

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 p. m., Monday, February 11, 1974

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the supper hour of adjournment, I was attempting to lecture, not unlike the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources attempted to lecture us the other night on Christian morality. I intend to lecture this government somewhat on democratic morality, something which they failed and have shown such miserable failings in, in particular these past few months. Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with essentially, to illustrate my example, with the Minister of Agriculture. I regret that the Minister is not in his chair. I must assume that he is on some important business of the province, but I of course have limited time tonight, as the First Minister and as the House Leader is well aware of, so I must carry on.

Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Minister of Agriculture is of course incredible. It demonstrates the point that I was attempting to make about this tremendous, insatiable desire of control that this government, this administration has. Mr. Speaker, it did not come overnight with this government. We found manifestations of that ever since they took office, Mr. Speaker. I can recall the almost hectic days of the Autopac insurance debate, and when initially even when the First Minister told in good faith the private insurers and the independent agents that he was not out to nationalize any industry for nationalizing sake, he would listen to all the sound and reasonable arguments, in fact he even set up, oh, some kind of a commission or a group or a board that would study or assess this situation, but in the heat of the debate the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources told us what it was all about, and what it was all about was control, control of the thirty five millions of dollars worth of premiums collected per year, and he didn't give a damn whether the Autopac rates were lower or higher or what, or whether the service was better. In the final crunch it was a question of control.

Mr. Speaker, that was an early indication of what we had to look forward to from this government. Mr. Speaker, disquieting items appeared in the kind of forgotten and shuffled-under-the-carpet NDP manifesto for Manitoba. It has of course, prior to the election, received an updating. It was called The Guidelines for the Seventies, I believe, or something like that. But again, I only want to - there's so much good material in here - but I only want to point out those that are germane to my arguments and they were, in dealing with the setting up or the possible setting up of municipal Crown corporations, and the problem was that they could possibly confront, you know, Conservatives occasionally, or Liberals, or some other mad dogs that haunt this province. And they say, and this is a quote from that particular document: "Because the Boards of Directors will be composed of local elected representatives, decisions will to some extent reflect the political preference of the areas they serve. Thus, if a local council that tended towards Conservatism and retrenchment were replaced by a more activist body, this would be mirrored in changes in the economic structures of this community." And, Mr. Speaker, they of course intend to appoint those more activist members, directors of those proposed constitutions . . . That, Sir, was another indication of the kind of control that this government intends to exercise on the future society, future citizens of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I can also--you know, the other night, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he gave us a kind of a homely story of how when as a youngster or as a young growing man when he was in difficulty, he didn't go to his MLA; no, he went to his bank, or his father went to the bank, to get his problems solved. And somehow that was something terrible, you know, that the bank wielded this kind of control, and he wanted to suggest that that was the reason for the entry into the financial institutions of the Province of Manitoba, that that was good enough reason for some people control in these areas. Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to make a note of this interjection on my part because I will come back to it and remind him of why I interjected at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, further on the matter of controls; we saw it of course, Mr. Speaker, when they introduced the Unicity Bill; I believe it was Bill 36. Of course this was introduced in those heady first flush years of the NDP electoral victory, a particularly impressive victory in urban Winnipeg, and of course, Mr. Speaker, they had every reason to believe that they would control that proposed 50-man council, and therefore the original bill had in it that the mayor of the City should not be elected by the people, because they could not trust themselves that the right mayor be elected. They could not trust themselves to that, Mr. Speaker, and for the benefit of the new

