of 1981, there were nine; in May of 1982, under this government, there were 28, a 250 percent increase. In this year again there were 27, Mr. Chairman.

So the record, simple and pure statistics, Mr. Chairman, speak clearly about the performance of this government which has been destructive of the economy of Manitoba. They talk about a \$200 million Jobs Fund designed to improve the unemployment situation in Manitoba, and we see the statistics under which they clearly have not improved the employment situation in Manitoba. It has gotten increasingly worse under this government and the policies that they have implemented are purely and simply designed to worsen the economy of Manitoba.

How many people, Mr. Chairman, have they put out of work with their payroll tax that they talk about? — (Interjection) — None, they say. Mr. Chairman, that indicates the naivety of members opposite. They have

never been involved in business, Mr. Chairman, they don't know how business operates, they don't know about the hundreds of firms in Manitoba who had budgets established, then the payroll tax was imposed upon them by this government, Mr. Chairman, and the managers of businesses in Manitoba were told to cut the payroll so that the businesses could pay the payroll tax. Jobs were cut, wages reduced. Mr. Chairman, that's how this government's policies affected the working people in this province. Mr. Chairman, and they increased the sales tax on those people that they supposedly are so concerned about, the 52,000 unemployed people as well as every other person in Manitoba.

The Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board has increased the assessment from 9 to 20 percent from the time, Mr. Chairman, in August of 1982 when the President of the Federation of Labour, Mr. Martin, said he couldn't understand how the Workers Compensation Board had accumulated such a huge surplus and it should be returned to those who paid it. Well, in a matter of a few months, his board that he appointed, Mr. Chairman, as well as doing everything else we've talked about at the Workers Compensation Board has increased the burden on small business by 9 to 20 percent in their assessment rating. Taken by itself, it's not that much, Mr. Chairman, but add it to the payroll tax. Add it to what he's proposing now. Everyone is concerned about the workplace and injuries to workers, but he's adding another \$4 million to business, Mr. Chairman.

The first contract legislation, does the First Minister think that is welcoming new employers and new investment to Manitoba? Do you think the first contract legislation is welcoming new investment, developing new employment opportunities in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman?

This Jobs Fund is a fraud, Mr. Chairman, because it is a sham to try to cover up for the most destructive economic policies that this province has ever seen by a government in Manitoba. These bankruptcy statistics point it out, Mr. Chairman. We will see, as the Member for Turtle Mountain has indicated, in another year, another two years, Mr. Chairman, how badly Manitoba is going to be doing comparatively to other provinces, because the policies that this government is implementing are destroying economic opportunities and employment opportunities for Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Under Rule 64, Subparagraph 2, I remind all members of the committee that the speeches in a Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussions. We can debate this for seven minutes, seven hours, seven days and seven weeks, it's up to you, but stay according to the rules.

The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the admonishment which you just gave applied to the previous speaker and not to the speaker that is just rising to his feet, because I do intend to stay to the business of this committee and that is the Jobs Fund.

A few moments ago, the members opposite in their haste, for some reason unbeknownst to us and known

only to them, wanted to pass this item without full debate after having talked for hours in this House previously and in the other committees about how this side of the House didn't want to talk about jobs, didn't want to talk about the Jobs Fund.

We want to talk about those jobs. We want to talk about the way by which this government is approaching the problem of unemployment. Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind in this House or outside of these Chambers, there is a problem in society today with unemployment. It is not confined to the Province of Manitoba. It is not even confined to Canada, but it is a problem that confronts all industrialized nations, and nations and governments respond to that problem in different ways.

Some throw up their hands and say, let us rely upon the ingenuity of the private sector to create wealth and jobs. Does that sound familiar? It should sound familiar, because it's the scenario that the members opposite presented to the people of this province for four long, hard, difficult years. Thank God, they don't have to listen to that sort of outdated philosophy and pragmatic approach anymore.

We know that the private sector has a responsibility to involve itself in the production of wealth. We know that the private sector has a responsibility to provide jobs, but at the same time we know that the governments of this land have a responsibility to provide opportunity and jobs where the private sector can't do it alone. We are not denying that right, or suggesting that's not the responsibility. We are only trying to help out where help is needed.

