

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 21 April, 1981

Time — 8:00 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Member for Burrows has 15 minutes.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that you would note that the sitting of this evening's session commenced one minute late for lack of interest on the part of two political parties in attending to business of the House. (Interjection)— One political party was present here. (Interjection)— No, 100-percent attendance. Well, that one I cannot speak for. Mr. Speaker, before we rose for the dinner hour, I had indicated to you that this exercise that the Minister of Tourism is involved in and spending \$1.1 million in an attempt to attract 22 families a day to Manitoba, to visit Manitoba, is simply an attempt to put the level of the tourist business in the Province of Manitoba back where it should have been, where it could have been, had tourism progressed and gradually increased at the rate at which it had been up until 1977. Because, as I indicated to you, up until 1977 never did it fall below the 3 million mark and now it's well below that, around the 2.7 million. So this is the Minister's attempt to recover something which he and his colleagues had lost over the past four years despite the fact that the Canadian dollar was devalued. I know that's a two-edged sword and insofar as exports it has its other effects but insofar as tourism is concerned that should have been to the Minister's advantage in attempting to attract tourists to our province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other comments that I had wanted to make but when I went home tonight for dinner and after going through the more important mail then I went through the junk mail and tonight, Mr. Speaker, it was junk, some of the stuff which came from Information Services, from the government's propaganda office. There was one sheet which I had held back from last week — ah, here is the Minister responsible for the government propaganda office, ah, yes of course.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they change portfolios so frequently that it's rather difficult to keep on top of things in terms of knowing exactly which Tory member is responsible for which portfolio. But a week ago the Minister of Labour sent out a propaganda blurb titled "Private Sector Youth Job Program Resumes" — and we had heard a bit about that during the Budget debate and the Minister said this — that it will be funded by \$2.8 million; about 5,000 positions are expected to result and this fund will pay a \$1.50 per hour wage subsidy to employers for creating additional employment for people between the ages of 16 and 24, between April 27 and October 31. He also said that this program will have a subsidy ceiling of 640 hours per position or employee.

Now, it would seem to me that the average individual reading this would interpret it in this

fashion, that the Minister is providing \$2.8 million to create 5,000 jobs during the summer months for young people and that there should be an opportunity for 5,000 people to work up to 640 hours — about 16 weeks or four months — which I suppose isn't all that bad. But, Mr. Speaker, all that the \$2.8 million will provide for is less than 3,000 jobs. Figure it out. Divide \$2.8 million by \$1.50 and then divide that by 640 hours and that gives you 2,916 jobs. —(Interjection)— So you're right, that's good mathematics over there, that's their 5,000 jobs, but by the same token say 10,000 jobs, say eight-week jobs, say 20,000 four-week jobs, or whatever it would work out to. But that's the type of propaganda, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest to you is a misuse of public money. This is not the conveyance of information; this is not the accurate description of a government program; this is pure sheer government propaganda. And then I opened today's junk mail and the first blurb that I came across is titled Energy Efficient Housing Program Plan. Now my leader commented on this. Mr. Speaker, I can't think of any other expression but the one used by my leader — is this some sort of a lottery? The program was designed to encourage the province's house building industry to construct housing to an energy-efficient standard, and under the program 100 purchasers of houses built this year to the energy-efficient standard will receive a \$1,600 tax-free grant. There's going to be several hundreds of houses I would hope, or thousands, there should be several thousands of houses built. So the Minister is going to select 100 houses that are going to be eligible for this subsidy.

A MEMBER: Maybe there's only going to be 100 houses though Ben.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well probably not because we heard from the Minister responsible for Housing that this year's housing starts had increased by 450 percent. So if last year there were two, this year there were nine because we know that last year there was very little, if any, housing construction in the Province of Manitoba.

Then talk about the use of government funds for propaganda purposes. Another epistle titled, "Tobacco, Liquor Tax Boost Set". The first page, for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, this is in today's mail, this is in tonight's junk mail which ruined my dinner — tonight's junk mail which ruined my dinner, this I received today. Yes, my wife went to great trouble to cook an excellent dinner and then it was ruined by having to read crap such as this. On the first page — (Interjection)— ah, the Minister says good news item. The first page, yes I'll concede that on the first page the Minister did say taxes on cigarettes will rise by five cents per package of 25, etc. and etc.; that's news.

But then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ransom said the present Budget will preserve the benefits of the major tax reduction program which a government has implemented since 1977 and then he takes a half page to review the so-called, what in his opinion are,

tax cuts and programs of tax relief which had been instituted over the past number of years. Is that information, Mr. Speaker?

Then the same Minister — Program calls for a \$219.8 million deficit. This government was going to balance its budget every year, now a fifth of a billion dollars deficit this year. Then the government goes on to say, "Well, this isn't all that bad because we want to remind you that in 1977-78 there was \$191.3 million deficit", which in 1981 dollars would be \$275 million deficit.

Then the same Minister goes on with the following statement: "In the intervening years deficits have amounted to \$84.3 million in '78-'79; \$45 million in 1979-80 and an estimated \$100 million in 1980-81". Now, Mr. Speaker, here's where the propaganda bit comes in —(Interjection)— as the Member for Winnipeg Centre says, another example of "Ransomatics". Yes, it's a new word. With reference to the 1978 deficit all we have to add is the inflation factor. With reference to his three deficits, you don't add the inflation factor. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If you're going to add the inflation factor to the 1977-78 deficit, then also add it to the other three which brings the total deficit, Mr. Speaker, of this Tory government for the three-and-a-fraction years that they've been in power to over half-a-billion dollars. Over half-a-billion dollars is the total deficit created by the Conservative Party since 1977. — (Interjection)— No, no, the Minister of Finance claims to be a bit of a mathematician. He can sit down. I'll loan him my calculator. Let him figure it out that the 10 percent per annum factor, whatever he uses — (Interjection)— He can do it without a calculator. Then I wish to hell that he would do it.

Then he says — another example of propaganda that the Government Information Services use for propaganda purposes — the opening statement on another epistle of his, "Confidence that Manitoba is" and this is supposed to be something that he is saying this year, Mr. Speaker, "that Manitoba is on the threshold of a time of real opportunity for sustained and steady economic growth". Mr. Speaker, what nonsense. Did he not read his colleague's budget speech of last year? That's what he said last year. He said the same thing last year. Remember the Blue Sky Budget? Remember, when your colleague said, "The initial transitional adjustment period is behind us. Our economy is back on track and we have blue sky ahead of us". Doesn't he read the previous budget speeches made by his colleagues? Maybe he can't read, maybe that's his problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he can't read then that's a reflection on the education program — because he's quite a young fellow — of the Tory administration which preceded us. Then the Minister of Finance says — and I would ask the Minister of Finance if he would allow me to revise the sentence and I would like to revise it at public expense and send out a correct version of it — Mr. Ransom said Manitoba faced a recurring problem of public confidence precipitated by those who would denigrate and underestimate the achievements and potential of a province.