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. ENNS cont'd) members now joining the NDP caucus, I want to indicate to you, while I have not yet had the privilege of attending too many NDP caucus meetings, it is a matter of fact an open secret in this House that one of the ongoing battles that has been fought in the NDP caucus is whether or not the mayor of this great city should be elected by the people of Manitoba, by the people of Winnipeg and not, as the bill now stands, by the 50 councillors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know the history of what happened. The bill began to flounder a little bit. It required the support of the incumbent mayor; a deal was made. The deal read thus: For the first time around the people of Winnipeg will indeed have the privilege of voting for their mayor. And that's as far as it went. And I must pause for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and pay tribute to a former member who is not now with us but I suggest has a great deal of influence in the House right now on this particular matter, and I'm referring to the former member from Rupertsland, who mounted a pretty significant one-man campaign to embarrass this government, to embarrass this First Minister, and to put him on the line and to make him committed to the concept that the mayor should be elected at large, and I suggest that maybe as a result of that work - and I could also suggest other reasons that perhaps maybe for some reasons known best to the mayor himself, who has now chosen to take on the anti-socialists on that city council that that might find favour with members opposite, that indeed the First Minister will keep that commitment and bring in that recommendation, that change in the Unicity Bill. But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the thought was there, the suggestion was there, not that the suggestion but in fact the bill contained no provision, and it is only with a lot of hollering and screaming by people, independent members of former Houses, by individual citizens that will force this government to allow the citizens of Winnipeg to elect their mayor, another indication of the control that I mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, really let me get down, in the few moments remaining, to the real serious matter that I have to bring to your attention this evening. Mr. Speaker, before I do that, I have to involve the Minister of Agriculture. I make some abject apology to the new Member for Fort Rouge, who seems to be somehow concerned about the timely debate of agricultural matters in this House, particularly the Hog Marketing Board, but I want to assure him and other members that I do so only because it does in fact represent a far greater issue.

Now I want to put on the record, I want to put on the record the position of the First Minister, the position of the Minister of Agriculture, indeed the position of the New Democratic Party and before that the CCF Party. The First Minister needs no reminder; he served on that committee, that initial Shewman Committee that set up the first voluntary Hog Marketing Commission in this province. Mr. Speaker, I have his words of that time when he served on that committee. He indeed initially voted for the setting up of that same commission, and then, only then when it was ascertained that there was a major farm organization--and I need not really identify that major farm organization, it was indeed the Farmers Union--that called for a plebiscite, that called for a vote, that called for a marketing board as opposed to a commission board, what did the First Minister say and do? "I suggested," he said, in 1963 I believe - '64, April 14th of '64 - "I suggested that we should make it clear in the report that if a vote was asked for that it be granted." Was there a vote granted when they instituted the compulsory marketing board? No--(Interjection)--but aside from that; but that was the First Minister speaking in '64 and in an organized way asking for a vote; certainly if any organization, certainly one of the larger ones, were in an organized way asking for a vote on a producers marketing board, that that should be granted.

Mr. Speaker, he rose up in indignation later on when the board did not follow that advice and set up the voluntary commission hog marketing setup to state: "So sure was I that this might happen that I tried to prevail upon the chairman at the time, last fall, late last fall or perhaps I should say late last winter, to do his utmost to see that this report would not be used as an excuse for not granting a vote should one be asked for by the hog producers. Mr. Speaker, three or four years later his now Minister of Agriculture reiterated the well-documented position of the New Democratic Party in respect to their belief and feelings for producer-controlled orderly marketing boards. The present Minister of Agriculture said, "The New Democratic Party," he said this on May 2, 1967; he said, "The New Democratic Party has taken the position a long time ago, and the CCF Party before has taken the same position, that producer-controlled marketing boards are an essential part of the structure necessary to build a viable agricultural industry."

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what they said when they were in opposition. What are they saying now, Mr. Speaker? What kind of an incredible performance have we got from the Minister of Agriculture today? Well, Mr. Speaker, that too I wish to document; that too I wish to document. Mr. Speaker, only a few short weeks ago, I can't be exact to the time, the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to bring about a kind of an inquisition court held by the Manitoba Marketing Board against a duly elected official of that producers board, namely one Don Cameron of Woodlands, Manitoba and this is what--(Interjection)-- Well, we'll deal with that in a little while. We'll deal with that in a little while. But this is what the Minister of Agriculture had to say, and I have a summary of his . . . He said, "We had, of course, a commitment of some two years ago to the producers of Manitoba that we would move from an appointed board to an elected board."