If one looks at what has happened under that regime and what is happening under this enlightened government, one finds a difference in approach to some very difficult and structural problems in the economy. There has been much debate about this particular item. There has been much debate about the Jobs Fund. They have used some rather negative terminology when discussing the Jobs Fund. They have made no secret of their distaste for the Jobs Fund. They have made no secret of their cynicism for the Jobs Fund, and they have made no secret of their outdated, pragmatic approach to economics in this province.

That is why we are having the discussions that we are having today. Because this government, as the Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for St. James and many others, including my Leader and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour and almost every individual on this side who has spoken to this issue, has said very clearly, this is our government's response to difficult times. This is the way we want to plan our response to assist in making certain that the economy responds as much as possible to the difficult times that confront workers.

Therein lies the difference, see. They're not for unemployment on that side of the House. They are not against jobs. They're against planning. We saw that in four years, and we're seeing it now. They are against government trying to involve itself in an effective and an efficient way with the economy. That is a role for our government.

We know we can't do it alone. We know that we are only part of an overall approach. The First Minister as Leader has indicated that we are working with labour and we are working with management, employers and

employees alike in this province. They are participating in this program to provide this sort of response mechanism to difficult economic times, because employers and employees don't like unemployment either. They want jobs as well, and they know it's difficult for them as well as it's difficult for us. So they are prepared to sit down with us in an amiable way and discuss in very rational, reasonable ways how we get ourselves out of a predicament not of our own making.

That's something that the members opposite never took the chance to do, never took the opportunity to do in their four years of administration. Perhaps that's what smarts. Perhaps that's what makes them rise to their feet with such cynicism and bravado — (Interjection) — well he says theirs worked a lot better.

A MEMBER: Yours worked? I can't believe my ears.

HON. J. COWAN: Statistics show entirely opposite, but I don't want to get involved in this statistical debate and I'll tell you why I don't want to get involved in this statistical debate.

Mr. Chairperson, if there is one person in this province that is unemployed, unable to work and who wants to work, then we have a circumstance and a situation that needs to be confronted by all of this society. One person alone and we have a tragedy.

They on the opposite side take great delight in indicating that there are 52,000 people unemployed in this province. As if we like — (Interjection) — Well, I think it should be noted that the Member for La Verendrye . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I demand that the Minister of Northern Affairs withdraw the allegation that we take delight in having 52,000 unemployed in this province. You do not impute motives to members on this side of the House. Withdraw!

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, if the Member for Turtle Mountain is now indicating that they do not take great delight in those numbers, I will accept that and certainly indicate that is the case. They do not at this time take great delight in those numbers, but they certainly do give an appearance of taking great delight. Well, only you can set the record straight to the member opposite for Turtle Mountain. If they don't take great delight let them say they don't take great delight.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, we have been through this point many times over the past years in the House that members on both sides have been called because they have imputed motives to members on the other side.

The Minister of Northern Affairs has said that members on this side take great delight in the fact that there are 52,000 unemployed people in this province. That is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Those are words that the Minister of Northern Affairs is ascribing to us and I want him to withdraw those.

HON. R. PENNER: On the same point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General on the same point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, however those words of the Minister may be described they are certainly not imputing motives. He simply described what, in his opinion, was a state of affairs. Now he then said by way of being willing to correct the record on his own volition to a certain extent that it only appeared like they took delight. So let's show on the record that it only appears that they take delight. The mere fact that they seem to revel in it from time to time is only in appearance, but certainly there's no point of order there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister of Northern Affairs explain what he means?

HON. J. COWAN: On the point of order, it would seem to me that I would be imputing motive if I suggested that they took great delight for a number of motivations or reasons known only to them. I haven't done that.

What I have provided to the House is my perception of what they have been saying, and I have in no way imputed any motivations behind that statement. So I have not in fact, as the Member for Turtle Mountain suggested, indicated that I have any assumptions as to their motivations why it would appear that they take great delight. I'll tell you quite honestly, it befuddles me. I don't know why they would appear to take such great delight and for that reason couldn't in all honesty impute any motives, and wouldn't impute any motives.

But if the mere statement offends you, then I am prepared to withdraw that statement and in its place, without in any way indicating that or suggesting or acknowledging his allegation that I have imputed a motivation on the part of the members opposite, withdraw the statement and say very clearly that it appears to me; it appears to anyone who has listened to this debate on this side of the House; and it appears to most of the province that they take great delight in such circumstances. Now they may not well take that delight, but they should certainly look at what they're saying and the appearances of what they're saying.

