

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 30, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

## BILL 7 — INTERIM SUPPLY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has two minutes left.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I thought my time had expired; I just wanted to catch your eye to correct the record because in looking around during my remarks prior to the supper hour, I had said that there were no new members present. That wasn't entirely correct; the member for Radisson, for example, was here, and a number of others.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few remarks in the debate to deal with the speech made by the Minister of Finance, and then in my latter comments to deal with the ringing speech of the First Minister, and it was sort of nice to have him back because it's been a long time since we heard him speak like that. It seems to me we would have to go back to the late sixties to have heard one of those outpourings.

I wanted to take a look at a few of the comments made by the Minister of Finance in his remarks because I think that when he introduced the estimates he made several statements which were very serious in terms of their inaccuracy. It was quite amusing to see the kind of language used by the Minister of Finance in relation to the fact that they had now decided to combine the current account and the capital account. If you listen to his remarks, and if you read his speech, you can see that there are all sorts of important reasons for doing this. For instance, he said that the previous system was arbitrary and unsatisfactory, and then he probably pointed out how the Auditor had called for this and this was a superior means of putting together the financial statements of the government and an important step towards greater accountability.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, he was — and I'm glad the Minister is here — he was a member of the Roblin government. It was his government that introduced that method of accounting, and I think that we can go with either one, we can go either way; we can either have combined accounts, or separate accounts, that is not the issue.

But what was the intent? What was the intent of the Minister and the government? It was to make it look as bad as possible. It wasn't good enough to have a deficit on current account; that wouldn't look too good, Mr. Speaker, just \$100 million or \$50 million, whatever the figure might be, but it would have to be sort of put in the worst possible light and coloured in a manner so that it looked as bad as it possibly could in terms of the previous administration.

And then when you look at how they arrived at the magic figure of 2.9, that is another example of a misleading figure. I would submit that the real figure is 3.8. Maybe more. Maybe it will be more as we go along and as the supplementary, special warrants, and so on, are introduced into this House. As the government retreats from some of its more ridiculous postures. I say that the 2.9 figure is erroneous, misleading and that we should really be talking about a 3.8 or approximately 4 percent increase. Because they got the figure by taking an increase on the current account and then taking \$10.4 million off of capital. So it was a plus in one department followed by a minus in another and as a result you got a lower figure.

**MR. CRAIK:** It says 3.8.

**MR. DOERN:** Yes, I understand it says 3.8 but, you know, I read your statements and I read the press headings and I know what the conveyance was to the public and the media, it was that it was 2.9.

**MR. CRAIK:** It was given both ways.

**MR. DOERN:** Given both ways, absolutely. So you know, I'm glad that the Honourable Minister, you know, freely admits and fairly admits that it's 3.8. That's what we're talking about. Comparing last year to this year, that's the increase. And it's a small increase. But, you know, there seems to be some sort of pride, Mr. Speaker, about slashing the capital budget. This was a great achievement on the part of the members opposite, that they have taken 8.8 percent off, \$10.4 million away, and they think that this is something to be proud of. But you know, I wonder whether some of the honourable members wouldn't concede that in fact when you are building, or using capital construction, that you are building assets. —(Interjection)— You're spending money. I agree, and they're against spending money and they can't see results for money. They cannot measure quality but at least in terms of quantity, surely they can recognize quantity. Surely they can recognize quantity. Surely they can recognize the value of a bridge or a highway or a building or a hospital, or a school, hydro plant, telephone system. Surely they can understand that. Surely they would concede that, that it is important to build up a stockpile if you like, a required need, a basic minimum of public

assets, that this is also a measure of a culture and a people and the means by which people are serviced and their needs are met.

So I say that this is something that apparently goes unappreciated and then we find the government bragging, literally bragging. The Minister of Finance, who is a fairly modest person in general, he's bragging about the fact that they have achieved this lowest expenditure. — (Interjection)— My colleague offers that he has much to be modest about and that's true, especially in this budget or this preparation of Estimates. He talks about achieving the lowest expenditure increase in Canada. Well, you know, superficially that sounds pretty good, but then I think, Mr. Speaker, we will look in a few minutes, and my colleagues will examine as well, what that has meant in terms of the winding down of government programs and the negative impact on people in our province — how they are poorer off, not better off — because of this administration's expenditures.

Now my Leader already dealt with the point that the Minister of Finance made yesterday, and Mr. Speaker that's a second point that was completely erroneous and misleading. And I was really shocked today to see the Minister get up and attempt a feeble defence of that point; namely that they had slashed some \$300 million off the preliminary Estimates. Boy, that sounded good months ago, and it even sounded good, I guess, the first time he said it, when he sort of slid it across that what had happened was that our government, the big wasters, the big mismanagers and the big spenders, the non-businessmen and so on, we weren't No. 1 kiln-dried lumber, Mr. Speaker. We weren't the men of clear grit and free enterprise, pay-as-you-go rugged individualism. We're just a bunch of teachers and lawyers and farmers, and businessmen, small businessmen and so on.

**A MEMBER:** Modest.

**MR. DOERN:** Too modest, well, perhaps. — (Interjection)— Too many lawyers — well, two is perhaps too many. Mr. Speaker, that point I think the Minister of Finance would have to agree was a whopper. What he was saying in effect was that when the departments came forth with their preliminary Estimates they slashed them. There isn't a government in Manitoba history that hasn't slashed the original preliminary Estimates of civil servants because there's an old game that's played I suppose in the Civil Service, as it is in many other jurisdictions, where more is asked for and more is demanded in the hope that, say 80 percent or 70 percent will be achieved. So I think that that paragraph should go.

And you know I found it rather interesting. I picked up copies yesterday of the Minister of Finance's speech from Information Services, and then I picked up some more copies this morning and that paragraph was gone. — (Interjection)— Now I don't know whether the Minister had some second thoughts or whether he had some qualms but I have the two versions. I suppose one was the longer version, the other was the shorter version, and in the second version that paragraph was gone. — (Interjection)— Joke. And fortunately it is on the record in Hansard, but in the distribution of my honourable friend's speech — notes for a statement on the 78-79 main Estimates of expenditure — it's not in the edited version.

Another interesting thing here is that he mentions about the valuable input of the Task Force on government organization and economy. He really appreciated the valuable input. Then he mentions a little later on that however there was an early deadline and they didn't really have that much of an input, they just sort of had a moral influence on the government. And I would like to know — perhaps the Minister could give us some clue as to whether those same, self-same businessmen, those true-spirited dollar-a-year-men, are going to give him some advice on the Budget? Because I think he knows very well that if other people, outsiders, are involved in the Budget then not only will some of those members from the Task Force be missing from this building in the future, but he himself will.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in a short while he is going to bring in the Budget and you know that is something that we are looking for. My colleague, the Member for Brandon East, is an economist and he is often made fun of by members of the Opposition because they do not appreciate the science or art of economics. They laugh at the fact that he is an economist, but, Mr. Speaker, I have a tremendous regard for the Member for Brandon East and I think that he would do well to provide some lectures free to members of the front benches of the government in the science of economics. Because, you know, there is a lack, a lack of knowledge there.

For instance, the Minister of Finance came in, I think, one day and hinted that revenues are down. . . . couldn't understand this, laying off hundreds of people, slashing the Budget by millions, freezing the construction budget, doesn't quite understand how come on the other side as the revenues come in on projections as the unemployment statistics go up, that there is going to be a falloff or a lessening in revenues. Well I think anybody who knows anything about economics, and even those with just common sense will tell you that if you adopt that kind of a policy you are going to be in deep trouble. You are going to have to do something otherwise there will be a negative effect or economists say, "negative multiplier effect", and it is going to have an adverse effect throughout the economy.

So there is a partial solution that the government came up with — sell everything, sell everything that you can, pencils, pens, desks, automobiles, boats, you know, anything. Get whatever money you can right now, because this is the time it counts. Like right now is when it counts. When we go from the old budgeting system to the new budgeting system it will look really bad for at least one year, and when we sell everything off now we will at least get a little more revenue. So they are just worried about their first big impact.