Well I would say they had a commitment, Mr. Speaker, not of two years ago, of five, ten, fifteen, twenty years ago. That's substantiated by the statements of the First Minister. "We knew that when we made that decision that there would be some risk." This is your Minister of Agriculture speaking. "We knew that the question of pork marketing was one of political nature and for some time in this province we knew that there would be activities on the part of politicians in Manitoba to try to circumvent the good intentions of the government." Is this for real? We are in Manitoba, I believe, eh? Well the long and short of it was, one of the hog producers, who is an elected member of that board, had some objections with the way that board was being run and the Minister objected. He says further on in his testimony: "We have a situation where board members are running about the countryside creating dissension on the basis of misinformation and that they have been promoting rather than building a public relations system."

Mr. Speaker, is that why we elect people to democratic boards, to set up a public relations system for this government? That's what this government seems to believe, Mr. Speaker. That's what this government seems to believe. So what did the Minister do? "I have undertaken," and I'm quoting the Minister verbatim, "I have undertaken to write a letter to Mr. Cameron asking him to submit his resignation in that morally he has no right to represent the producers of Manitoba for his district or otherwise, and certainly there is no way in which he could, from this point on, carry out the responsibilities on that board in a way that would be normal."

You know, Mr. Speaker, you know, what is normal? Three, four hundred farmers, hog producers elected this man. Who is that one Minister of Agriculture that's telling him what's normal and what is not normal? Mr. Speaker, where are we? Where are we? Further, further the question was put to the Minister of Agriculture, this same Minister of Agriculture who in 1967 stood up on this side of the House and gave his undying dedication to the concept of producer-controlled marketing boards. This same First Minister who is now preparing his speech, this same First Minister who reiterated, in fact who tried to back out from a position that he found himself in in 1964 when he supported a voluntary hog marketing commission but backed out immediately to support the producer-controlled marketing board. We have silence, dead silence when his Minister of Agriculture was asked. The question was: "You said elections will be held shortly. Will this be a fully elected board, and if so will it remove some of the clashes between appointed and elected members?" And the Minister's reply: "Well, I'm afraid that it will have to depend on who is elected." Mr. Speaker, it will have to depend on who is elected. That's the level of democracy that we have come down to.

Now let me put it down into a context that more members can understand, some of the labour members in the back row. You know, can you imagine? Now let's just go back a little bit in history. Years ago labour legislation was set up so the working man could organize into trade unions, just so that he could bargain better for himself. Right? Is that right? Years ago, years ago, the Natural Products Marketing Act, years ago the Natural Products Marketing Act was introduced for the same purpose, for the same purpose so the primary producer, the farmer, could put himself into a better bargaining position. Now can any of you representatives of labour tell me that any one of you would accept a government-appointed person to sign a three year contract with International Nickel, Sherritt Gordon or Hudson's Bay and not know what it contained? That's precisely what your Minister of Agriculture has done. You mean to tell me that if any one of you responsible labour leaders would have then asked the government of the

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. ENNS cont'd) day and said, "Now look. I want to know what's in that contract. I want to know what my men and my producers are working for," he would have received a letter from the Minister of Labour calling for his resignation and furthermore threatening that same organization that if henceforth you don't elect the right people we will abolish elections in the labour organization, we will appoint all members. We . . . you puppets in the back row, that's the kind of . . . that's going on in the front row. You tell me. You tell me.