I would like to revise it in this fashion, put it in its proper perspective and let the sentence read as follows: Mr. Ransom said the Conservative

government faces a recurring problem of public confidence precipitated by those who would denigrate and underestimate, and properly so, its achievements and potential. And come the next election the people of Manitoba will tell the government that; the people of Manitoba will tell the government that.

Then the Minister of Finance goes on to say, well, you know, we're a resource-abundant province, resources of all kinds including a vast water supply. Well, we know what's about to happen to the water supply if the Alcan project ever materializes and after the Alcan project, you know, Inco isn't going to sit back, Mr. Speaker, they're going to be on the Minister's doorstep and say, now look, we think everybody should have a Hydro plant; we want one too.

A MEMBER: I wouldn't mind one.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's right. Then the Minister proceeds to take credit for a 40 percent increase in the value of mineral production. He made no damn contribution to that because the value of mineral production had nothing to do with what he did in the province scene. He had nothing to do with it, absolutely nothing to do with it and he attempts to take credit for that. He also attempts to take credit for \$4.3 billion in manufacturing shipments for which he had nothing to do with the value of manufacturing shipments; not a damn thing, not a thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I could say to you in closing is to assist the gasohol plant to get under operation, which I understand gasohol can be made from wood products and paper is made from wood. I'm prepared to donate this thing called "The 1981 Manitoba Budget Address" to the Minister to give to the gasohol plant to assist him . . .

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

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to speak and to enter into the Debate on this Budget that was presented last week by the Honourable Minister of Finance who stated with confidence that he believes in the position of the Province of Manitoba at this time, and that the province is on the threshold of a time of real opportunity for sustained and steady growth. Also, he was confident in stating that we are now in a position where we can look forward to somewhat more rapid economic growth in the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba enjoys every requirement for economic growth in the future. It was reassuring to me when the Budget did not include any general tax increases, this government's fourth consecutive Budget without a general increase in personal income or sales taxes. The Leader of the Official Opposition the other night stood up in this Assembly and described the First Minister of the province as an incapable leader for the government of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion any man who cannot hold together a caucus of 23 members as an Opposition and guide them to a sensible conclusion on issues pertaining to the betterment of the people of Manitoba, should step down. On second thought maybe it's better for the

people of the Province of Manitoba if he stays where he is. I can just imagine the mess he would have this province in, in a period of some four years.

He has said, Mr. Speaker, it is time to turn things around. Mr. Speaker, any government who can lower personal income tax rates, eliminate the succession duties, eliminate gift tax, increase exemption under corporate tax capital, capital tax, new exemptions under provincial sales tax, reduce small business tax, reduce taxation on mining industry in a period of 42 months is not all that bad.

I want to refer to the White Paper reforms, extension of benefits under the SAFER Program provides rental assistance to low-income families with children to people between the ages of 55 and 65 years. Child Related Income Support Program, the CRISP Program, established to assist low-income families; day-care services increased by 300 percent, \$3 million to 9 million; Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners doubles the benefit to senior citizens and extends benefits to people 55 to 65 years of age living on pensions; increased the maximum property-tax credit for senior citizens up to \$525 from \$375.00; increased the property tax \$100 to a maximum of \$475; extended benefits of the Pension School Tax Assistance Program to pensioner-tenants. Under the health policy, \$234 million is approved for health facilities constructed including more than 800 new personal care beds; \$138 million redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre; major new psychiatric facilities at the St. Boniface Hospital, Grace, Health Sciences Centre and Seven Oaks; \$4 million expansion of the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Centre; \$3.7 million for a new Cadham Provincial Laboratory; new hospitals in Carman, Selkirk, Crystal City and Snow Lake; established Manitoba Health Research Council and new first-time program of direct funding for medical research; established new Manitoba Council on Aging; new insured services under Manitoba Health Services Commission including breast prosthesis, hearing aids for children, cleft lip pilot repair, orthopedic shoes for children; adult day care for personal care homes; incentive program for rural medical practice; a 10 percent fee differential for northern doctors; increase in annual health programming budget from \$503 million in 1977 to \$771 million in 1981.

Now on general employment. Manitoba has the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada; 30,000 jobs have been created in the last three years, 28,000 of them in the private sector. Wages and salaries for the first 10 months in 1980 advanced 9.6 percent. In two years manufacturing employment increased 16.1.

The mineral policy: Withdrew from compulsory participation in exploration in mining; provided a healthy and competitive mining investment climate. Expenditures on mineral exploration in 1980 reached a new record of \$31 million, almost double the previous high of \$16.6 million reached in 1979. Mineral output rose 27.7 percent in 1980 in addition to 39.5 percent increase in 1979 to reach a record of \$833.6 million. Mineral acreage exploration was up by 58.2 percent in 1980 on top of a 45.2 percent increase shown in 1979.

Besides all that, Mr. Speaker, there were other major actions that have come to be; the five-year freeze on Hydro rates; \$50 million additional support

for education; \$40.3 million for Drought Assistance Program; increase of City of Winnipeg block grant; raised the minimum wage; taken the lead in the constitutional discussions; rewriting the family law to make it more progressive in Canada; established the Milk Prices Review.

Then of course, we have the full growth prospects for the Province of Manitoba, Versatile's expansion at \$26 million with 800 jobs to be created; Inco's exploration and development at \$30 million; Tan Jay's new \$5 million plant with 260 new jobs; CSP Foods, \$40 million rapeseed crushing plant; Bristol Aerospace has a \$4 million project with 69 new jobs; St. Lazare Potash Mining is likely to create 400 permanent jobs through a \$500 million investment; the proposed Alcan project would create 600 to 700 jobs on a \$500 million investment; Motor Coach Industries has a \$2.2 million expansion creating 178 new jobs; Kitchen Craft's \$4 million expansion creates 63 new jobs; Canada Wire and Cable's \$38 million expansion will create 35 new jobs; Bank of Montreal announced plans for a new \$7 million to \$10 million office tower; Domtar, \$5 million expansion.

Mr. Speaker, when all of this has happened in the last three-and-a-half years since this government took office I say, Sir, that we have a good record. The Leader of the Official Opposition, while debating Budget, said that Manitobans have left the province for better times. I don't doubt for one minute that we have lost some young people to Alberta, so have Ontario and other provinces across Canada, seeking the high wages that are available. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, people are returning home because they can't afford the high cost of housing and the high cost of living in Alberta.

The Leader of the Official Opposition, in his debate, stated that the Tories have the inability to start new thrusts and that they are bankrupting the province by not providing jobs. I believe that 30,000 new jobs have been created in the short three-and-a-half years that we have been in office. He also states that construction on senior citizens' homes was stopped when the PCs took office. A lot of bunk, I would suggest.

He also said, if elected to form the next government, he would stop investments on the part of private investors; and they expect to be elected while talking like that?