I say it is going to be extremely interesting when they bring in their budget to look at their revenues, because whatever they were going to be for us, Mr. Speaker, whatever the projections

were, they are going to be worse for this government, because this government has done things to increase unemployment in the Manitoba economy, and as a result they are going to receive less taxes and there is going to be a negative effect going throughout the entire economy.

You know, so the Minister brings in his departmental estimates, and what is his solution for unemployment? You know this is probably one of the worse periods in Manitoba history. If you read the headlines nationally: "A Million People Unemployed", "Rising Rates of Unemployment in Manitoba", and what is the program put on the table by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance to attack unemployment? Surely, if that isn't the first priority of the government, it cannot be less than the second, and here is their solution. Eliminate or slash winter works, slash student jobs, freeze the construction of government buildings, and fire civil servants. That's their package to stimulate the Manitoba economy.

Then we look at some of their other programs. Their number one priority, Mr. Speaker, as I read it, as is tabled in the Estimates, is the construction of roads. That's it. That's what they are going to do for the people of Manitoba; they're going to build roads. —(Interjection)— Well, they are going to pay for most of them. There is one road I know they're getting free — (Interjection)— And it probably will be named after somebody associated with that project, and you know I suppose if they were handling the City of Winnipeg they would also put down another freebie and that would be Al Golden's 16,000 or 20,000 seat arena — that's free too. You guys should have asked for that, you shouldn't just sit there, ask him if he would build it in a Provincial Park.

So when you look at what has increased, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the percentage increases and the absolute increases and so on, you see the following: that there is about, if I read this press release of the Minister of Finance correctly, "Education and health are going up 41.7 million. Highways is going up 40.5 million." You can see where their priorities are. They value the construction of highways on a par with the enrichment of education or health programs. That is their sense of value.—(Interjection)— Rural socialism, agrarian socialism, that is what it's called. Well, the roads, the roads we know — we don't have to look at the program when the Minister of Highways brings it in, we know where they are going to be. Pilot Mound, Souris-Killarney, Boissevain, we know where the roads are going to go — (Interjection)— southwest.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, in that sense, they really are true Tories, you know who their model is — the Ontario Tories. That was one of the big programs of the Ontario Conservatives. You've got to cement your support altogether, connect it all up so people can get together and have a good time and so on, but when it comes to social services, forget it, every man for himself. Take care of yourself. Pay as you go. Everybody can pay the full shot.

So I say that it is incredible that this government has as its first priority. . . if you look at the number one priority of the government it's roads over people. And if you look at the percentages, however, education going up 20 million on 350 million — it's not that much, Mr. Speaker.

**A MEMBER:** How much on roads again?

**MR. DOERN:** Six percent. If you look at Health — 20 percent on 650 million, three percent. But if you look at Highways there is a massive increase from 120 million to 160 million, 33 1/3 percent increase. That's the kinds of priorities that we are getting from this government.

You know, they really believe, some of them really believe that they have done well in slashing the Budget. Some of them really think they have made some cuts. They have put a few things back in already, but they have made some cuts. But what have they really done? All you have to do is read the daily papers and look at the impact of this administration's cuts in terms of its impact on people in Manitoba, and it is a horror story, that is what it is.

For instance, I have a copy here of the Free Press from last Saturday, and the first couple of pages it is really shocking as to what is going on in this province. For instance, transit fares are going up. You know they are not going to give grants to the City of Winnipeg to hold transit fares down, which is what we did. We made it a condition and we put up the money to hold transit fares down. They are going to pass it on.

You know, I will tell you something, my friend from Burrows — he and I have been in this Chamber for 12 years and we know — that Duff Roblin when he was Premier and Walter Weir, this was one of their techniques. It was called "pass the buck", take it off the province and stick it on the municipality and on the individual and on the school boards. That was the idea, that is how they did it.

We look at other headlines here in the paper. Milk is going up. You know, what is my friend, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, doing about that? You know, Mr. Speaker, I have a pretty high regard for the Member from Brandon West. I think he is a man of integrity, but his mandate is really to close up shop, to shut down the department, just like the Minister responsible for MHRC. The Department of Consumer Affairs from now on is going to just open mail. If you write them a letter they are going to send you back a letter saying, Thank you very much for your letter and you will be hearing from us in due course. They are going to become inactive and that Minister is going to have a very tough time of it. He is sitting back while these things go on, while consumers are getting hit. For example, they are going to spend more for milk and there is another round of increases going to be asked for in the near future I understand. The government is allowing the brewers to raise the price of beer so everybody will be paying more for that. They are going to let . . .

**MR. BANMAN:** Only people that drink will pay for that.

**MR. DOERN:** That's right. Only people who drink beer will pay for that. They are going to make some changes in agriculture, which is going to drive up the price of chickens. They are going to slash legal aid. They are going to lay off people in the hospital fields and so on.

You know, Mr. Speaker, today we have people who are here in the Assembly, and who are outside, who are demonstrating on rent controls and there is no doubt in my mind that this government is bent on removing controls so that their friends, Sidney Silverman and the landlords can jack up the rents.

Mr. Speaker, their program in the Estimates is to slash one-quarter of a million dollars from the rent control budget and that is a sign — (Interjection) — a horror story — a sign of what is to come, that the agency is being wound down or shut down. You know, right now in Manitoba, in Winnipeg, there is a very low vacancy rate and the people who are tenants are very concerned about the fact that if you take the ceiling off rent control their rents are going to skyrocket.

I have spoken in the last couple of days to a few people who expressed that concern to me. In one case I spoke to a lady who told me that she had a job and she did not get very much in the way of a yearly increment. She had a small wage, but she got her annual increases and she was able to manage. But she said, "If they take the ceiling off rent controls then what am I going to do? I am really going to be in trouble."

So I just want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of this issue, in terms of the question of whether or not there should be rent controls, I say to the people who are tenants, who are fighting in favour of maintaining controls and continuing controls that we are with you all the way. And I say that although there are 33 Conservatives and only 23 of us . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I'd ask one of the guards to please close the door up in the gallery. The Honourable Member may proceed.

**MR. DOERN:** I say, Mr. Speaker, that the votes on any issue in this Chamber are clear — 33 members of the government, 23 New Democrats, and one Liberal. In a straight fight we lose. But I think that if the people who are in favour of rent controls will make their views known to the government — there are thousands upon thousands of them — that perhaps together we can change the government's mind.

Now, you know, the members opposite will tell you that they don't care about demonstrations, that they are not listening to demonstrations, that there has been a lot of demonstrations. You know, Mr. Speaker, in the last little while, the last few months, in the last week or two, we have seen a lot of demonstrations and there is going to be an awful lot more. I think it is going to become practically a daily occurrence. There is going to be some group coming to this government asking them to change their course every day, if not every hour on the hour. We are going to have to schedule the demonstrations because this government is so unpopular.

But they will tell you, the members opposite, they don't want to believe, they just can't believe, they are not ready yet, they don't have the right psychological psych, they think that everything, all of these demonstrations, all NDP inspired. It is all a plot. The Opposition got their friends out there and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how true that is. All I can say is that if the government keeps on doing what it is doing, and the demonstrations continue to mount, there is going to be thousands upon thousands of more members of this party than there were before, and the government is going to have to spend more and more time at Shilo, because they have got to go to the bomb shelter. It is an area of high security and when you close the door it is quiet in there, Mr. Speaker. You can't hear the demonstrators picketing outside. You can't hear them marching and chanting and making speeches and so on. It is nice and quiet.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a brief comment on the speech of the First Minister. He gave us one of his inspired messages the other night, 90 minutes, and boy, you know, it was good. I began to feel sorry for members of the government because they have really taken their lumps. You know, here it is, a brand spanking new government, they're only in office a few months; they're all excited. They are all excited, Mr. Speaker, about how good things are and how promising things are. For instance, one of the members . . . And so I think it was good, it was really good that they had their inning, that the First Minister came in and really poured it on and they all felt a lot better. Then they felt a lot better when the Minister of Finance got up the other day. Well, they are not going to feel so good about that when our speakers get through with him. Our Leader already started and there are going to be a few more speakers who are going to grace this Chamber with some information directly counter to what has been produced in terms of Estimates.