I heard the Honourable Member from Crescentwood say on TV the other night that they are moving to one year contracts, but the farmers of this province are expected to sign three year contracts with Japan and not know what they're getting. Mr. Speaker, I intend to be able to prove in this House and this Chamber that we have our own Watergate affair conducted right here by this government, and I'll tell you what I expect to prove. I'll tell you what I expect to prove. That every day the packers in good faith, Swifts, Canada Packers, Burns, are paying a certain price for the hogs that the farmers of Manitoba are bringing them and that the marketing board is then not paying the same price back to the farmers. Indeed they're ripping off 30, 40 or 50 cents per hundredweight on every hog that's marketed so that they can build up a fund to cover up. To cover up. And really, that is of course the moral of the whole Watergate affair - to cover up a poor contract signed by this Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, far better for the Minister to tell us the details of that contract and if the contract is not that beneficial, that's fine. He made a stab at international marketing; we can forgive him for that; we can forgive him for that and we can accept that. And indeed it may have some redeeming features in terms of stability of market and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, don't let none of those puppets in the back row talk to me about what kind of freedom, you know, this government particularly will stand for. Do you mean to tell me that any one of you fellows would work for three years, sign a three-year contract and not know what you're getting? But the farmers are supposed to do that under your government. The farmers are supposed to do that under your government. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of nonsense, that is the kind of nonsense that we're getting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that unless the Minister, the First Minister, who will undoubtedly use his privilege of speaking to us for the next hour and twenty minutes, undoubtedly he will do that, Mr. Speaker, and he has that right. But, Mr. Speaker, if he does not find five minutes or ten minutes time in that speech, you know, to publicly rebuke his Minister of Agriculture, to rebuke that position that his Minister has taken, Mr. Speaker, I won't ask for the Minister of Agriculture's resignation because I know, I know the limited material, I know the limited material that he has over there, and if I do that I know for sure that the next Minister of Agriculture will be the First Minister. And I don't wish that on him.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance the other night he took exception, he took exception to the ads that were run, the kind of campaign that we conducted. He called it a kind of a scare campaign in terms of our impressions that we tried to leave with the people of Manitoba of the kind of control. He referred specifically, you know, to the one particular ad with the arms around the Legislative Building depicting control. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, if the First Minister can accept that concept of democracy as it is being exercised by his Minister of Agriculture, then the only thing wrong with that ad, Mr. Speaker, the only thing wrong with that ad, Mr. Speaker, is that those arms should have been bigger and they should have been hairier and there should have been a hammer and sickle tattooed on either forearm. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have but a few moments.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up.

MR. ENNS: May I ask leave for a few moments to finish my few remarks?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, democratic government--(Interjections)--(recording failure - few seconds) . . . people and when governments become the masters of people, then freedom surely does vanish. Mr. Speaker, if that holds true for a small minority segment of our population and democracy is measured, is measured indeed and truly so by how minorities are treated, if that is true in this instance with the hog producers of this province, then what on

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. ENNS cont'd) earth faith should we have when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says that he wants power in the hands of the people for such things as banking, treasury branches and other things? They can't trust that that . . . never mind our financial institutions, Mr. Speaker. You know, in a country, probably one of the greatest countries in this world, you know, a simple poet tries to write his poetry so the people would like to read his poetry, but all in the name of the people that is not possible. And that's the kind of rhetoric that we're getting from these people. That's the kind of rhetoric that we get.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that failing, failing the silence, the all too evident silence of the First Minister, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, to accept this kind of conduct on the part of one of their colleagues, one of their colleagues that the Premier has suggested as being the next Leader of this party. --(Interjection)--A little bit of the laying of hands that went on. That could cause grave concern for most people in Manitoba. I know it does to me, and I will continue to voice that concern as long as I have a right to speak in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll depart from custom in my opening few remarks by complaining that it will be a difficult act for me to follow, because indeed what we have had for the past 20 minutes is a diatribe bordering on acting and not very good acting at that. Having said that, and I'll come back to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside later in my speech, I would like to revert back to custom and tradition and begin by joining all other honourable members who have congratulated you on your re-election to the office of Speaker. I should like to take this opportunity, Sir, to express thanks to you once again for agreeing to carry on as custodian of our rules and express confidence herewith that you will be, as you have in the past, a most fair mediator of our proceedings in this Chamber.

I'd like also to congratulate all new members who have been elected here for the first time and to also extend congratulations to all members re-elected. Of course, it perhaps doesn't really behoove us to presume to give advice to other members in this Chamber, but if I might be permitted one exception to that I would advise all new members in this Assembly that the cardinal rules which they should try to guide themselves by are simply to try their very best to serve the public interest as they perceive it, and also as much as possible to avoid personal recrimination. Unfortunately it isn't always possible to avoid recrimination and, after having listened to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition last Monday and the Member for Lakeside just a few minutes ago, they'll well understand why I say that with regret.