We have been criticized by the Opposition severely for lifting rent control. I would like to read into the record an article by Dr. Walter Block on rent control. "Manitoba praised for dropping rent controls. Manitoba and Alberta get top marks for dropping rent controls, says Dr. Walter Block, a senior economist of the Fraser Institute, an independent economics research group based in Vancouver. Citing the two provinces as being the only in Canada to terminate controlling provincial legislation, Block says extensive studies have shown such a rent limit program reduces incentives to supply new rental housing. Rent controls, he says, don't benefit anyone, especially hurt the poor who suffer most from the lack of available space. The MLAs of Alberta and Manitoba are to be congratulated for their wisdom in terminating the rent controls. The other Canadian provinces are headed for a rental housing crisis". Mr. Brock goes on to say,

"Surprisingly a low opinion of rent control is shared by all economists. Economists appear to be unanimous in their opinion about the effects of rent control. In many cases rent control appears to be the most efficient technique presently known to destroy a city except by bombing".

Mr. Speaker, in my own constituency of Portage la Prairie I received a few complaints where the tenants thought the landlords were not using them properly and I have to say there were one or two cases that turned out that way. But once these were straightened out things were running quite smoothly, at least I'm not hearing of the complaints if there are any.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer back for a moment when I mentioned the time of real opportunity for the sustained and steady growth. We are now in a position where we can look forward to a stronger economy in the next few years with renewed interest in major capital projects referred to as the mega-projects, such as Alcan's smelting company and the renewed interest in mining in the north and the recent development in the southwest corner of our province in oil exploration.

Mr. Speaker, the private sector as well as our government are showing their faith in the future of Manitoba by creating 30,000 jobs in the last three years, 28,000 of them by the private sector. The private sector has faith in the future of Portage la Prairie and area. The Imperial Oil Company is investing something like a total of \$18 million just west of Portage la Prairie. Esso Chemical Canada is constructing a Manitoba ammonia distributing centre at a cost of \$15 million just west of the existing Dry Fertilizer Distributing Centre which opened one year ago at a cost of \$3 to \$4 million. The total investment of \$18 million providing six full-time jobs and four to six seasonal jobs.

Construction jobs will peak at 90 in the month of August and September of this year. Bentall Canada Limited is the sub-contractor being the Bird Construction of Winnipeg. Esso Chemical Canada has all the necessary government approval for this important project. The Portage rural municipality will gain \$100,000 taxes annually from this finished complex. Mr. Speaker, the location is ideal as it is centred at the heart of the agriculture area of the Province of Manitoba.

It has been explained to me that this project is not just based on the market of today as the agriculture industry is going to have to produce more food than it is presently doing and to do that it is going to have to require more fertilizer. It is estimated that fertilizer use will increase 5 percent annually. Over the long run fertilizer needs will increase substantially. This company recognizes the potential in the use of this commodity in the future of agriculture. The construction on the site began in January with the facility to be completed by the end of December of this year.

Westco Storage, Mr. Speaker, while Portage la Prairie is increasingly being recognized as the strawberry centre of Manitoba and as the centre of the vegetable-producing area for the province as well as the many special crops grown in the area, special storage is of utmost importance. The Westco Storage Limited of Portage la Prairie is filling this need by constructing a total of 135,000 square feet

of combined cold and dry storage, located in the Industrial Park in Portage la Prairie. The offices and dry storage area of this \$2 million plant is in use at this time with the completion of the cold storage plant later in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I personally have faith in the future of Manitoba. I always have and I always will. It is regretful, Mr. Speaker, to hear the members of the opposition preaching doom and gloom to the people of Manitoba. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on the Budget and I am quite pleased and proud of the Budget that our Minister of Finance has brought out at this time and I'm sure he will continue in the years ahead to bring more budgets to this Legislature. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make sure that I have enough kleenex as there may be some tears shed during my speech because I really want to spend most of my time on this occasion saying good-bye to the government. This may be my last opportunity, Mr. Speaker, before the election to say good-bye and there unquestionably will be a lot of new faces in this House which can only be an improvement.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the members of the Conservative backbench will not be here after the election that will probably be held this year and of course the Ministers regardless of which ones are here, will no longer be Ministers. They may be re-elected but we will be looking at them from another perspective across the way. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, as the Holy Father says we are guaranteed at least one Minister on this side at all times.

Mr. Speaker, I think I want to begin by paying tribute to my leader who was heavily attacked by members of the Conservative side. I want to say to them that I think they are missing the boat when they continually attempt to hurl abuse at the Leader of the New Democratic party because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fact that he has grown during his period as the Leader of the Official Opposition. I think that anyone who has watched his performance in this House can say that he has made a major improvement. He has fought the issues; he's demonstrated that he can fight the issues; he's demonstrated he can stand up to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative administration and he's won some battles along the way. I think in particular, Mr. Speaker, he has to be given credit for turning around the tax credit thing, that's his most recent accomplishment. Without the prodding of our leader and the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the Member for Rossmere, etc., and our advertising program, Mr. Speaker, which we paid for out of our own pockets, some \$1,500 to place an advertisement in the Free Press; unlike our friends across the way who spent tens of thousands of dollars to put their point of view across, but they have sent the bill to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I might just say there that I find it shocking indeed that these pamphlets which are being distributed like confetti around the province, they are only one example of the abuses of this government during their period in office and I have

to say to the Finance Minister, a man who has his sights firmly set on the seat beside him and who continually looks down on the Minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course it feels good to be the First Minister of any province.

Mr. Speaker, there is a coup d'etat in the making this evening — there are at least two candidates there who are vying for the leadership and I will speak of them later — but I have to say to the Finance Minister that his decision to write letters to all civil servants was a new low in Manitoba political history. Mr. Speaker, to send everybody in the Civil Service a letter saying that the New Democratic party is responsible for holding up your paycheck surely, Mr. Speaker, that is unprecedented in Manitoba history. In school days it would have been called either an outright lie or it would have been called being a tattletale. Now I'm not sure which one the Honourable Minister really believes in but I can tell him that a lot of people who received this pamphlet, I know, didn't read it because I asked some of them and a lot of them just fired it into the ash can when it came to their door.

So I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government is desperate and I also want to say that I think there could be the following prospect that the government is worried about continuing support from the business community and can no longer count upon the businessmen of Manitoba, whether they're small or large, for funding and for support because of the fact that the economy is so rotten in Manitoba and because of the fact that they have to take the blame for that state of affairs. So maybe what they are attempting to do is to head off the possibility of dried-up election funds and a war chest that's largely empty and they are spending money now as fast as they can, while they have access to it. So they've spent money on those letters; they have spent money on the SAFER adds; they've spent money on the Economic Development Program of the Minister of Economic Development, \$62,000 there; they've spent \$40,000 on this pamphlet and how much are they going to spend tomorrow when we pick up the Winnipeg Free Press and see a full-page add with all the pictures of all the Premiers and paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba?