**A MEMBER:** The only speaker we hear is the Member for Burrows.

**MR. DOERN:** You'll get him; he'll be there. Mr. Speaker, one of the backbenchers ran up to me the other day and said, "We proved you wrong. You guys were wrong. You thought we were going to close up day care but you know what we did, we increased the budget. We gave more money to day care and boy did we ever outsmart you."

Mr. Speaker, who outsmarted who? They were the ones who were talking about cutting day care. They were the ones whose Task Force said, "Get rid of this stuff; let people pay for it themselves." The people in favour of day care put the pressure on.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The newspapers were talking about it. We never talked about it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I want to remind all members that you will have a chance to take part in debate and let the Member for Elmwood complete his remarks. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, all we know is that the government is leaking like a sieve. I'll tell you this, in the last days of our administration, our government was leaking badly. There was a lot of stuff, material going to the Conservatives —(Interjection)— No, I'm talking about document leaks. A lot of that was going on in the last days and there are a lot of leaks out of the Task Force and, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of leaks, a lot more leaks coming out of the Civil Service now.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No member of the government ever said we were reducing day care.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, let's say a lot of people, knowing the mentality of a government that builds highways before anything else, a government that looks to the big businessman and makes concessions on succession duties and gift tax, they know the kind of mentality that is going on, Mr. Speaker and they know that given that mental set, given their support, they know which way they are going to go. So it was a reasonable assumption to deduce and to believe that that government was going to slash day care. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would please ask all members to take their turn in debate. We can only have one speaker at a time and I would like to recognize the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is surely not going to deny to me that that wasn't considered, that it was considered a possibility. It was never a possibility with us. It was out of the question, out of the question. Just like rent control, out of the question. But with these people, Mr. Speaker, it is a real live possibility.

So anyway, I say, a backbencher came up to me and said, "Look at this, we outsmarted you guys. Look at that, we put some money into day care." Well I would like to know who outsmarted who? And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is our job on this side. We can't bring in legislation; we can only try to stop this government in their tracks or to point an alternative set of policies and I think we have done that in some areas already and I think there have been some retreats by this government already. I'll leave it to some of my colleagues to expand on that, like at the Portage Home where we had the staff cuts and we had the lack of action. Then we had the pressure and then we had the expenditures and then we had the introduction of staff, and on day care the same kind of thing. It's going to be on rent control and it's going to be on other issues. We have to build up the pressure in the public and the public has to work with us to show this government how far they can go and where they can't go.

Mr. Speaker, in effect, there is a difference of priorities between that government and this. You know, when I first came into this Chamber I used to listen to Duff Roblin and he talked about priorities all the time, priorities, priorities, priorities, priorities. Now they have a different set than we have, and that's okay, I don't mind, I don't object to that. They have a different set of priorities than we have but they don't have the guts to call their priorities "priorities." You know what they keep saying? They keep saying, "It's waste and mismanagement. We had to do it; we had to do it. It hurts, causes pain, but we had to slash this and we had to slash that because of the NDP's waste and mismanagement."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's why they had to do certain things. Well the fact of the matter is that we have our priorities and you have your priorities and I think that you should simply say that we don't share the same priorities, that we don't share the same value system, that we listen to certain groups of people in society more than others. So if somebody comes knocking on their door in a grey flannel suit and says, "I'm from a mining company," or an insurance company, they will hold that man —(Interjection)— No, not the Member for Fliin Flon, no. Mr. Speaker, they will listen to a person like that over people who come from other segments of society.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I only have a few minutes remaining. I'll try to deal with one or two points by the First Minister. As I say, I enjoyed his speech. It was a good rousing fighting speech. We haven't seen him in that form for a while because for the years that he was leading the party in the House, he just kept quiet. His policy was, "Say nothing. Don't do anything, don't say anything, then people won't know what you are going to do." —(Interjection)— And he got elected, that's right. He got elected on that basis. Then he started saying all sorts of crazy things to us a couple of days ago. He made some comment about Harold Laski in 1928, as if we were supposed to read this. You know, how many of us have read Harold Laski, his famous article? Well, I haven't, Mr. Speaker. Most of us are products of the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg. Some are products of, I guess, what was then Brandon College. Mr. Speaker, we have been influenced in our thinking by people like John Maynard Keynes and John Galbraith and Ed Schreyer. Those are influences on this side of the

House. We don't read the old musty journals of the British economics and political science from the early . . . Well I certainly don't read Milton Freedman; I certainly don't.

So Mr. Speaker, I just say in conclusion that the First Minister, who was a clever debater, he was a clever debater from the time he first got elected, he's a thirty-year-old Cabinet Minister and I suppose it's twenty years later right now. He is always a good debater and, you know, we will ignore some of the name-calling and some of the baiting that he does to this side of the House, and so on. But we find it very interesting how he operates, that he believes, as I think he has all his life, that the best defence is an offense. That's how he operates.

Then he told us that there are skeletons in the NDP administration's closet, and they've got all the skeletons, Mr. Speaker. He spoke ominously about how they were going to hit us with these bombs. You know it sounds as if we're the government and they're going to question us during Estimates. They're going to be asking us about our administration. That seems to be the way it is going to be. And he was going to get the Member for Rupertsland, who is a really nice guy, and myself — (Interjection)— That's an and/or.

Mr. Speaker, his motto . . . —(Interjection)— Wasn't it Herbert Hoover who said "a chicken in every pot"? Was it him? Maybe it was Coolidge, Oscar Grubert? You know as long as it isn't a chicken in every hamburger; that's what I'm worried about. But Hoover's saying was a chicken in every pot, and the First Minister, his saying, in effect, is a skeleton in every closet. That's what he is going to go on.

So Mr. Speaker, I conclude on this point. This government, led by the Member for River Heights for years, for years he used to stand up in here and explain how we lost the election. I used to listen to him. He was sitting on this side of the House telling us how we lost the election. And now the present First Minister is bragging about how they got 49 percent of the vote.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, they were worried about the fact that a minority of Manitobans were ruling this province for years. And I say that ultimately it's a case of the number of seats. And I say, in conclusion on my final point, you have a set of priorities — defend your priorities. Don't try to belittle ours.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the honourable . . . The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I saw somebody who was going to rise on that side, and I would have of course yielded to him but when I saw the Minister rising I realized he would closing debate if he spoke. And I don't think we're quite ready to do that.

However, I think he needn't worry and he can tell the staff and all the creditors of the province that they will probably get the Interim Supply through and the cheques will be paid; that is the part of the Civil Service that's still with us. The others, I assume, have had their separation payments made and of course made in the fiscal year of 1977-78 so that it wouldn't appear in next year's spending. It will appear in the spending of the former government in the year 1977-78. In that way you may even be able to find a half a million dollars to blame on us. But you know, why not? That's the way it is. Those things don't bother me. Very frankly, those things don't bother me at all.

Mr. Speaker, I looked at the Estimates when they were first tabled. I didn't have much chance, really, to go into detail and it is difficult — as the Minister knows — to compare these Estimates with former Estimates because of the change in format. And so it is very, very difficult to zero in specifically on any one item. And perhaps, in any case, it would be wrong because what we are dealing with is a global figure.

I do note that the Minister is asking for 30 percent of the total rather than 25 percent as has been done in the past. And I'm wondering whether the Minister of Finance has decided to ask for 30 percent instead of 25 percent because it is so late on in the year. In other words, we are at April 1st already, and normally this is prepared much earlier. So I'm wondering whether that's the reason or whether there is another reason why there would be a change from previous years when 25 percent was the norm, and they usually almost inevitably asked for an Interim Supply. But he is asking for 30 percent, and when he responds I'm sure he will have an answer. Again, that doesn't bother me because, in the final analysis, all of it will be voted because the majority will pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't in the House, unfortunately, when the Minister started to introduce his Estimates. I didn't hear his comments until the exchange this afternoon during Question Period when I realized he was somehow trying to take credit for some Herculean effort on his part, on the part of his colleagues, to have brought the Estimates under control. And I couldn't believe, really, what I was hearing, that he was trying to take credit and, in taking credit, to discredit the former government. He has been around long enough, not only in government, but before ever coming to government he was on a School Board. And, he will recall, and I never sat on his School Board, but he will recall in his School Board days the asking budget by staff, the preliminary budget, the Estimates presented by staff were always, always high, and I'm not being critical of staff. Good staff wants the best programs they can possibly get, and they are right from their point of view. Their job is to provide the best within their capacity as professionals, as specialists. They want the best, whether it be in the field of health or education, or social services, or labour, or what have you. And so a good administrator with good back-up staff with always ask and argue for as much as they possibly can for their respective departments.