So I don't want to get sidetracked in that nonissue because the real issue is the 52,000 unemployed Manitobans in this province. We acknowledge that there is a problem with unemployment. As a responsible government we feel that we have an obligation to do that which we can to assist in resolving that problem. No more, nor no less. We want to do that which will provide, in whatever way possible, employment for those who wish to work and cannot find work.

That approach is different than the approach which they brought to their government, granted. That approach is different than the approach that is happening in many other jurisdictions, although I might add that there a number of other jurisdictions that are now looking to what is happening in Manitoba and the concept and adopting it as their own. They are jurisdictions, my friends, not of New Democratic Party composition but rather of Conservative Party composition, which only shows that there are elements of the Conservative Party in this country that are more progressive than the Manitoba element. But in fact they do exist and they are looking to Manitoba to determine what will happen with our Jobs Fund and what benefits they may apply to their own jurisdictions.

I want to talk about some of the inferences that have been provided to us by way of this debate by members opposite.

No. 1, they say that if we do a job this year that might have been done in any given year by a government, then it is not really Jobs Fund money, because the government was going to do it at one time or another anyway. That is the basis of their criticism of some of the ongoing projects which we are bringing forward.

I will tell you quite frankly, and they know quite frankly having been in government, that if you don't plan on doing a job this year, and you bring it forward as part of a program, it is a program that would not normally exist under the spending authority of the province. For that reason it is distinct and unto itself as a program.

So if we move up capital works, which they talked about for four years and which was never done, and which we had no intention of doing in a given year to the present year, then I would suggest to you that we have created new jobs and jobs that would not have been there had we not had the Jobs Fund mechanism with which to deal with those proposals. That's what we're doing. So don't let them try in any way to befuddle the issue, or to confuse the general public, or to make inference that those jobs are not real jobs under the Jobs Fund, they are not distinct jobs owing their very existence to the Jobs Fund, because they, in fact, are and they know that. If they were only able to cast aside their parochial approach to the debate and admit to that, the public would all be for the better.

They say as well that if we're doing a job that is not creating the type of long-term permanent job which they feel is important, then it's not a job. It doesn't matter whether it lasts a week, or two weeks, or ten weeks, or sixteen weeks, or twenty weeks, or a year; to them it's not a job.

Well, let me tell you, to the person who obtains productive employment by way of that job it is the most important, the most valued, and the most desired job that they can get. It is a job.

Mr. Chairperson, a job is a job is a job is a job, and by any other name it is a job. If you're out of work and you have a chance for staying out of work, or a chance for 20 weeks of productive work, I guarantee you, you will seek the productive work and you will provide your energies to that job with enthusiasm and with dignity.

Dignity, let's talk about that for a while, because that's part of this Jobs Fund. There are other ways to address the problem of unemployment. One can call for expanded unemployment benefits. One can call for more welfare. One can call for any of a number of other responses which take it out of the hands of the individual and put it into the hands of the state, but we didn't want that approach. We wanted to be able to provide to those people who want to work a chance to work and that is what this Jobs Fund accomplished. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it is a valuable fund all on its own.

I don't want to go through all the different projects that have been accomplished and will be accomplished under this fund, others have done it and they have done a better job than I can, but I want to talk about one such project that falls under my responsibility and in doing so I don't in any way want to imply that the other projects that might fall under my responsibility are any less valuable or important or needed.

But we talked about earlier, the Jobs Fund and the Mosquito Larviciding Program and the Premier of the

province indicated that I could speak at great length on that particular program. I can indeed, but I'm not going to speak in great length on that particular program this evening, but I do want to provide some brief details as to what that particular program provides for this province. I want to as well indicate why it is a part of the Jobs Fund, and I want finally to suggest to you that it would not exist if there were not a Jobs Fund.

When we looked at the situation in this province with mosquito control programs, we knew as a government that there were difficult decisions that had to be made and that there was a need for a review of the system and in fact there may be need for a reform of the system. So we asked the Clean Environment Commission to review the matter and they did by way of public review, by way of internal review of what's happening in other jurisdictions and here, by way of a review of the literature and they came forward with a report. That report said in one part that larviciding in this province should be the preferred method of mosquito control abatement projects. It can't be the only method, but certainly should be a primary response mechanism as a part of any abatement strategy.

We indicated to the municipalities that we agreed with that, but we went farther than that. We said to them, that if they were prepared to involve themselves, we, as a province, were prepared to use this Jobs Fund money to provide: firstly, needed employment in their municipalities; and secondly, long-term benefits to this province by way of maps which they would generate which would be used year after year after year in the development of larviciding programs as part of an abatement strategy.