Now, I find that very very peculiar indeed and I'm sure that if you added that up — I don't know how much the total would be, I see at \$150,000 there — I would hazard a guess and say that it's between \$150,000 and \$250,000 spent in the last 12 months to publicize programs and attitudes, Mr. Speaker, of the government. It's one thing to advertise a program — the case could be made for the fact that a program is information and the information must be disseminated to the people of Manitoba — but surely an attitude or a posture cannot be struck and then billed to the taxpayers, like this constitutional pamphlet. They are afraid to bring in their resolution; they've blown the ballgame —(Interjection)— well, I will criticize him too. I will say to my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake, that I will not be supporting the Prime Minister of Canada either. But I'll tell you this, the people of Manitoba are going to do the following. The people of Manitoba are not going to get fooled and vote for the Lyon Government in order to get rid of the Trudeau Government, Mr. Speaker. They have two

assignments before them; get rid of the Liberals in Ottawa and get rid of the Conservatives in Manitoba. That is the assignment.

The Conservatives are going to try to dupe the average voter in the following way, they're going to say the way to get rid of Trudeau is to vote for Lyon. Isn't that the technique? They want to say, if you are against Trudeau, you should support Sterling Lyon. Mr. Speaker, that is a cockeyed logic but it is the logic of the government. It's the constitutional smokescreen, the idea being that they best represent the people of Manitoba in their fight with Trudeau. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba have to look at the constitutional question and they have to look at the issue of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said neither that constitutional smokescreen which they are going to put up or the old red smear which we are hearing all the time in this Chamber, is going to work. We heard it today; I heard it this afternoon. Who were they spouting that line against? Well, it was the Minister of Agriculture of course, the Minister of Agriculture, the old stuff that he gives them back home there, he stands on a mound or a heap, or the back of a truck and — (Interjection)— well, I don't know agricultural jargon, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to get into that earthy stuff; but the old red smear, that's what we heard from the Minister of Agriculture.

The Minister of Fitness when he spoke that's what he dealt with, it was the old red smear. I can see the Minister of Natural Resources, of freedom fighters and all this stuff, free enterprise versus socialism, that's going to be the debate, isn't it? That's going to be the Tory line in the next election. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point; they're not going to say as much about the Constitution now as they would have a month ago. They blew the constitutional question in Manitoba. They had a resolution on the Order Paper; they thought that they could embarrass the New Democratic Party — maybe they could have, maybe they couldn't have — but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, you know what happened? Joe Clark, Ed Broadbent and the Prime Minister came to an understanding in Ottawa and because of that it has pulled the rug from under the feet of the Premier of Manitoba and, to a certain extent, from all the Premiers that are associated with him. They blew their opportunity; they had an opportunity to attempt to focus on the fact that our federal leader and ourselves had a divergent opinion and the fact that the Saskatchewan group had another independent position. If they had put their resolution at one time perhaps they could have scored some points. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? They blew it. If they put that particular motion now all the electricity and all the explosive effect of that has gone out of it because their own leader, Joe Clark, has shut off an option to them. As I said to the First Minister today, they can to us that we have a different position than our federal leader and that is generally so. But we can say to them that they have a position different than their federal leader and two of the Premiers of Canada, so that argument as it used to be said by one Sidney Spivak in this Chamber, "it won't wash." That was the expression, "it won't wash". They say time and again to us that they are concerned about the constitutional question and why don't we back them

and didn't all the other provinces of Canada send out literature and pass resolutions in their particular House. (Interjection)— Well, they had discussions; they put their resolutions. But this First Minister freaked out, Mr. Speaker, chickened out and waited too long, blew his opportunity and now there's a resolution which, as my colleague for Logan says, it's a fait accompli, it's finished. (Interjection)— Well, it's French, if you could ask for the translation the Clerk will forward it.

Mr. Speaker, I say that when the Tories are having their banquets, when they are holding their banquets to raise funds in the next election, I want to tell you that the menu better be roast chicken because that really is the performance of the Conservative party in Manitoba. They chickened out on the Constitutional question and they struck out on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few minutes about the performance of the First Minister of this province because I say and, of course, I'm biased so one may discount some of my comments. I say that my leader in the past year in the judgment of people who are objective has grown and has made improvements in his ability. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister of Manitoba has disintegrated and is an embarrassment to the people of Manitoba as Prime Minister of this particular province. I ask you to look at his performance on the constitutional question and on the way he behaves in this House and on the way he deals with the burning issues of the Manitoba economy.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that today the Ontario Legislature opened and Bill Davis, who is a pretty shrewd operator and a man who is carrying on a 38-year tradition in the Province of Ontario, he said in the Throne Speech, "Let us not spend too much time on the constitutional question before the country; let us spend a lot of time on the problems facing Ontario, the economy, etc." Now I would like to have seen that kind of statement and that kind of a posture coming out of this government but it didn't. Mr. Speaker, I'm being unnerved, as I keep looking across, I'm looking at the Finance Minister sitting there where he hopes to be sitting five years from now and I've predicted that he may be sitting there but I find it unsettling to see him actually sitting there because it's like a nightmare or a dream, a dream come true. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, remember I came third in our leadership contest. I also say this, if you are going to lose, whether it's by one vote or 10,000, if you're going to come second you may as well come third. There's no consolation in being a close runner-up, I want to point that out.

I want to say that I met a gentleman not too long ago in my own constituency, a very fine gentleman, 80 years old. He was a candidate for the CCF in Saskatchewan in 1945 — and I think there was a federal election in '45 — and he lost the federal riding by two votes. So I just want to say there is no consolation in that. Some of the other people here who ran for the leadership a number of years ago in the Conservative party and my friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, finished second but, you know, there's no consolation in that; you've either got to win or you're going to lose, one or the other; there is no point in coming a close second.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think that the First Minister of this province has lost a lot of yards

in the last few months. I'll give you an example, every time he poor-mouths the Leader of the New Democratic party or members on this side he loses yards. I'll give you an example: I was talking to a lady the other day who may or may not be a Liberal, she certainly isn't a New Democrat, certainly isn't a Conservative. She said that when she heard the First Minister say to the Leader of the official Opposition that he could politely go to hell, she said that's it, I'd never ever again consider voting for that man. You know, that kind of language doesn't go over too well in the general public, nor does all this stuff about serpentine, wriggling, weaseling, oiling, squirming and all of that stuff, Mr. Speaker. Those I think are —(Interjection)— no, no, no. That's turpentine, turpentine. Mr. Speaker, you can always tell a used-car dealer, he doesn't know anything about paint.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that the comments of the First Minister in this House and I want to say this, that I have watched, that I do not profess to be a psychologist, I studied a lot of philosophy in my university days, but I have watched the faces of the Conservative government over the past few weeks over the question of Hydro; over the case of the pamphlets; over the handling of the economy and I have seen a bunch of dejected and broken-spirited members on that side of the House. Although we're used to seeing the Minister of Economic Development with his beet-red face every day of the week, I've noticed that the First Minister's colour has turned pink or medium rare every day that we've been in this House for the last three or four days. His nerves are not very good because his performance —(Interjection)— well, the Minister of Finance, he's in the red in the sense that he's brought in a red-ink Budget and he'll have to answer to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the language of the First Minister — the other day he said something which escaped most people but it sure didn't escape my attention — on the front page of the Free Press he referred to Trudeau as using a big lie. I know what the big lie is. The big lie is what was said about Hitler. That is the jargon that was used in the Second World War about certain propaganda tactics, and that is simply an example of the language that is used all too frequently by the First Minister. So I say that if we had a Prime Minister who might have been thought of as the "fuddle-duddle Prime Minister" because of his language, I think we have a Premier who can be considered the fuddle-duddle Premier because of his consistent use and his consistent manifestation of behaviour which is not appropriate in my judgment, to a Premier of the province. I say that based on watching Premiers perform in the Manitoba Legislature since 1966 — and some of us have been here that long, some have been here even longer — but some of my colleagues will remember the days when Duff Roblin was Premier and how he handled himself, his demeanor in the House; or Walter Weir who was a gentleman; or Premier Schreyer, and how that compares to the performance of the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say I think that the First Minister has made a fundamental error in judgment by allying himself with people that he should not be supporting, or as the all-too-often expression in this House goes, "is in bed with", and

that is of course, Premier Levesque who is a separatist from the East; and Premier Lougheed who is a rich oil man or "sheik" from Western Canada.