It isn't just the name of the game. Somebody said, "Well, they know they are going to be cut down, so they ask for more". I don't buy that. They ask for it because that's their responsibility. They should

ask for the best for their particular sphere of operation. But on the other hand, I do know that every elected official — albeit a School Board, be it a Council, be it a Hospital Board, be it a provincial government or a federal government — in the final analysis you have to sit down and come face to face with the realities.

I used to make the comment — one that the Minister did not quote me on; he quoted me on another one — that the Estimates review by Cabinet I've always compared to a blood-letting. That's the only way I can describe it. Some of you have been through it, others haven't been but you will be and literally it's a blood-letting. And when you walk out of those offices after days and weeks, and weeks, of sitting until 12 and 1 o'clock in the morning — it's a difficult thing to do, but it's an essential thing to do and you do it every year — and it has nothing to do with a legacy from anybody else. It's the Estimates, the spending, the preliminary requests from departments who, as I say, have been asking for and would like to see the best for their particular area of responsibility. You on the other hand have to deal with it within the realities that you have to live with.

You know, if the Chief of Police wants another 100 policemen, I don't blame him; and if the Fire Chief would like another 200 firemen, I don't blame him either. But you ask the City Council how often they get what they want; it's very seldom, but their Estimates are always there. I recall year after year, and some members here will remember, that the City of Winnipeg in January always announces an 18 mill increase. Like poof. Then why? There's a man who asks why. He sat through it. Then of course it comes down to a more reasonable limit when the political people who have to take the responsibility, prune and cut and do what they have to do.

As far as the Estimates are concerned, as far as the spending is concerned, the 3.8 not the 2.9, but the 3.8 that the Minister now says is the percentage increase — and I'm not sure that that's all — it's been combining capital and current, that it's difficult to make a comparison. I'm not sure whether in fact it is a 2.9 or even a 3.8. It may be more and I'm not in a position tonight to say so. But whether it's right or it's more is not the point.

You have tried. You wanted to and you felt you had to, because when you took office I think that some of you honestly felt that there was so much waste and so much extra manpower, useless manpower lying around, that without any trouble at all you could just lop tens and tens and tens of millions of dollars off all your spending and still give to the people of Manitoba the programs, the services for people that I am proud this government established; because ours was a government for people. There's no question; our priorities were "people first", no question. I don't back away from that. That was our priority. In the long term I feel that if you follow those priorities you end up, not only with a fairer society, you end up with a healthier society and a society that can stand on its own feet and not have to depend on somebody coming in here, maybe to invest and maybe not to invest, and draw and pull out when he wants to and not when you want him to.

So I'm not at all apologizing for the fact that our government was a people-oriented government concerned with people's needs and a healthier society.

But the present government had made accusations; they ran a campaign on — if they didn't say it in so many words they certainly made people think that they could do everything that has been done in the past plus, plus they could do it better. They could supply even more services. They could improve the services without any extra costs to the taxpayer. Not only no extra cost, they didn't cut, and that's what they did right off the bat. They gave 2 percent on personal income tax right off the bat; 2 percent on corporate, the small business corporate income tax right off the bat; they could do it. Then I think reality set in. Maybe they didn't believe us when we said in 1976 that we, too, had to recognize that we had to practice restraint because we, too, got a shock when the Federal Government in mid-course, out of the blue, changed the rules of the game and changed the amount of money the province is going to get — all provinces — under the old revenue guarantee formula. Suddenly we were faced — and I remember there was some disagreement as between my Leader and myself, he predicted a \$30 million shortfall, I predicted a \$70 million shortfall, it ended up somewhere in between — we knew we had to cut back, and in August of 1976 we went through a restraint program. I'm not talking about 1977; 1976. 1977 is another year.

You've got problems and you have my good wishes to deal with them. I'm glad you have them, not me. —(Interjection)— I know. We'd have a restraint program. Yes, we would have a restraint program, of course we would, there's no question. you have to have restraint and we did, and we did have a restraint program and we cut it down, and we cut. You know, we came in with a deficit, a greater than anticipated deficit and we cut our spending, we froze, we slowed down and people who thought they were going to get things done were told, "Sorry, can't do it." And by attrition, hiring was stopped and departments were ordered to have a 10 percent vacancy rate. The positions were filled to 90 percent unless there was a darned good reason why they should go beyond it. In some cases we had very small little branches of four or five people, you could hardly cut them in half. But by and large that was used. —(Interjection)— That's right. That's what we did, faced with a sudden shortfall and a need for restraint and we practised it.

You took over and that restraint was still there, that 10 percent vacancy was still there. I don't know, you know to this day I don't know, whether some of the separations that we're hearing about — I won't call them firings — the separations for whatever reason, the separations are actual separations of bodies from the service or they're simply separations of SMYs. In other words, the staff man year, the position is there, but there was nobody filling it; because we, ourselves, had understaffed by 10 percent. So if that's a good idea you can use it, it's free, no extra charge, no extra charge. As I say I'm not sure whether you haven't already used those figures, so don't use them twice, you know, that you shouldn't do. I don't want any multiplier effect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing about these Estimates, they don't come as a surprise to me. I know people have said to me, the Conservatives, how can they do these things? I say, this is the kind of Estimates I expect from Conservatives. They're doing what comes natural, that's why they're Conservatives. They're doing what Conservatives do by being Conservatives. You know, there was a saying years ago — I don't know who to attribute it to — "Conservative times are hard times" and they were at that time and they're going to be in Manitoba. They're going to be in Manitoba for a very strange reason. You see, we're accused on this side of sort of always, I hear it all the time, the NDP believes in redistribution, redistribution of wealth. Well you know, Mr. Speaker, so do they but they redistribute the other way. It's just exactly the reverse. They redistribute income; they gave a 2 percent personal income tax cut across the board; \$50,000 income, \$25,000 income, \$10,000. You know, I'm going to say what I heard from them eight years ad nauseam, let's not talk about what happens elsewhere, let's talk about Manitoba, let's deal with this here. If you had Saskatchewan's oil, you could do the same thing; and if you had Alberta's oil you could buy out the country. You know you wouldn't need anything else. Alberta could secede tomorrow and mortgage us all. It's just like Saudi Arabia, suddenly being transplanted into our midst. Saskatchewan has such a surplus they could afford a deficit in their current budget. They're just drawing from surplus. They're just drawing from surplus.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, they talk about Saskatchewan; meanwhile I notice Saskatchewan mining regulations are far more like our own and I am wondering what this government is going to do with them. Saskatchewan has no hesitation about utilizing its resources for its people and making sure that they get a piece of the action. Not that government, they are going to get out of mineral exploration as fast as their little legs can carry them.

So they do believe in redistribution, that is the funny part about it. They always accuse us of, "O you are great believers of redistribution of income." So are you, but your priorities are different than our priorities. Your priorities are that if they are enough. . . somehow another 150 or 3,000 or 5,000 people in the \$100,000 bracket, then maybe some of their money will rub off on their neighbors. Well I think it's naive. I don't think it works that way, and in any case it's not the kind of society that I would like to see in Manitoba.