So we accomplished a couple of goals: one, employment; and secondly, a rational system by which we could address long-standing but urgent problems.

Now, we're not going to hire a lot of people by way of that project alone, but those people that we hire are going to be thankful for the job and we're not going to provide great edifices to the future as we are in some of the Jobs Fund Programs, but we are going to provide long-term benefits to this province and we are going to do so in a co-operative fashion with the municipalities and other parties and we are going to do so in a rational and planned manner.

So, it meets all the criteria of not only the Jobs Fund, but the criteria of a progressive government that wants to use the instruments of government to deal in an effective and an efficient way with serious and urgent problems.

I could talk as well about what we're doing in Northern Manitoba, with the multimillion dollar Job Creation Program, a program which will provide not only long-term infrastructure to many communities, but as well will provide dignity and the opportunity for training and skill advancement to many many hundreds of Manitobans in the northern part of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a matter of privilege.

This afternoon, I asked a number of questions of the Minister of Labour. I asked her about the Careerstart Program. I asked, specifically, the number of work weeks

that the Careerstart Program was going to produce. I asked her on numerous occasions. The Minister refused to answer. She said she didn't have that information. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources has tabled a document after speaking in the House which specifically sets out the number of work weeks for the Careerstart Program in every - as it's done by the top, sorted by electoral division, Mr. Chairman, one can only wonder about the motives for that. But I asked those specific questions of the Minister of Labour and she refused to give me an answer. Here we have, a few hours later, the Minister of Natural Resources tabling this information in the House showing the exact information that I asked for, done by electoral division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour. What is the point of order?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Member is indicating that I refused to answer. That is patently incorrect. I took that question as notice.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour does make it worse. She takes the question as notice when she had the answer within her grasp and quite available.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. MERCIER: So, Mr. Chairman, we have had in the past numerous occasions where we have been unable to get questions answered by the Minister of Labour. Now we have a situation where the detailed information was readily available to her . . .

HON. R. PENNER: You've got it, what are you complaining about?

MR. G. MERCIER: Because I asked for it this afternoon and she said she didn't have it. It was available, Mr. Chairman, obviously when the questions were asked.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Chairman, that information was brought into the House tonight. As I indicated this afternoon, I said I would get the information for the member. It was brought into the House tonight and it was tabled tonight.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's what makes it worse, because the first thing I did at 8:00 o'clock was ask the First Minister and the Minister of Labour whether they had the information that we asked for this afternoon and they said no.

HON. R. PENNER: There's no motion, so there's no point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to Beausheue . . . Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: We were about to pass the item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to Beauchesne, Section 76, Page 24: "Breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on the report from the committee." So, we are not in a position to deal with the question of privilege in the Committee of the Whole House.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I yielded the floor on a matter of privilege. I hadn't quite finished my remarks at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, the Minister of Northern Affairs still has the floor.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll be brief in my concluding remarks, Mr. Chairperson, because I believe it has been said very well and, perhaps, better by others on this side of the House. However, I would not want to allow the opportunity to pass without having taken advantage of this chance to speak to some of the specific programs which we are providing by way of the Jobs Fund program, and as well to speak to the general issue of the Jobs Fund and the objectives of the Jobs Fund.

In closing, I would like to reiterate those objectives, because I think we cannot repeat them enough times. I think we must, as a government, be vigilant to ensure that the public fully understand what the Jobs Fund is and what the Jobs Fund means to them as members of a society and as individuals. We will go to great lengths to ensure that the type of misinformation and that the type of implications that the members opposite have thrown since Day One at this Jobs Fund program do not go unanswered. I have great faith that the public, when they are aware of the facts, when they are aware of the figures, when they are aware of complete and honest information, will in fact support this Jobs Fund because it does exactly what they are telling us as a government to do.

So we will make the facts known. We will use every opportunity, every vehicle and every mechanism to ensure that the public has an accurate picture of the facts regarding the Jobs Fund. We will not let the record be distorted by those opposite who for pragmatic or parochial reasons do not support this program which we believe is of value to all of Manitoba.

So what are the objectives of this program? The objectives are to develop long-term assets in the province and to enhance the economic viability of the province and, in doing so, to create permanent employment opportunities, to create immediate, short-term employment opportunities to tide people over in the meanwhile, and to preserve and enhance existing jobs and skills.