The position of the Manitoba Government and the Province of Manitoba should not be in association with those particular points of view; with the historic viewpoint of Quebec, that is not the historic ground of Manitoba; or with the oil-rich position of Peter Lougheed and the rich oil companies, that is not Manitoba's best interest.

Manitoba's historic interest and Manitoba's historic position has been to support a redistribution of national revenues and to show some moderation and some middle-of-the-road judgment. That has been the position of every Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, for the past 100 years and only in the last three years has there been a reversal of that particular position. That is a surprising thing. I say to members opposite, study your history, look up the record of the Campbell administration, the Schreyer administration, the Roblin, Weir administrations, and you will see that they tended to be in the moderate part of the spectrum, as opposed to the extreme right or the extreme left. I see some of the members opposite of course concur with that particular viewpoint.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is a fundamental error on the part of our Premier to have adopted that position and if it isn't a fact that the Premier of Quebec and the Premier of Manitoba got together and torpedoed that agreement, then it surely is a fact that each man stood separately, adamantly against the Charter of Rights. So it's either a coincidence, or they didn't have any communication, they simply were on the same wave length and as a result they could block either deliberately or from different reasons, from different angles, from different perspectives, any possible agreement that would have elicited some wider support.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm going to have to wrap up here and simply say good-bye to a few of the Ministers. As I said the election is any time now, between now and October, and I want to say to the Minister of Finance — I don't know where he went — but one of my colleagues already said that he used to be called the rifleman, and that if he was the rifleman, he certainly missed the target — (Interjection)— the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to inform the honourable member, I misread my figures. He has 15 minutes left.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that's what I thought. I hate long good-byes. But I believe in you so much, Mr. Speaker, that I just took it on faith that your judgment was correct.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the Minister of Finance that as one of my colleagues said, if he's the rifleman then he shot himself in the foot. I only say in that regard, thank God he didn't have a sawed-off shotgun or there could have been worse damage as a result of that Budget and the performance of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the Cabinet, I don't think too much can be said about them. The Minister of Energy, the Deputy Premier I think is in very serious hot water in this Chamber, and I think that when that whole Hydro thing unravels — and I leave it to my

colleague to dig up the information — that his reputation is going to completely collapse in this particular Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture I want to say that I look forward to the time in the next few weeks, for him to stand on his own feet. I think it's one of the low points of this legislative session that he has had to have served up so many soft questions. I cannot recall, Mr. Speaker, any Minister in this House having so many questions put to him from backbenchers. I don't remember that sort of day-to-day occurrence. —(Interjection)— A sign of weakness. You mean the backbenchers should be putting questions to the Ministers. But I say it's a sign of weakness on the Minister's part for him to have to have questions, collusion between the back bench and the front bench on an ongoing basis in an attempt to make the Ministers look good.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say also to the Minister of Highways, who is affectionately known as pothole on that side of the Chamber, that we cannot predict a bright future for him; that I know that there are those in the party in Pembina who think that he's a real comer in the party. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't predict a bright future for the Minister. We predict a re-election, predict his re-election, and that he will be a very aggressive member in opposition and a backbencher of note in this particular Chamber.

But, Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Rock Lake may be back but the Member for Emerson won't, that much I know, that he's going to be one of those that bites the dust. And the Member for St. Matthews he won't be back. One of those two Ministers won't be back, either the Minister of Natural Resources or the Minister of Education, one of them will lose the nomination fight. I assume there's going to be a nomination fight. No, I don't see any response from the Minister of Natural Resources. He normally blinks or winks but, Mr. Speaker, he's doing neither so we can't tell what his particular prediction is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this prediction and what I say will not be enthusiastically received by the other political parties but I want to say that in the next election I want to make the following predictions: that the Liberals will have either zero or one seat, that's a safe prediction; that the Progressives will have either zero or one seat; that the New Democratic party will have between 32 and 35 seats and that the Progressive Conservatives will therefore have the remainder which in one case might be 22 seats or 25 seats, and could be as low as 20. But our assessment and my assessment is that the government will lose 10 to 12 seats in the next election. They know that, Mr. Speaker, and that is why they're not going for an election right now. Do you know what? They're making a mistake because they're going to wait and wait and wait and wait and all of a sudden it's going to be too late. I know that as a member of the government in '77 some of our people wanted to go in June and some said let's wait things will get better or things will pick up because when you're not sure, when you're a little uneasy you always wait a little longer in the hope that something may happen. But what happened in the last month? Things didn't get better for the Conservative government; they got worse. Now they're going to hang a lot of this stuff. They've blown the

constitutional issue; they can't rely on that any more; they're going to have to hope that everything can ride on Alcan.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say two small things about that because I think this is a major issue that we will have to look at very carefully. I just want to say that I am pleased that a reputable company like Alcan is seriously considering coming to Manitoba. I'm in favour of that. But I want to say that we must be very careful and cautious about any agreement signed with a corporation, be they reputable like Alcan or the other case that we all remember only too well, that gang from CFI that came into Manitoba and stole \$20 million or \$30 million or \$40 million — (Interjection)— well some say 50 or 60, from Manitoba. We all remember how the Tories in those days fought the election on that and we all remember how that turned sour.

So all I'm saying is ladies and gentlemen let us be careful of the agreement made with Alcan or with anybody else.

The other thing . . .

A MEMBER: We will.

MR. DOERN: . . . My colleague gives me his assurance that he will be vigilant in terms of that agreement so I at least have that particular satisfaction.