The Minister of Health and Social Development I believe, when he was speaking in the Throne Speech talked that they had to turn off the tap. The tap was gushing under our government, and they had to turn off the tap. Mr. Speaker, what we have here in these Estimates is a turning off of the tap but Mr. Speaker — and I say this to the Minister of Health because he will understand that — when you turn off the tap you may also turn off the oxygen and that is what they are doing — not by not spending money in the field of construction highways — housing, in buildings. Those areas where governments traditionally have had to prime the economy. Without government input the entire construction and building industry must suffer. And using just the general contractor because as a matter of fact, the general contractor doesn't necessarily have that many employees. It is the subtrades. You talk to the subtrades today in Manitoba, your electrical subtrades, your plumbing subtrades, your heating subtrades, your concrete foundation people, your carpenters, they will tell you they are bleeding today. And they are going to continue to, so long as this government has that perverse idea that if you spend money on an asset — and that is what it is — an asset, that that is poor business.

Mr. Speaker, the Norquay Building I believe is probably paid for. If it isn't paid for already, it's down to just about nothing. According to the books of Manitoba, it has no value. Unless there is a debt ascribed to it, it's got no value. Well maybe that is how the government accounts are kept but what a bunch of nonsense. You put the Norquay Building on the market tomorrow, for your book value, I'll buy it, I'll rent it back to you, I'll make a mint. And this is the same whether it is in the field of housing, whether it's hospital construction, school construction, these things occur.

I notice, for example, that there is a considerable drop in capital, in education, that is between universities, community colleges and others. Others I assume are the public schools. As I say, we can't get at it and we won't be able to until we can direct our questions to the Minister. But they have simply transferred the costs. They want to look good, they have to look good. They promised Manitobans that they can deliver something. They found they couldn't, so they are doing the thing that comes natural to Conservatives. They shift the cost, they transfer the cost to the user, whether the user is somebody who has to ride transit and will now pay — if he works 5 days a week, in 50 weeks let's say — it will now cost him about \$52 a year more and that's saying if he was a \$10,000 wage earner and if he is using transit, he benefits all of \$12 from the income tax cut, so he is going to be out, he is going to be out immediately. Even if he buys a monthly pass, he will still be out, not quite as much, he will save a dollar. Even people at the 15,000 and 20,000 dollar level, those who use transit, it's going to cost them more than what they supposedly made on the income tax cut.

I want to stick to user fees for a moment. Another form of user fee is tuition. That's a nice user fee. You say to the university student, you say to the community college student, "you are using it, you are going to benefit from it, well you are going to have to pay." So we are going back to the good old days because they always practise that. The good old days of simply ignoring the mental capacity of the student and having his education depend upon the pocketbook, the capacity of the parent's pocket book. And that's what we are going back to today. This is what they practised in the 60's, this is what they are practising today. They are going right back again. What is it, 23 or 24 percent increase in

student fees at the University of Manitoba, something similar at the University of Winnipeg and if they persist, and this is the way it will go next year, it will go up again.

The City of Winnipeg has already given notice that the transit increase this year is just the first year. You know, I guess they just didn't have the nerve to bump it all the way in one year. They had a bit of a conscience. But the universities are really in a bind, just as the hospitals are. You know, for the Minister of Health to get up here and say, this is a challenge to the administrators, this will test their mettle. I think he mentioned global budgeting as one of the reasons that he mentioned it. I've got news for him — we have tried global budgeting, and I am sure his staff will tell him. We had it. You know what happened? No matter how much elbow room you gave them, how much leeway we gave them, when the pie wasn't big enough they just didn't have the money. I predict that if you persist in the limitations you have imposed on hospitals, on other health institutions, I don't know yet what you have done with your agencies, with your child care field, and in your mental retardation field, I don't know. But if you persist on squeezing as hard as you have on hospitals, on universities, then they will either have to resort to user fees or they will have to come back to you — cap in hand — six months from now and you will have special warrants coming out of your ears. Otherwise they are going to close them.

And you know the same boards who did come when we had global budgeting — and one year we were tough, we kept them to 10 percent — and everyone was. . . Oh, we got it from this side. You remember how measly and miserly we were, Mr. Minister of Health, don't you remember? I am sure you remember that because I think you led the parade in that one. I think you or your colleagues. I'll tell you, the one I remember best but I won't quote him, is the Member from Birtle-Russell, but of course we can't talk about him in this House right now but boy he was good at that, he was good at that. Oh yes, oh yes. So as I say I just make a small reference to it. —(Interjection)— No, I haven't got that.

The Minister of Urban Affairs says, well you know, after all we've said to the city, "We're giving you latitude. You can transfer the money that you were getting under what you call special projects" — which are the innovative transit projects — "you can transfer that to the general transit fund and therefore perhaps it won't hurt you quite as bad." What he's saying to the City of Winnipeg is, "All right, all the moneys you got from the province in the area of transportation you can use them to offset the shortfall, 50-50, and what they're now getting."

It's interesting though, the other day he said, Handi-Transit, the transportation for the wheelchair people, ah, there he imposed a condition. I'll bet you he did not say to them, "Yes, you can scrap Handi-Transit too, and use the funds saved to lower the fare." I'm sure he didn't because he wouldn't. He wouldn't dare. Of course he wouldn't. So the business of, "I'm giving him latitude, the latitude has sometimes reins on it obviously, you know, it's got a bit of a chain. So I say to him, if he's keeping any rein at all and if he feels it necessary to, and he obviously does, then he's doing what I think is his responsibility. He's recognizing the responsibility of the senior government in his dealing with the junior government, with the City of Winnipeg, he is recognizing that responsibility because the city is a creature of the province and he knows it. He has told me that and I know it, and therefore he can't back away from that responsibility by saying, "I have given them latitude."

If they want to cancel DASH, they can do it, he says. If they want to cancel Dial-a-Bus, they can do it. But why were those programs brought in? They were brought in because it was recognized in the early Seventies and late Sixties, really, by all authorities and all metropolitan governments. It's a direction taken in the post-war period of building overpasses, underpasses, high speed, limited access roadways, was for the birds. It was killing the cities. There was a conscious acknowledgement of it, a conscious attempt to come up with alternatives to get people away from the dependence of the car. I've heard it said, "Well, if the transit could only spruce up its service. If we could do something for making a better service we'd attract more passengers." Mr. Speaker, it does not work. The love affair that mankind has with his car is not going to be broken by that sort of thing. There's going to be one thing that does it. When the cost of driving your car and the cost of the transit are so great that the attraction to use transit becomes overpowering and overwhelming, then even I would take a bus.

But if, on the other hand, you allow the transit fare to just keep going up and that gap doesn't widen, then you're condemning the transit to becoming a second-class service to be used by people who have no other alternative, instead of transit becoming something which helps build a city which has a quality of life to it, which everyone can enjoy and which in the final analysis, in the dilemma mankind is in today, utilizes less energy. It's energy saving.

So for all the reasons, the member I think said its lowest —(Interjection)— That's it, Mr. Speaker, that's right. Exactly what I'm proud of. We are the lowest and we should have stayed the lowest. My only regret is, we couldn't have gone the other way because frankly I would like it even lower still. Just as DASH had no charge at all to it and, Mr. Speaker, DASH was a success. It was a success because it convinced people and it attracted people, not to take their car and drive six blocks or seven blocks or eight blocks. They took the DASH bus and it kept them off the streets where they shouldn't have been; it cleared the streets of the congestion and I say to you if transit fares go back up, (a) it's going to hurt the low and moderate income financially, but in the long run it's also going to hurt the city. It's being pennywise and dollar foolish.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon my colleague the Member for St. Boniface, I think commended the Minister of Health and this evening the Member for Elmwood, so that we're also somehow a little complimentary to him. You know I don't really share, unfortunately, their, should I say, enthusiasm or kindness, because, Mr. Speaker, although there's an increase in dollars . . .

**MR. SHERMAN:** You and I have always got along.

**MR. MILLER:** Oh, yes, we still get along, we still get along. We'll get along, we agree to disagree, but that's fine with me.

Mr. Speaker, it's not only in the field of Day Care but it's in all these fields. Where to impose or to grant increases of a minimal amount, in the case of Day Care, or to grant increases to universities of one and one and a half, or to hospitals of whatever that figure was, 2.9, in areas that are labour intensive, where it's not machines that are doing the work, it's people; where a hospital is budgeted at 80 percent uncontrollable; and even that so-called controllable which is the goods and materials used within, let's say, the health institution where a lot of their supplies come from the United States, the major supplier, and with the exchange rate they've got to pay even more than they did last year even though the price hadn't gone up, but of course it has gone up. So that you have the situation where the Minister of Health says, "This is a challenge to the administrators. Let them come to grips with it. Let them show their mettle," and I say you can't pay people off. You can't expect people to operate at all when their budget is so restricted in their maneuverability that what you are granting is not going to be adequate. This applies in the field of Day Care too.