Listening to the Leader of the Opposition last week it would seem that the really only major theme he had to develop was his amateur diagnosis that the government was suffering from old age, I think he used the term progeria, or a term to that effect. And I suppose, Sir, that I would have to admit that there is some sign of some degree of physical tiredness on the part of members of this Cabinet, but it's only a matter of degree; it's certainly not fatal. And I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for dedication to effort and for the work that they have put into their responsibilities in the past several years. It is one way I have of knowing that they are applying themselves, which is something which I suppose honourable members when they formed the government had no way really of knowing the extent to which their cabinet colleagues were trying.

This government, rightly or wrongly, and driven by its ideals and philosophy of desiring to help bring about more fairness in society, more equality of opportunity and more equality of actual human condition itself, has undertaken many new policies and many new programs. We have indeed, Mr. Speaker, launched many new programs in the past three or four years. Of course, if one wished to enumerate them it would take some considerable time but I will mention just a few in passing.

We have taken steps to bring about a far greater supply of public housing for low income family in this province than they ever did. We have taken new programs and efforts to northern Manitoba, which was an area most of the communities of which suffered benign neglect for all the years of previous governments. We have brought in patient air ambulance. We have brought in personal nursing home care financing. We have built more nursing homes despite what they would like to say about it. We have brought in a program of Pharmacare for the elderly; Northern Manpower corps; the office of Ombudsman so that there can be more revelation of maladministration in public offices; Law Reform Commission and Human Rights

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Commission; a town and village sewer and water installation assistance program for every community in this province that seeks to request it; a farm improvement assistance program; livestock diversification grants; 20 or 25 veterinary clinics into this province; hog marketing board--and I want to pause here to say to my honourable friend that he was completely incoherent a few minutes ago when he suggested that we had departed from our previous commitment to producer representation on marketing boards. They were the ones, Mr. Speaker, that had to be literally begged to introduce a hog marketing scheme in the first place. It took them four years to do so and when they did so it was a voluntary scheme hardly worthy of the name, and--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: I did not interrupt my honourable friend. And when they did introduce that hog marketing system they did so with government-appointed only, government-appointed directors. We now, Sir, have a hog marketing system which is pervasive, which has some muscle in the marketplace, and which has producer-elected representatives. So what's his complaint?--(Interjection)--He's wasted 20 minutes of . . .--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, if he can't contain himself to please remove himself.

MR. SCHREYER: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, he took 20 minutes of our time to allege that we were in basic opposition . . .--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.--(Interjection)--

Order, please. Order, please. ORDER. Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside kindly keep quiet. If he does not wish to abide by the rules there's a simple solution, but I wish he would extend me the courtesy when I ask for order like every other member should extend a courtesy to every other member of this House. You people elected me; I want to maintain the calm discipline for you, not for myself. I can behave just as well as anyone else. Now let's have some discipline and decorum in here. Any member is entitled to the floor and gets his full time but when his time is up then he should have the courtesy to let someone else go ahead. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . interrupted in mid-sentence. I was in no way suggesting, Sir, that there was anything unusual in an honourable member taking whatever time he likes compatible with the rules. All I was saying, Sir, was that 20 minutes was taken within which to allege something which in fact is not the case at all, because the transmission, Sir, from a completely government-appointed board to a producer-elected hog marketing board took place, and is taking place, under this administration and not in the previous six years when my honourable friends were in office. So the very opposite is true of what he's been saying in the last 20 minutes that he was speaking. He even went back to 1963 to try and make some points, however erroneous it proved to be.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. SCHREYER: And I hope, Sir, that I will be given equal opportunity to go back to years such as 1969, '68, '67, in order to make certain basic comparisons that need, which comparisons need making in order to set the records straight.

A MEMBER: Shades of George Hutton.

MR. SCHREYER: The Leader of the Opposition would have Manitobans believe that we are a government which is not moving fast enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: The Leader of the Liberal Party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister has referred to the Livestock Marketing Commission that sat at that time, and at that time he was on that board . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege?