I also want to say this, Mr. Speaker, about long agreements. I'm interested in the CPR Agreement which I think should be reopened.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are you sure it's not fifteen?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the honourable member I'm sure.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, so I say that on the CPR, which I intend to deal with on another opportunity, that was a 100 . . . No, it wasn't even a 100-year agreement, it was in perpetuity; it was "forever". Of course after about 5, 10, 15, 20 years people got very nervous about that agreement and they started pressuring the CPR as early as 1906 and 1912. Then of course it was not until 75 years later where they were able to do something about that agreement. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, you can't see down the road 50 or 75 or 100 years so I'm nervous about the fact that we're talking about 35 years and two 15-year renewals. We have to be very cautious because none of us are going to be around when that agreement runs out and very few of us are going to be around in 35 years when the first — well the Minister of Health, he'll be around providing he quits smoking, otherwise I'm not going to guarantee him that either.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's much more that could be said. I wanted to read comments made in the Free Press by Frances Russell who brought out the discrepancies in the present Budget, who brought out the discrepancies in the Budgets in '78 and '79 and '80 by the Conservative party and what they promised and so on, or Arlene Billinkoff a fine reporter who also gave several interesting quotes

from earlier budgets. (Interjection)— I don't have his column here.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the Conservative party in '77 promised the people of Manitoba balanced budgets. They promised balanced budgets, no more deficits, no more debts, no more interest payments that are killing every man, woman and child.

MR. WALDING: Scouts honour.

MR. DOERN: Scouts honour. So they promised that and then they have the nerve to bring in \$100 million and \$200 million deficits, Mr. Speaker. I tell you that I don't ever want to hear from a Conservative, from now on, ever again say that they believe in fiscal responsibility and I don't ever want to hear a Conservative, at any time, say that they believe in balanced Budgets because their record has demonstrated that they don't and I say that they have no right to make those claims any more.

So, I'll simply wind up in a sentence or two, Mr. Speaker, and say that the government in my judgement is running scared; that the government is desperate and will do anything to stay in power, whether it's spend money on advertising that's questionable. They are afraid to call an election because they are not sure that they can be returned to power. I simply say to them that they've had their turn in office, they made their promises and one of the things that we're going to do in the next election campaign, that I'm going to do, is we're going to take all of their promises and all of their record and make the comparison. The result, Mr. Speaker, will be that the public of Manitoba will see that there is a credibility gap, they'll turf these people out of office and re-elect the New Democrats some time in 1981.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, one hesitates to intrude on the mood of the Chamber after that moving farewell from the Member for Elmwood which was delivered of course in sepulchral and august tones and which has certainly set a standard of debate in this Chamber in this current debate on the Budget Address and Budget Motion that the rest of us are going to have extreme difficulty in meeting. But having set that tone, having moved his farewell, having moved the Chamber with the honesty and candor and richness of language to which he has just treated us, Mr. Speaker, we'll do our best. I approach the task with trepidation but I wanted to participate in this debate and I will certainly do my best to meet that standard.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member for Elmwood talks about looking across at this side of the Chamber and noticing a picture or a representation of dejection, that one must come to the conclusion that he never got out of the member's lounge and never got past the mirrors on the wall, because for him to be able to bring himself to the conclusion that that has been the mood on this side of the Chamber throughout this session, much less throughout the last few pitiful days of fumbling and ineptness by his leader and his caucus, is simply beyond comprehension, Mr. Speaker; I would suggest it's also beyond demonstration.

On Monday afternoon, less than 24 hours ago we had a vote in this Chamber on a motion to which a number of members had addressed themselves with considerable sincerity and depth of feeling and if the record in Votes and Proceedings is correct and if my memory serves, I think the vote represented a government attendance and participation numbering 31, which includes everybody in the government caucus with the exception of the Honourable Mr. Speaker, who of course was not called upon to cast a ballot in that vote; the number on the other side totalled 18, Mr. Speaker, of which one was the lone Liberal member of the Chamber and three were the members of the New Progressive party. So that we come down to a participation on an issue on which they had expressed righteous indignation, if contrived indignation, and in which 14 members of their caucus of 20 participated, as against all 31 eligible members of the government caucus.

So, I think that that demonstration, which is on the record, Mr. Speaker, adequately deals with the assertion or the assumption by the Member for Elmwood that there is some lack of enthusiasm, cohesion and support for the position taken by our leader and our Premier and the Premier of this province throughout the debate that lead up to that vote, throughout all the events that have occurred and had been at the centre of debates in this session of the Legislature or throughout the events in this province for the past three-and-a-half years.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes. My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that we have always been cautioned by the Chair that we should not reflect upon the attendance or non-attendance of members in this House. Now, if that is the case that we will then I think that in the future we too, on this side, will indicate when a member is absent without questioning the reason why. I believe there are a number of reasons why members are absent from this Chamber. It has been indicated they have constituency works, some are ill and some have other appointments and they may not necessarily be able to be present at any particular time. Now the Ministers themselves very often have commitments and that creates an absence from this Chamber, and if we're going to use that as part of the debate I think it should be allowed for both sides. Now if it isn't allowed then I would ask the Honourable Minister to take that back and not utilize it in his debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the Honourable Member for Kildonan on his point of order; well taken. It has not been general practice to make reference to members who are absent; but also to the Honourable Member for Kildonan threatening to take such action as that we will do the same thing is strictly out of order also.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker since you've dealt with the point of order I won't comment on it. I certainly was prepared to because I think that it again is a contrived and a phony argument raised by

the Opposition. We've had a number of examples of that. The fact of the matter is the Member for Elmwood made comments bearing upon the cohesion and the unity of this party and its enthusiasm for, and support for, its leader and referred to what he interpreted as a look of dejection on the part of some members on this side of the House. I say when it was put to the test, Mr. Speaker, the government demonstrated its solidarity, its unity, and its enthusiasm for the position of its leader and that particular issue was one in which members opposite had professed righteous indignation; it wasn't we who professed righteous indignation about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood has also suggested that he doesn't want to hear again from anybody on this side of the House that we believe in fiscal responsibility. Well, I want to assure him that that hope is short lived because I tell him, four or five minutes after he concluded speaking and making that plea, that I believe in fiscal responsibility; my Premier believes and has demonstrated that he believes in fiscal responsibility; my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has demonstrated that; and every member of the government since October, 1977 has demonstrated it and will continue to demonstrate it. And that's what's at the nub of the Budget introduced by my colleague on Tuesday the 14th in this House; fiscal responsibility, accountability, reality and honesty, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the facts of life, not only in Manitoba, not only in Western Canada but in Canada, North America, the western world and indeed the whole world today; that is what is at the nub of the message delivered by my colleague.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the Budget debate and to lend my voice to the general expression of enthusiasm and support coming from benches all around this Chamber for the Budget Address and Motion brought into this House on April 14th by the Minister of Finance.