You have increased the budget but I say to you, I question whether it's going to be enough to cover the increases and the salaries, the wages, of again a labour-intensive industry, because it is labour-intensive. You know, we haven't discovered yet the machines — maybe you will, maybe you've got one around the corner. If you have good luck to you — a computer that you can program and it will look after these kids, feed them, look after them.

**MR. SHERMAN:** But we haven't got any more money.

**MR. MILLER:** Okay, you haven't got any more money. Mr. Speaker, you have as much money as other provinces with the exception of Alberta, I'll grant you, and Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, he and his colleagues are going to find it lying around in the tens of millions, that's what we heard.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's right.

**MR. MILLER:** Fat here, fat there, blubber here, blubber there, it was coming out of your ears. You were going to take all of that and you were going to be able to give all these programs. We can and we must maintain the services, these wonderful services that the NDP brought into being: Pharmacare, Personal Care Homes, Home Care. Do you know that Home Care today is suffering? Do you know that people on your staff are telling people when they're phoning, that we don't know whether we can continue this service, Mrs. Jones." The squeeze is on. Do you know that, Mr. Minister?

**MR. SHERMAN:** We haven't cut a single program.

**MR. MILLER:** Well maybe, you may not have cut it yet, but I think what's getting through is the message that the people of Manitoba have got through; because you know people working in the Civil Service, as in any firm, they are very sensitive to what they hear from their Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The member has five minutes.

**MR. MILLER:** Thank you. People are very sensitive to what they read in the paper and what they hear from their Minister, when they quote the Minister. You know, the clerk or the girl working in an office does not know the Minister personally. He's just a figure out there but she hears of what he said. She knows there's restraint. It's coming out of her ears. Restraint, restraint, restraint; you're restraining till you're strangling. That's the kind of restraint you're doing. You're doing it by granting so-called increases which are far below what normal inflation, normal inflation, forget about anything else, normal inflation requires. I won't even call it inflation — normal incremental costs.

You know, even this increase in education — and I don't remember the amount, \$11 million, \$9 million, whatever it is — you know, in that there's a figure which, if the Minister of Education stood on his head, would have to be there. It's known as an incremental cost, and I suggest to you it's around \$3 million, maybe \$2.5 million, it's there. You couldn't stop it; and there is the same incremental costs in the field in your area, too. Some of it is by agreement, as in the case of education, other is simply that the person is going to have to have some increase.

Now, you were just telling labour today — I gather you are giving a message to the people of Manitoba — saying, "Look for job permanency. Look for job security. Don't think in terms of wages." Mr. Speaker, when the cost of living is going up and has gone up at about 8 to 9 percent, when the cost of food has gone up even higher, you can't say to people, "Take 1.9 percent and like it." You can't say to people, "Take 1.9 percent and you're lucky. At least you've got a job." What are they trying to do? Bring back the old days when people would work for 25 cents just in order to live?

Mr. Speaker, if you have to there are times when you put into an economy and a time you take out. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that by turning off the tap that you talked about, you didn't turn off the tap, you were turning off the oxygen. You are stifling this economy. You're forcing unemployment. And, Mr. Speaker, when the people of this province haven't got money, they can't buy; and the stores on Portage Avenue are going to be empty if they can't buy; and their clerks are going to be dismissed if they have no one to sell to. And it's that kind of snowball effect, October, November, December,

January has been going up, up, up. The students today, do you know what they're told? We're going to help you. We're going to create an office and in that office we're going to have people, and do you know what those people are going to do? They're going to take your name and your address and they're going to say to you, "Well, have you tried Canada Manpower? Have you tried Eaton's? Have you tried here, tried there? There are no jobs with us, but we're going to advise you where to maybe look." That's the extent of it.

**A MEMBER:** Try the Civil Service.

**MR. MILLER:** Try the Civil Service. Well, they've got a few in the Civil Service I guess. That is the extent of the Job Creation Program of this government. That's where they cut, \$17 million worth, whammo, wham. —(Interjection)— Yes, we'll see.

Okay, I am making a prediction, Mr. Speaker, and I'm expressing my opinion. I know my opinion cuts no ice with you. I know you're wedded and committed to a theory that has not been successful anywhere in Canada unless you find oil in Manitoba tomorrow, then even your system can work because it's obvious if you have that kind of wealth, it doesn't matter what kind of system you've got. The wealth is there, whether it's Saudi, Arabia; Alberta, Iraq or South Yemen, it's coming out of their ears. So unless you discover that kind of source of income, you're going to have to practise a different kind of economics than you're practising now.

The idea that you are creating a psychology which will somehow attract business to start doing things is outdated. Business will invest when they can sell what they produce. Today Canada is producing at 80 percent of capacity. It isn't a problem of lack of goods. It's a problem of lack of markets. They can produce more than they can sell. —(Interjection)— That's it. It's the way it's distributed that's at fault. I would want to be in a government, I'll tell you honestly, that puts people first, and not in a Conservative Government which says, "Restraint, restraint, if you get hurt, it's tough," and as the First Minister said, "Manitobans are prepared to be challenged and to make sacrifices." Mr. Speaker, they are, providing those are fair sacrifices not a sacrifice from those on moderate and average incomes and benefit to those, the wealthy ones, which is what you did. You gave up \$23 million unnecessarily.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place this evening to participate in this aspect of the debate of the Assembly in order to address myself to matters which I feel should be before this House, fully expressed and dealt with at length.

Mr. Speaker, several times this session the Honourable Government House Leader has made mention of my inexperience. He has indicated that at times I neglect to conduct myself in full accordance with the rules. Of course, he is an experienced member and, having had that experience, he is fully familiar and aware of the rules of this House. I don't deny that he is fully acquainted with those rules.

I, Sir, being a new member, am much less so. One might say, Sir, in a sense I am an innocent abroad — an innocent abroad, Sir. I, Sir, am the — I suppose, in a sense — Edgar Allan Poe, or I am about to become the Edgar Allan Poe of the Assembly.

A couple of nights ago we were told by the Leader of the government, the Honourable Premier, that he and other members opposite were going to develop a theme during the Estimates review. They were going to develop a theme of horror stories. There were going to be frantic revelations; revelations that divulged all sorts of apparent neglectful omissions on the part of members on this side when they were in government.

**MR. MINAKER:** We're just building up the suspense.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, I, too, am building up the suspense. I've sat now for some two sessions — participated in two sessions of this Assembly — and I would like to say, Sir, that I have seen some horror stories. I am prepared this evening, in the few minutes that are allotted to me, to recount these stories for the benefit of members present. Because I think it is illustrative of the ethical force, the moral force, and that's something that the Honourable First Minister continually refers to in demonstrating his party's best right to govern this province.

As a matter of fact, it puts one in mind of his first remarks when he came before us in order to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. He was in an expansive mood and he was much more conciliatory, much more mellow than he would usually be, Sir. He came in and he congratulated members on this side and he was very nice. He was very polite — very courteous, indeed, Sir. I must admit that I for a moment thought that perhaps we had been too hard on the man; perhaps we had. And he spoke of a need for *rapprochement*; he spoke of a need to offer constructive criticism; he spoke of a need to participate in a sort of dialogue. I thought, well we have indeed improperly gaged this man.

As he did so, Sir, he developed a theme in his speech. And soon, Sir, he was referring to members on this side as nitwits — nitwits, Sir. This is how one establishes this dialogue and establishes this constructive environment. We are nitwits. And he was talking about raving socialists and Red

Airforces. This is how one creates an environment of *rapprochement* and conciliation — by red baiting. And that's what he did, Sir.

I thought it was a fine speech. I was thinking, as a matter of fact, as he proceeded that it would have been a very appropriate and a very effective speech perhaps for a member who is charged with the responsibility to lead an opposition. I didn't think that it bespoke a man who has the responsibility of governing the province of Manitoba.