I talked to those issues when I spoke to the debate of second reading in this House. Almost every member on this side who has spoken to the matter of the Jobs Fund has addressed those same issues and we will repeat again and again the objectives of the Jobs Fund, because we believe that those objectives are the mandate which were given to us as a government when they decided a number of months ago to forgo the opportunity that government had to do something - because they did nothing - and to provide a progressive New Democratic Party Government with a chance to turn this economy around

in these most difficult of economic times. That is what we are committed to; that is what we will accomplish by this fund.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, that is pretty thin gruel indeed for the 55,000 Manitobans who are out of work tonight and for the farm bankrupts who are up under this government, for the business bankrupts who are up under this government, for those labouring under onerous tax burdens which are up under this government, and for those who are struggling to maintain some semblance of private enterprise against an atmosphere that in almost every expression that this government makes is one that is calculated to be anti-business in tone and certainly anti-business in effect.

Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed another travesty of credibility and truth in this House with the performance by the First Minister, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Natural Resources with respect to the information sought by my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert. You know, when I said a moment ago that information was extracted from the Minister of Natural Resources, there was some reaction of disagreement and argument on the other side of the House. There was some consternation expressed by the Minister of Labour at my use of the term "extracted," but I would like to ask her and you, Mr. Chairman, and ask the First Minister through you what it amounts to if it does not amount to extracting that information when my colleague had asked for it at the beginning of the sitting tonight, was told that it was not available. Then we move to a point in consideration of this item where the item was ready to be passed, where nobody got up on this side of the House until the Minister of Natural Resources couldn't resist the temptation to get up and engage in some kind of wild smoke screen apologia for the ineffectiveness of that government, during the course of which he let slip inadvertently some information that my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, had asked for several times and that my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, had asked for several times.

That is how it came out, Mr. Chairman. If that isn't extracting it from the Minister of Natural Resources, I don't know what extracting means.

HON. R. PENNER: You're right. You don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I really believe that the member should be asked to withdraw that. As he knows, the Minister of Natural Resources was making a speech, not specifically naming any document he was referring to - reading from his notes. He then said that he was prepared to table that although there is no rule of this House that says he's required to table a document he hasn't referred to in the sense that he's saying I am quoting from this document or that document or the other document. He was doing his

speech, he had his material there, and he agreed voluntarily. It was not extracted from him; there was no ruling made that required him to table it. He tabled it voluntarily. For the member opposite to suggest that somehow it was extracted is totally inaccurate. It should be demanded that he withdraw forthwith and apologize.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister of Finance has a point of order or just an opinion. I don't believe he has a point of order. He certainly has a strong opinion, but I reject that opinion. The fact of the matter is the Minister of Natural Resources did not offer to table that material, that information, until he was asked to do so. So that if that isn't extracting it, Sir, I don't know what is. — (Interjection) — I'm not yielding the floor at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, but I am yielding to you if you have an opinion that you intend to offer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources to the same point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member uses the word "extracting." — (Interjection) — All right, all right. Mr. Chairman, by implication of that word, there is some resistance to the giving of the document. There was no resistance at all. I was in the middle of my remarks, and I was asked whether I would be prepared to table. I wanted to confirm the nature of the document to determine whether there was anything confidential in that document. They were statistics and when I confirmed it, I said, yes. That's not extraction, Mr. Chairman, no resistance at all.

So that's a distortion of fact, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw. The document was voluntarily tabled and not with any resistance at all.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the Minister of Natural Resources, (Sherman) Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the Minister of Natural Resources, he may be technically correct about himself. But then, Sir, it can be said, if it was not extracted from the Minister of Natural Resources, it certainly was extracted from the government. It had to be extracted from the government.

It was requested earlier by two of my colleagues; it was rejected. My colleagues were advised that it was not available. Subsequently, the Minister of Natural Resources in making his remarks was asked to table some reference material to which he was referring which addressed those questions, and he ultimately agreed to do so. I call that extraction. If the Minister of Natural Resources feels that reflects unfairly on him, then I say perhaps it was not extraction from him, it was certainly extraction from the government.