I want to compliment my colleague on his first Budget and on a clear-sighted and farsighted approach to the actualities in Manitoba today and the potential that Manitoba and Manitobans enjoy. It was a Budget that not only took into account the fiscal needs that all Canadians must face up to, not the least of them Manitobans, but took into account the social aspirations, ambitions and potentials of the people of Manitoba who have built a great province and who will build a greater one, notwithstanding the efforts of many members opposite and many of their followers and many others in the public who sympathize, for one misguided reason or another, with some of the arguments advanced by the official Opposition; notwithstanding the efforts of those to attempt to portray the Province of Manitoba as a jurisdiction being in difficulty for the sake, for the sake, Sir, of manufacturing a political issue, for the sake of political opportunism and for the sake of nothing less cynical than that.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have made considerable of one comment that was made in the House by my leader, the Premier, with respect to one of the recent issues before us and some of the nattering and nitpicking that was foisted upon the Chamber for a number of days by the Leader of the

Opposition when the Premier and the leader of this party in this province said in a, I thought, very gentle way, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless in a manner that certainly reflected the kinds of good natured banter and sometimes competitive banter that accompanies debate in this House, when he advised the Leader of the Opposition that he could politely go to hell. Now, the members opposite, and the Leader of the Opposition has been one of them, and the Member for Elmwood has been a recent one, have professed outrage at that kind of language and that kind of terminology, Mr. Speaker. What a sham that is, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition stood in this House on April 15 replying to the Budget Motion, replying to the Budget Address, and deplored what he called the erosion of civility in politics and in this House and he went on to blame the First Minister for that. He said the First Minister is the one who has insulted the people of this province by several of his expressions and he's responsible for the erosion of civility in politics and in this House.

Well, Mr. Speaker I refuse to let that kind of accusation stand on the record unchallenged or to let members opposite go unreminded of the fact that many of us sat in this Chamber, in different seats admittedly, when the former Leader of the New Democratic party, who was the Premier of the province at that time, told a colleague of mine, now the Minister of Energy and Mines, standing in the Premiers, the First Minister's spot in this House, told a colleague of mine what he thought of him in words to the following actual, on the record, effect "I puke on your head", he said to that member, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, through their leader of this day, complain about the erosion of civility in this Chamber when the present Premier comments to the Leader of the Opposition that on an issue in which he has had no case, no grounds, other than the disruption and the interference with the processes and the business of this House, to politely go to hell. And they stand in their places again in righteous contrived indignation and complain about civility in this House and civility in politics. Mr. Speaker, what a sham, what a farce. There are unparliamentary words that can be attached to that kind of performance and everybody in this Chamber knows what they are. They simply, Mr. Speaker, are scandalously insupportable accusations coming from members of that party who have spoken out through their leadership in language such as I have referred to in previous debates in this House, so let us not deplore what the First Minister of Manitoba circa 1977 has done to civility in this Chamber. Civility in this Chamber was injured and damaged long ago in those terms, Mr. Speaker, and not by the Premier of this day.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition also in his remarks the other day described the Budget as full of fillers and said that he was trying to be modest in his criticism of it. Well we were grateful that he was in character in that respect, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that the Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't have to try very hard to be modest about the Budget Address or to be modest about any other event in this Chamber or in this province, he comes by it naturally. As Churchill said of Attlee, he's a modest little man with a good deal to be modest about and

that is the highest political accolade that one can pay the Member for Selkirk and I wish he were in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm sure that the Member for St. Johns will pass it on and I hope that he will.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition on the Budget, one is absolutely assaulted by incomprehension. How the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues could move the proposed amendments to the main Budget motion escapes me and I think would defy the credulity of every reasonable thinking person in this Chamber.

The motion talks about the lack of significant new programs and ignoring serious problems faced by farmers, northerners, working men and women and breaking faith with Manitobans by projecting the largest ever Manitoba deficit. Mr. Speaker, the record of this government and the record detailed by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Address the other evening flies in the factual face of all those artificial criticisms that have been ineptly welded together by the Opposition to make a case for a Budget Debate at all. One doesn't have to look very far over the record of the present government and individual departments of this government to be struck very vividly by the fact that none of the points that the Opposition attempts to make in that amendment — in the various clauses of that amendment — stand up under scrutiny. To talk about the failure to introduce any significant new programs, Mr. Speaker, would indicate to anyone who has spent any time in this Chamber in the last three-and-a-half years that the writer, the creator of that amendment sat here with his eyes closed and his ears plugged and with a stubborn refusal in his mind to read, observe or participate in anything that has taken place in Manitoba since October, 1977.

One can look just for individual and singular example, Mr. Speaker, at the kinds of things detailed at some length within the last few hours in this Chamber by the Minister of Labour and Manpower; the Minister who represents the Northern constituency of Thompson and the introduction of programs in his department ranging from Workplace Health and Safety Programs — the first effective, meaningful, real programs of that nature that have ever existed in this province — through to programs aimed at meeting critical skill shortages, in meeting vocational counselling needs, in meeting fire prevention and protection programs, in meeting the special needs of women, in meeting the needs of recent immigrants to the province and one could go on and on; that is one department, one Minister.

That doesn't speak to the range of new programs that have been introduced in my department, the Department of Health, in the Department of Community Services, in the Department of Economic Development, in the Department of Cultural Affairs, in the Mineral and Energy field, in the Department of Fitness Recreation and Amateur Sport, in the Departments of Highways and Agriculture, in the Department of Education — \$70 million additional support for public school education — the first meaningful creative move to assist separate schools, aid separate and private school education in this province's history, over and above that \$70 million additional support grant, in fact, Sir, in the whole

spectrum of government departments, in the whole spectrum of government business.

So the amendment moved by the Opposition through the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, speaks to a non-existent wonderland world, a fictionalized world, created by the Opposition in a desperate search for some reason to debate, for some reason to prolong the business of this Legislature and for some reason to justify their existence and their present leadership. It simply will not withstand honest, decent, realistic scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance on the 14th cited the history and the record of this government in terms of its introduction of a range of important program improvements that have been achieved and will be achieved in 1981-82 without a general tax increase despite the fact that all around us we have provinces, states and other jurisdictions finding it necessary to increase taxes in a major way in their budgets this year.

We have before us, Sir, a Budget that addresses the realities of today's world and the tomorrow that is on the threshold, the immediate frontier for Manitoba and Manitobans as I've said in both a fiscal and a social sense and does it without excuses, without rationalizations, without sugar-coated preachments and fictions such as we got for many years under the previous administration when we lived in an artificial atmosphere of purported success and progress, which carried with it the ultimate day of reckoning which we faced and Manitobans faced in 1976 and 1977, and which led to the turnaround in terms of governmental responsibility in October, 1977, and which also reflects a more acceptable and amenable and creates a more acceptable and amenable 1981-82 climate for the residents of this province than is the case in many of our neighbours to east, to west and to south.

There are hard economic realities all around us, Mr. Speaker, something which the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues refuse to face in other than philosophical and doctrinaire terms, refuse to face in realistic terms. They refuse to look at other provinces around us who have brought down budgets this year that call for in many cases major deficits, far out-weighting the one that is projected by this government, including the projected deficit brought in by the Province of Alberta. They refuse to look at what's happening in states immediately to the south of us.

Only a few days ago, the Governor of Minnesota took steps and measures to reduce the projected deficit for 1981-82 in the State of Minnesota that called for reductions in services which, if even hinted at in Manitoba, would set that pack across the way, Sir, howling, screaming and protesting about cruelty and arrogance in a crescendo, the likes of which we haven't heard yet. The refusal to face those realities of what's happening around us and to be honest and creative and positive enough to say that this Finance Minister has done that, has done that without attempting to perform any slight of hand or any fiction and has done that by looking to the great resource that Manitoba has demonstrably always had in putting his faith and asking all of us to put our faith in that resource and that is, the will, the enterprise and the willingness of our people, is a sad

sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the party opposite, the New Democratic party and its caucus and its place in politics in Manitoba today. A sad commentary.