He said that he would recall horror stories. Well, Sir, I am going to beat him to the punch, because in these few months this innocent abroad — this new member of the Legislature — has seen some horror stories. I am now going to divulge them and I'm going to talk about something first; something that need be discussed in this open forum.

I am going to talk about a horror story which is very immediate to myself. I am going to talk about a horror story that involved many score of employees who were formerly associated with the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet. I am going to tell people and I am going to tell members opposite how they treated members of the Civil Service of Manitoba, when they took office. And it was their declared intention, Sir, their express intention; it was I think a part of their platform that they would disestablish the Planning Secretariat. It was well-known and no one takes that from them. That was part of their mandate, I suppose. But they didn't tell the people the brutal manner in which they would follow their mandate. They didn't divulge that. Well, I am going to tell them how they did it.

First of all, they herded all the people together. They didn't tell them what was going to happen to them. Nobody spoke to them. Now this doesn't just include NDPers. No, not just NDPers. It includes ladies who have served this province for over 25 years in a clerical capacity, people who had served Minister's opposite under the former Roblin administration. Those people, Sir. They weren't asked what sort of aspiration they had in their employment. They weren't asked as to what experience they had — what their preferences might be if they were relocated. No, sir; no questions were asked. They were left to languish for some two to three months not knowing where they would go, not knowing what was to become of them. And then finally, Sir, one glorious December morning they received a letter. Well, Sir, they were told that they could report to certain positions. They didn't know what these positions entailed. They hadn't had any opportunity to participate in this particular re-allocation of their placements. But they were told that they could report. But they were also told that, in a sense, they were now at sufferance. They were told that their term of employment would lapse if they were not picked up in the Estimates review presently at that time, currently taking place.

So there they were, Sir, for another few months left to languish in various positions. Many of them came to positions where not only were they totally unfamiliar with the administrative *milieu* but were also completely unexpected. Their superiors weren't even told of their imminent arrival.

So there they were, as it were on the doorstep — some stranger's doorstep — babes in baskets and again left to languish. This is a horror story, Sir. This indeed is a horror story.

Talking about horror stories, Sir, it brings me to mind of the Minister of Highways. The other night in addressing this Assembly he talked about this. He felt that I was a bleeding heart. I didn't know all the facts. I didn't know what happened when I wasn't here before I came. I didn't know what happened in 1970 during the Autopac debate. I didn't know about the dislocation and displacement of all sorts of people's jobs in the private sector as a result of the creation of MPIC. And he, Sir, introduced a new principle of ethics. It's called the two-wrongs principle. In defense of his government's firings of 373 people, he referred to that. He suggested that if it were wrong it didn't make any difference because after all hadn't it been done to members of the private sector in 1971.

Well, that's a fine ethic on which to premise a government, Sir — the two-wrongs principle.

Well, Sir, horror stories; let's go on. The Minister of Labour — and I'm pleased, Sir, to see that she is in her seat — has provided us with some remarkable recountable horror stories. Never in my wildest dreams or imaginings, Sir, did I ever think that a Minister of this Crown would circumvent the authority of the Honourable the Attorney-General to attempt to make special compensation and dispensation for companies under prosecution by the Department of the Attorney-General.

Never in my wildest imagination did I think that somebody could behave in such a reprehensible, irresponsible manner. She nods her head. It's not true; it didn't happen. Has she risen? Has she risen to explain that in debate? Has she ever indicated why she took that position? She speaks, Sir; this is a momentous occasion. The Minister is speaking from her seat. Hear, hear! The Minister is speaking.

**MRS. PRICE:** I only speak when I have something to say that's . . .

**MR. CORRIN:** I challenge the Honourable Minister to rise in debate. There is still an opportunity to rise in debate and tell us about Hooker Chemical — to tell us about that. Tell us about what she told those ladies who met her in the office. Tell us about what she told them about her feelings about unions.

**MRS. PRICE:** Were you there?

**MR. CORRIN:** No, I wasn't there. I was not privy to that; I would that I were. But I am not invited into her office. As a matter of fact the last time that an NDP member walked into her office, the Deputy Minister left permanently. That is a horror story; that is a horror story.

Oh, and she is an advocate of restraint — restraint by all means, restraint. She has done something — something that is a remarkable contribution to this Assembly; something that will be in the form of a permanent endowment to the people of Manitoba. Sir, she bought new drapes, new

drapes for her office. This was the only thing of any great import or moment that has emanated from the Ministry of Labour in the past five months and there was controversy over that, Sir — great controversy — whether the price was \$2,000, or \$500, or somewhere in between. And she wouldn't tell anyone.

We know what the price is. The price is this Minister of Labour and that is a mean pun, Sir, but it is well-intended.

Horror stories, Sir. Let me continue to recount horror stories. Let me talk about a man whom I have a great deal of respect for, and I do. I say that sincerely because I believe him to be poorly suited to sitting with members opposite. And that is the Honourable Attorney-General, the Minister of Urban Affairs. Poorly suited; poorly suited.

For years, Sir, and it's to his embarrassment — I know he bears this with a heavy heart and he is very reluctant to speak about it — for years, Sir, I sat with him on Council. That is not to his embarrassment. What is to his embarrassment is that for those years he was in a position of authority. Sir, he spoke long and eloquently, indeed, about the need for home rule. That was a slogan that was picked up and widely disseminated by members of the ICEC caucus at City Hall during the NDP government's tenure — home rule. That, Sir, meant that the Provincial Government should pick up the tab for most civic services, should send the money *carte blanche* to the civic politicians, as it were, and that they should have absolute authority as to how that money was to be spent. And he wasn't the only member that was a member of that particular group. There are several members opposite that participated in that particular group with him; I believe at least four.

Now, Sir, what are we confronted with? I come to this august body, the Assembly of the Province of Manitoba. My honourable friend is appointed the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I'm surprised. I confront a situation that I find to be horrendous — a horror story. He is now telling the civic government that there is no money. They must exercise restraint.

So he is giving them less money but he is still telling them — I must say to his credit — he is still telling them that they can exercise home rule. He is not going to assist them there. He is going to give them all the autonomy they want.

He suggested, as a matter of fact, several things they could do in exercising their prerogative — home rule. They could raise the bus fares, the transit fares — part of home rule. And how equitable that was, Sir. How equitable it was. I wish, Sir, now in retrospect — I don't sincerely, but I wish, Sir, that he could have been so candid with the former NDP government.

I wish, Sir, that he could have come before that government and could have suggested that he would have been more than willing to raise transit fares, and not, Sir, ask for funding. But he didn't do that, he was wearing different stripes then.

No, Sir, we have before us a very equitable policy, one that will mean that senior citizens now have to pay transit fares. He wasn't willing . . . — (Interjection) — Not higher. A member on this side says higher. Not necessarily higher — a lot higher, I think 40 percent higher. Not just a little bit higher.

So, Sir, we have a situation where those who are without any resources, without any financial resources, are being asked to bear 40 percent increases. Necessities, Sir, we're not talking about frivolous expenditures, we're talking about necessities of life. I ask you, Sir, is this not a horror story? This is a horror story. For those people it will be a horror story.

I ask you, Sir, is it fair that there should be these increases when one contemplates that this is a government, this is a minister that has spoken so often about the need to conserve energy? What is he doing? He is creating a disincentive with respect to the conservation of energy. If we raise the transit fares we are taking the risk of reducing the ridership. And if we reduce the ridership, where are we? It's a possibility. I'll tell you where we are — larger deficits, that's where we are, and then where are we? Cyclically we are up to higher fares again and on and on and on.

Sir, this minister has given us other horror stories. I don't believe, Sir, I honestly do not believe that it was his will — I believe it was imposed upon him by others — but he ultimately had to bear the burden, unfortunately, of another horror story, that of Family Law. Legislation that was lauded by all, I think all representative opinion groups in this province — not only opinion groups in this province but it was lauded by other governments, by responsible people across Canada — law that was referred to oftentimes as being a model law was suspended, repealed and why, Sir? Why, Sir? There is no good reason. No good reason at all. But people will suffer that as a horror story. People will suffer as a result. Horror stories, Sir, the list goes on.