MR. WATT: . . . the privilege--(Interjection)--but he did not agree with it and I say that he did agree with it the day before the House opened, and when the report was brought in he then got up and voted against it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That is not a matter of privilege; that is a difference of opinion. The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable House Leader state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Sir, on a point of order. It was indicated to me at the opening, I thought

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. GREEN cont'd) jocularly, that some of the time that would normally be used for the Prime Minister to reply was taken up with questions. I thought it was a joke. I see now that it was not a joke, that there is the intention of the honourable members to prevent the Prime Minister from utilizing what would be normal time in a Throne Speech Debate, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask with respect - and you are the arbitrator of the rules - that following the vote on this question the First Minister is again going to seek to be recognized and I would hope that you do so in view of what has taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): The rule stipulates that the vote is called at 9:30. We on this side of the House will be happy to give extra time to the Premier, perhaps to a quarter to ten, so that he can complete his remarks, and that perhaps we don't have to go on after the vote is taken to the debate again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not want any further time of this House to be taken on what could be the beginnings of a procedural wrangle. I listened, no matter what I thought, I listened to the Honourable the Member for Lakeside without interruption and I would assume that we can be allowed to proceed.

I was in mid-course, Mr. Speaker, of simply making a very rapid and brief enumeration of the many different kinds of programs and projects that we had in the course of the last four years that the new Government initiated in this province. We had the Leader of the Opposition last Monday allege that we were a government that was no longer moving quickly enough, and the Leader of the Liberal Party seemed to share that kind of view. Then I know very well, and other members opposite in the Conservative Party voiced an opposite view that a New Democratic Government was moving too quickly, too fast and into too many areas and getting itself, shoving its nose into too many people's business, etc. Obviously there is a division of attitude and position among honourable members opposite themselves. When it suits them to say that we're not doing enough, they say so. When it suits them to say that we're doing too much and becoming too pervasive in terms of the province's economy and so on, then they say that that's socialism for you.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, let me just very quickly conclude just a short list, a selection of the many different programs we have introduced. I didn't mention crop insurance which in the past three years we have made major amendments to to allow for hail insurance coverage, to allow for all-risk coverage on any insurable crop, and we've extended the list insurable under that. And we have made provision for the payment of all administration costs along with the Federal Government, and as a result there is a substantial increase in the numbers of farmers in this province taking out crop insurance. We have made efforts through the Department of Agriculture to bring through community fairs and rural development programming, specialized counselling service and technical services to people living in agricultural Manitoba. We have tried to bring some degree of hope for the future to those living in the marginal economic areas of the province with problems of chronic unemployment by means of Manpower Corps training, Manpower projects, and this has been widely expanded.

We have brought water services, water services financing, sewer and water installation financing assistance to over 20 towns and villages in this province which, prior to the advent of this government, there didn't exist any form of provincial financial assistance to local government for the installation of sewer and water services. --(Interjection)--We brought in much improved veterinary diagnostic services; veterinary clinics are now existing in some 27 districts. Central veterinary drug purchasing--and the list goes on and on. The establishment of Grassland Society to bring groups of farmers together in order to learn about more effective ways and means of the utilization of grazing land as a partial substitute for dependence on feed grain in cattle finishing. An incentive program for the production of increased numbers of hogs; changes in our milk supply program to the Manitoba Milk Control Board; stoker program in co-operation with Manitoba Pool Elevators; dairy products and quality control inspection's been integrated instead of being fragmented in three or four different departments as it was in the past. The list goes on and on.