If I were a supporter of the NDP I'd be sick at heart today, Mr. Speaker. I'd be sick at heart. You look over at that disorganized, perpetual state of yesterday morning I would say, Mr. Speaker, look over at that disorganized, dispirited bunch over there, that collection of so-called Socialists, once proud of their name, purporting to carry the colours of their party. Mr. Speaker, one is tempted to recall the glory days and ask where the glory days are gone on those benches yonder. Where are the glorious old campaigners, Sir, waving their red banners of solidarity? They are not there any more; they don't show any more. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there is no solidarity there any more.

MR. ENNS: What about the one who hangs in the museum, Bud, that you hung there a long time ago?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, he's still there. We haven't taken that one down yet. Mr. Speaker, the poet asked where are the snows of yesteryear and one may well apply that appellation with only some breach of poetic honesty to the benches opposite. I ask it plaintively, Mr. Speaker, where are the old Socialist firebrands of yesteryear? Where are the purple fulminations of the former Minister of Labour, the Member for Transcona, Mr. Speaker? The purple heart's gone, gone, never to return. Where are the irreverent icon-smashing speeches of the former Minister of Highways, the Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker? Disappeared, vanished, a sad commentary on the political affairs of this province. Where are the agonizing self-lacerating confessions of the Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Speaker? We've heard none of them, none of them, for months in this Chamber.

Remember the outrageous radicalism of the former Member for Crescentwood, Mr. Speaker? Where is that fierce Marxist radicalism gone today in benches yonder? One might even ask for that matter, Mr. Speaker, where is the outrageous radicalism and authoritarianism of the Member for Inkster? Where is it now, Mr. Speaker? Although we did see a little flash of it the other day when he moved his subamendment on the main motion and a few of the old flashes crept through but he's very careful to disguise them. He keeps it pretty well under cover today, Mr. Speaker. He's going straight these days — or he's trying to anyway — but he's a little like an old safecracker, Mr. Speaker, and his fingers obviously still twitch and tingle every time he sees the political equivalent of a dial on a safe in the free enterprise shop and you could see that coming through, Mr. Speaker.

Where are all those great thundering reprobates and radicals and thundering voices of destruction and thundering voices of the new Jerusalem? I despair and I deplore their departure, Mr. Speaker.

It used to be fun to battle the socialist hordes opposite. Today they're tired and tattered and shuffling about and mediocre like a collection of accidents looking for a place to happen. As for leadership, they don't have a leader, they have a lost leader, Mr. Speaker. Gone, all gone. A sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, replaced by that faceless, nameless gang of mediocrities. I must say that if it

brings a wrench to the heart of Conservatives and Tories in this Chamber, it certainly must bring a desperate pang, a desperate spear and thrust of agony and sadness to the old socialist hearts in this province today. We hear from one or two of them every once in awhile. We do indeed, Mr. Speaker, hear from a few of them, but they were wiser than we knew perhaps and they took to the hills because they saw it coming.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that we don't need any —(Interjection)— I'm nearly out of time, Mr. Speaker. Let me conclude by saying — and I know that I'm really supposed to be speaking to the subamendment but when I get up to speak on the amendment, I will then perhaps speak on the subamendment, Sir, because I really have addressed most of my remarks to the amendment up to this point in time — but let me say that the subamendment at least has the saving grace if one reads it, one does catch flashes and suggestions and implications again of that old doctrine that has been preached by the Member for Inkster and many of his colleagues for so long, and it has got that saving grace; it's doctrinaire at least, whereas the amendment is simply nonsense, Mr. Speaker, simply nonsense. It misses the point of what's been happening in this province and what has been reflected in the Budget introduced by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, by not one country mile, Mr. Speaker, but by the breadth of this great province. So that I do acknowledge at this juncture, that there could be a debate of some stimulus and some interest, perhaps conducted on some of the points recorded in the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster but it would be a philosophical debate; it would be abstract because as I say, it's based purely on doctrine and doctrine of the past, a creed outworn, but nonetheless it's recognizable. There is nothing recognizable, nothing representative of what's been happening in Manitoba in the amendment moved by members opposite. I would think that they would be dismally disappointed in the pitiful efforts — and I presume they were largely collective efforts because I wouldn't think the Leader of the Opposition would be capable of doing it on his own, Mr. Speaker — largely collective efforts to put that pusillanimous motion together, that pusillanimous amendment together.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the great purpose that this debate serves is the purpose for members on this side of the House to speak again as is so necessary unfortunately, to speak again of the greatness of Manitoba, of what Manitoba is, what it's got, who we are, where we come from and where we're going. We are not dismayed by the kind of desperate, negative, niggling, socialist, political, inept opportunism that is expressed and articulated in the speeches made in this Chamber by members opposite, and outside this Chamber by members opposite, and represented in this weak-kneed, lily-livered, trembling, fumbling, inaccurate, misguided amendment to our motion. (Interjection)— Or as my colleague the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources says or said in another way, this piece of nonsense attached to the motion moved by my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

So, Sir, let us just rejoice for a moment in the strength of Manitoba as represented through the

programs introduced by this government under the Premier, my leader, the Honourable First Minister of this Province, and articulated and shaped and honed by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, into a fine document of social and fiscal consciousness which sets out the parameters in which we will operate and move this province forward, and demonstrate that although Manitoba certainly enjoys a place in the Canadian sun, it's nothing to the place in the Canadian sun to which we aspire and which we will enjoy in the years immediately ahead.

We will not be detracted and deterred and dismayed by the feeble efforts opposite, Sir, to divert the attention of Manitobans or this government from the purpose at hand, and to focus argument and debate and business and time and energy on contrived issues which take the place of real issues, and take the place of principle. That has been the record of that Opposition since it went into Opposition. It has certainly outdone itself in this session, Mr. Speaker. We thought they were bad in 1978, 1979 and 1980 but, Mr. Speaker, we hadn't seen anything to the ineptitude that has been represented and been reflected in those members opposite this time round, a fragmented, fractured caucus, split in 20 directions — and it would be split in 23 except three of them left — on virtually every issue and the constitutional question is only one of them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us get on with the business of Manitoba as defined by the Budget brought in by the Minister of Finance and save the people of Manitoba from too many of these diversionary tactics contrived and orchestrated by an Opposition that has no issues on which to attack this government, no issues on which to go to the people. They're fumbling and grasping for issues. They've contrived a few. All Manitobans of good will and good sense see through them, Mr. Speaker. The Budget sets out the course for Manitobans. It certainly will have the support of the majority of Manitobans and there should be no doubt about that in the retiring mind — not the shy and retiring mind, the arrogant mind — but the retiring mind in the professional sense of the Member for St. Johns, Mr. Speaker, or the minds of any other members opposite. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if it will be possible to call it 10:00 o'clock. If this is the case, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the debate will be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.