Let us talk about the Minister of Tourism who is not in his seat this evening. Would that he were. A minister who is oft referred to as a billion dollar minister. I can't name him or I would, a billion dollar minister. He told us in the first session about a billion dollars of capital that was going out of this province. Well, Sir, did he not rise in his place and have to admit shortly thereafter that he was in error and that the figures he relied on were erroneous and that he had misled the people of Manitoba and this Assembly? That's a horror story, and now we are confronted with what I think will infamously be remembered as the "Jarmoc Affair." Another horror story. All in such a short span of time.

We are confronted with a situation where a minister with a very short memory can't remember what he authorized; whether he authorized anything; whether he authorized a road. In a sense it would be funny if the implications weren't so tragic.

**A MEMBER:** A funny horror story.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, it is a funny horror story in a sense, a funny horror story that any minister would come before this House and try to make members believe that a private developer would spend \$100,000 to link his property with a main highway and not have anything in the bag, that he did so purely on speculation. Now, there is speculation. That, I would say, would be an incidence of real speculation, to spend \$100,000 to link one's property with a highway with nothing committed. That would be speculation. It would not only be speculation, Sir, it would be sheer stupidity and I suggest it is not the developer that is stupid. The developer, though, is insensitive and I would say that outside of this House. I know that there is a privilege here and an immunity that I enjoy but I would say that outside this House. He's insensitive in the sense that he would ask those people who live in that provincial park to put up with, to bear the possibility of some 200 units on a 40-acre site.

Sir, I sat on City Council in Winnipeg for some three years and I don't recollect very many circumstances where we at that body, in our deliberations, allowed developments of that scale, of that density in an urban environment. And now he suggests to us, the honourable minister would suggest and I presume he does because I saw the development agreement and it is explicit — he may think there is room for conjecture, I tell you, Sir, it is explicit — he suggests that, well, there is nothing wrong with it, no need for an environmental impact review and he'll exercise some discretion under The Parklands Act. Fine, Sir, that is fine protection. Well, Sir, this isn't a case where we are dealing with just some — and I don't mean to use this term disparagingly — but it's not a group of hysterical extremist naturalists and I'm not suggesting that any naturalist is in fact hysterical or extremist.

But it's not a question of that sort of situation against an innocent poor developer. We are talking about an absolutely ridiculous, deplorable state of affairs, a development that would see more than five units per acre in a rural setting in a provincial public park. Sheer madness. There is absolutely no way that members of this Assembly or that any minister, any member of the public of the Province of Manitoba, should have to countenance a development of that scale in that sort of setting. That is not why we establish provincial parks.

Another horror story, /, let us talk about the MDC. That is a horror story. For years members opposite, and I wasn't here — I admit I wasn't here as several members like to remind me, I wasn't here, no, no, but I did read the papers — and, Sir, in reading those papers, I managed to elicit several facts. It was obvious to me that there were certain MDC corporations that were profitable. It was also obvious that there were some that weren't. I must say, Sir, that I find it extremely unpalatable, extremely distasteful and extremely implausible that now those members opposite are divesting the public interest of those companies that were profitable, not those that lost money but those that were profitable, dormant; and do we know, Sir, that those companies are being sold at fair market value, at book value? How do we know, Sir? Will there be accurate reports tabled? I challenge members opposite to divulge all information, to prove that those prices were absolutely fair; they were equitable; they represented and reflected pure book value, market value, sales at arm's length as going concerns. — (Interjection) — Somebody says I have to explain that. I don't have to explain that to certain members opposite. They have much more experience in business than I do. I do business, not as many years as they have, and they do business and many of them are much more successful and much more important and have met with much more success in business than I have. I challenge them to exact the same standards with respect to these sales as they would to the divestment of their own interests. And I suggest, Sir, that the lie will be in their mouths and eventually the truth will out.

Horror stories, Sir, horror stories. The cuts in staff at the Manitoba Home for Retardates, that was a horror story, Sir, for a government that was so proud to pronounce its support — this was prior to the election — so proud to announce its support to the public of financing for that sort of social service. And they weren't wrong. At the time their position seemed wholesome and it seemed purely ethical.

But then, Sir, we are confronted with cuts. Where is the consistency? Where is the reason? There is no rhyme and there is no reason. Pure political pragmatism. Restraint — that was the new jingle. Free Manitoba — that was a jingle. Restraint — that is another jingle.

They are not freeing Manitoba. The only thing they freed in Manitoba is a lot of people from their incomes. Those are the only people they have liberated. They are liberating people from their incomes. They should be ashamed. Let's look at what is free in Manitoba. My we have a free Manitoba. Higher tuition fees — free Manitoba. Higher rents in public housing — free Manitoba. Higher property taxes, municipally in the urban centres — free Manitoba. Higher transit fares — free Manitoba. Legal aid deterrent fees — free Manitoba. No estate taxes though — free Manitoba. — (Interjections) — Yes, higher milk prices — free Manitoba and higher unemployment — free Manitoba. That is the legacy of this free enterprise government.

They are not a free enterprise government. It's a myth. They don't know what the word means. Classic competition, that's free enterprise. They are not fostering an environment where there will be that sort of competition, not at all. Using eminently good sense again, eminently good sense, where do they make their cuts? In the places where it will do the most good: public works, in a year when the construction industry in this province is on its knees, it's stagnating, it is in a complete morass. Well, it was freed. The private sector was allowed to languish, Sir. Fifteen hundred employees were free to starve. An excellent record.

Now we have the Minister of Finance telling us another horror story only it looks good. It is restraint again, this 2.9 or 3 percent increase. A \$46 million increase in spending and that shows restraint, Sir. Well, Sir, it is going to take a great deal of restraint when that honourable minister tables his budget. It is going to take a great deal of restraint for members on this side to stop laughing because, Sir, I suggest that he is in a terrible predicament and eventually something is going to give. He has reduced personal taxes; he has reduced corporate taxes, but he has increased Estimates and spending by \$46

Thursday, March 30, 1978

million. Where is the money going to come from? He can't go back on his election pledge. Where is the money going to come from? —(Interjection)— I'm new to the Assembly. I don't know very much, as the Honourable House Leader continually reminds me. I don't know very much but I know that something is going to have to give. What is he going to give away; that is what is going to give. Is he going to sell some more businesses? What is he going to do, sell some Crown corporations? Is he going to impose another point on sales tax? I suggest, Sir, that's where it is going to come. I will predict that in all likelihood that is where it will be, the sales tax, because that is going to be the only easy avenue of access. There will be nowhere else to go.

But we will restrain ourselves from laughing until he shows us what the product of restraint will be. But then I warn him, Sir, that he may well find himself on the horns of a dilemma.

The Task Force. The Task Force talks a great deal about restraint, too, but certain members of the Task Force, the Chairman of the Task Force talks about an organizational analysis unit, a bureaucracy to review bureaucracy from henceforth. Well, Sir, I ask you, is that in the spirit of restraint? No, I would suggest, Sir, and quite respectfully that it is explicable and perhaps it is even sensible. In a sense I can sympathize with a minister, an unemployed minister, soon to be unemployed, a Minister without Portfolio going job hunting. And what better place to start a job hunt than your own backyard. So we will have an organizational analysis unit, a rose by any other name. And it might just, Sir, end up a planning and priorities Committee of Cabinet. No, no, God forbid, it couldn't be that. It must be something else. It must be an organizational analysis unit.

So, Sir, I ask you, have I related, have I recounted some horror stories and all in a few short minutes.

A horror story, Sir — I see the Honourable First Minister has left his seat again — but another horror story was "breeders." He talks about breeders. Manitoba's main breeder, breeder of contempt, talks about . breeders. That's not a horror story, Sir, disporting himself in a manner consistent with a First Minister.

So, Sir, we are waiting now to see the results, not only of the horror stories I have spoken about this evening, but the horror story that will be the Budget in a few short weeks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, can we call it 10:00 o'clock?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd prefer to close the debate if the . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.