Mr. Chairman, I don't mind yielding the floor to the First Minister or the Minister of Natural Resources on this point, but I do not intend to yield the floor in terms of participating in this debate at this juncture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the allegation by the Member for Fort Garry that

the government was forced by way of extraction. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert had accused the honourable member for not releasing information. The honourable member had not even had the opportunity to speak. I had responded in respect to certain questions I had taken as notice. After I had spoken, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources had spoken. So, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the claims by the honourable member that extraction was required — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order in case the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain does not recognize that. — (Interjection) — Yes.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister's speaking on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the information was provided. For the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to indicate that something was let slip, something had to be extracted, is profoundly untrue and should be withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we get on to the substantive debate?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, please. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is on the same point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there is an implication on the part of the member of bad feelings or bad motive on the part of this member or my colleague, the Minister of Labour. There is an imputation of motive.

Mr. Chairman, let's consider the fact. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) — no, on the point of order - that I rose - the honourable members opposite did not want any further information - to supply further information in debate, and the Minister of Labour had indicated to me that she was concerned that this information might be given to the House. Mr. Chairman, for the honourable member to suggest that somehow they had to extract this information is so false in light of what happened in this House tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A difference of opinion between two members is not a point of order. Let's go on to the substantive debate.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In any event, Mr. Chairman, as I said, we have really experienced a travesty of credibility where the government is concerned in responding to questions about this fund. In addition to that, Sir, I think that one can only feel compassion bordering on tears for the 55,000 unemployed in Manitoba, who are forced through the kinds of exposure to the comments that

government members will get in the media, to suffer the outrageous protestations and outrageous smoke screens offered by various Ministers and various spokesmen on the other side, most recently the Minister of Northern Affairs, to defend the indefensible, to try to defend and in that performance that has wreaked tragedy of a social and economic nature upon this province, Sir.

We have a litany of economic and social tragedy in Manitoba as a result of the failure of this government to meet the economic challenges of the day, to adjust and refine and develop its programs in a pragmatic and a non-doctrinaire way so as to encourage the development of enterprise, the creation of jobs, and the development and growth of personal activity in the marketplace. All they can do is stand up and try to make a charade of it, try to smoke screen it, try to cover with a long litany and dissertation on a series of projects that for the most part are rather abstract in concept, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — yes, and in some instances are highly repetitious, and in a great many instances still require to be seen to be proven.

The jury is out on many of those projects and the First Minister knows it. He has, for example, in his list cited projects that have been announced before. He has cited projects that will never see the light of day, and he knows it, that amount simply to rhetoric. He has announced projects, for example, like urban redevelopment which consists of the \$20 million input into the core area redevelopment program. He has seen himself the reports, the declamations and declarations of officials connected with that Core Area Initiative, connected with that program which state as recently as today in today's media that the jobs that were promised and floated about and talked about have never materialized, that those jobs haven't as yet been created.

What the First Minister is talking here is puffery, Mr. Chairman, and he knows it. What the Minister of Northern Affairs is doing is defending puffery.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would not want the honourable member to mislead himself and also this House. The \$20 million relates to allocation re Portage North. The Portage North proposal has not even been finally determined, because all three levels of government are presently examining proposals.

So when the honourable member talks about jobs and puffery, he is referring to an entirely different area, not the area that the \$20 million is directed towards.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister can address that point in the manner in which he wishes to address it when it's his turn to take the floor. But he has an item here stating that \$20 million is being put into urban redevelopment, and I am asking him to show us what that means in terms of direct jobs creation.

I am citing the fact that in the Core Area Development Initiative in which the province is supposed to be participating, there is already clear evidence that the dreams, fictions and the romance about all the jobs that were going to be created are highly questionable and are proving at this juncture to be purely romance and purely fiction. I ask him to demonstrate that is not

the case in connection with the urban redevelopment item that he cites here in his Jobs Fund, his "fraud" fund list.

I would like to know where the money is coming from for the Brandon Fire College project in this Jobs Fund, "fraud" fund list. This government shows in its list that \$1,874,800 is to be expended or committed on the Brandon Fire College, Mr. Chairman, and anybody reading that list would have to assume that means the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba through their government, are funding that project. I would like to have some demonstrated proof of that, Mr. Chairman. My information is that is not correct.

That Brandon Fire College will be paid for out of increases in fire insurance premiums that people in the community are paying for their fire insurance and that it is not representative of input of taxpayer money by this government but it's being presented as such and that really is typical of the whole list of projects that appear on this so-called Jobs Fund so aptly renamed the "fraud" fund by my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, Mr. Chairman.

Then we have people like the Minister of Northern Affairs standing up here and engaging in a long-roaming dissertation trying to make something out of the fictions of this whole program and out of the suffering of the people of Manitoba. He was one of the prime critics of this government when he was in opposition for an unemployment rate, Mr. Chairman, that was never in the worst years anywhere near what the unemployment rate is today under this government in Manitoba. Yet, he tries to cover the tracks of inactivity and ineptitude with the kind of rambling dissertation that he just gave us about abstract projects that so far are doing nothing and producing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister for Northern Affairs said that the Conservatives are not against jobs, they're against planning. Well, Mr. Chairman, we're certainly against planning if planning is what is meant by what that government for the past year and a half has done to destroy this province.

Is it planning, Mr. Chairman, that has given us a \$570 million deficit, a deficit that will probably hit \$700 million before the end of the current fiscal year? Is it planning that has given us the highest total of farm bankruptcies in our history? Is it planning that has given us the highest total of business bankruptcies in our history? Is it planning that has given us 55,000 unemployed? If that's planning, Mr. Chairman, then you're darn right the Progressive Conservatives are against planning. They're certainly against NDP planning, because the only kind of planning that represents is planning for destruction.

Mr. Chairman, it almost becomes a situation in which one is at a loss for words when you have to listen to the kind of fictionalization and creation of stories and creation of abstract, unrealistic ideas and proposals that emanate from that side of the House while Manitobans are crying out for meaningful initiatives and meaningful action that will create real enterprise and real jobs.

Mr. Chairman, it really makes one weep for the condition of this province to have to listen to that kind of thing. Why don't they stand up and face the fact that their policies, ranging through their taxation policies, through their invasions and intrusions at least by suggestion into the fields of oil and gas exploration,

into the fields of life insurance, into the fields of investment funds, are discouraging the development of enterprises in this province that would create meaningful jobs and real wealth.

I spoke to that subject a week ago in this debate, and I don't intend to be repetitious about it, Mr. Chairman, but let me just say to the Minister of Natural Resources, who I think it was referred to the fact that we had not - I may be accusing him unjustly, it may have been the Minister of Northern Affairs - but one or the other referred to the fact that we had insisted we wanted to talk about jobs and the Jobs Fund and then when the opportunity came, we did not do so. That, Sir, is a patent untruth.

We've been talking about and trying to get the government to talk about the inadequacies of their Jobs Fund and the phoniness of this fund for the past week in this House. We had said what we felt needed to be said and we were prepared to pass this item this evening until the Minister of Natural Resources got up and started to do his rain dance about the kinds of wonderful things that this government has done for Manitoba's slumping economy and for Manitoba's unemployed. It was then when he started giving information about work weeks that my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, and my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain had asked for, that we got into this extension of this debate.

But we talked about the inadequacies and the inexactitude and the dissatisfaction of this proposed fund, this "fraud" fund, all last week on this item. So do not let them attempt to say that we haven't seized the opportunity to speak about it. We thought the pragmatic and practical points had been made and we were prepared to move on and get on with other business of the province until the Minister of Natural Resources got up. If he wants to keep the debate going with the kinds of imprecise arguments that he raised plus answers to questions about information that were raised earlier in this House, then we're prepared to keep it going, but we're not going to accept the fact that their posture on this thing is anything but posturing,

that it is anything but smoke-screening a very critical, very serious situation, because that's what it is and that's what 55,000 unemployed Manitobans know and that's what farmers and businessmen in this province know and that's what students coming out of our universities and our colleges in this province know, and they will not be amused by the kinds of excuses offered by members on the other side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we prepared to continue?

HON. A. MACKLING: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion that the committee rise. Those who are in favour that committee rise, say Aye. Those who are against? The Ayes have it.

MR. B. RANSOM: A formal vote, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ring the bells.

There can be no vote after 10:00 p.m.

The Rules say that you cannot have a vote after 10:00 p.m. if the vote defeats a motion.

Order please. The Rules of the House say that we cannot have a formal vote when we are voting on a resolution or a motion. There are two kinds of votes that are prohibited, any vote that befits a motion approving an item in the Estimates of the government, or any vote that passes a motion varying an item in the Estimates of the government.

Other than those two we can have a vote.

Are we ready for the question? Whether the committee shall rise or not and a formal counted vote shall be taken by the Clerk.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows: Yeas 14; Nays 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.
Committee rise.