Well of course, Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson involved in this, and that is that the more one tries to do the more work a government undertakes to try to carry out, the more problems of administration that there are likely to be encountered. Obviously my honourable friends feel

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) that they have a talking point when they say that there are problems of administration that this government is beset with. Well, I would only say to that, Mr. Speaker, that they had their share of problems of administration, which I will come to in due course, later on this evening, and furthermore they ought not to have had that many problems in administration because they undertook so few challenging programs to meet human needs - that's where the challenge is. --(Interjection)--The whole range of programs, Sir, that we have undertaken apply to different occupational groups, different communities in the province, different regions of the province, but all of them have a common objective of providing employment, community improvements, bringing about better transportation access, improved housing conditions, improved conditions of repair of housing, dwelling quarters, improved sense of local self-government and self-government participation in many communities in the north; in short, not only improvements but also more reason for more people to hope for an even better future instead of having to continue with the legacy of neglect and despair that all too many fellow Manitobans were left with under Conservative administration.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the more one undertakes in the way of social and economic programs, the more problems of administrative co-ordination. But better to try and half succeed than to sit on your thumbs or your duffs, and that's what they did. Because, Mr. Speaker, when the history of this province is written and rewritten as time passes on, the years of the 1960s will not be noted as years in which there was any particular great effort being made under the Conservative administration to bring more equality of the human condition to fellow Manitobans. That's not what they'll be remembered for. They'll be remembered for a few other things but not that.

A MEMBER: Just the reverse.

A MEMBER: You were here . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. . . . Yes, I was here for much of that time and I have too, unfortunate for them, I have too clear a memory as to what kind of new trails they blazed and what new programs they pioneered. Not very many in the context of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition diagnoses our problem as one of advancing old age. Well, Sir, as one listens to them, particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, one sees that they too suffer from a malady, but it isn't the tiredness of old age or overwork; that much is obvious. It is a form of intellectual schizophrenia. But more specifically, Sir, their greatest malady is amnesia. They've forgotten the many things that they failed to do, they've forgotten the context in which they refused to this House the kind of information that they now accuse us of hiding. And, Mr. Speaker, that simply can't go unchallenged.

In the case of their amnesia it is difficult to deal with it, to treat it, because it is deliberately incurred. They want to forget the mercy of invoked forgetfulness. That's my honourable friends opposite. They want to forget their time in office, especially their last four years between 1965 and '69. Well, diagnosis of amnesia can be based on many of the administrative and policy decisions they took and then fouled up through indecision and incompetence. Four or five quotations of the 100 or so that can be documented will suffice to show the pattern of incompetence and secrecy that they operated under during their latter years in office. I would refer, for example, to their criticism in this Throne Speech Debate thus far of our practice of secrecy. They say this despite the fact that we have amended legislation to provide for more disclosure of public administration and finance than they ever did. I refer to the fact, Sir, that for ten years, between 1960 when it was first raised in this Assembly, and rejected by them, it took ten years before we had the establishment in this province of the office of Ombudsman. The office of Ombudsman which acts as a place for the receiving of complaints by citizens of alleged maladministration by government in the public service. They can't say that they didn't know about it because it was brought to their attention in 1960. They turned it down; they wouldn't have any part of it. Now they accuse us of not, of not wanting to make the Ombudsman report public. I can assure them it will be made public as it's required to be by law, and we provided for that because, Sir, it was this government that asked this House to pass that law, which they refused to do. We established a Human Rights Commission. Now they talk about human rights as though they've forgotten that for a decade they refused to move forward with respect to any systemization of any means of handling and treating of major problems in human rights and discrimination.

With respect to the MDC they would like to pretend that we are somehow practicing

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) secrecy when the fact is, Sir, that it was this government that amended this act that was passed when they were in office, and the act read as follows then, it doesn't any more, that notwithstanding the Legislative Assembly Act or any other Act or law, the corporation (meaning the MDF) shall not be required to produce to the Assembly or to any committee thereof any application for a loan or other information or any of the books, records or documents of the Corporation that would disclose anything contained in an application for a loan or any information. And no director, officer or employee of the Corporation shall be required to attend and give evidence to the Assembly or any committee thereof respecting any matter to which this clause relates.

A MEMBER: Author Sidney Spivak and Mr. Spivak's the author.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the law has been changed so that now there is an Annual Report of the MDF in which there is a listing of every applicant, corporation, the amount of the loan and the interest rate, which was not available to honourable members before. It was deliberately refused.

Mr. Speaker, in case that there is any doubt about it, I would refer honourable members to not go back to 1963, as my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, but to refer to Hansards, for example of March 1966, in which the Minister of Industry and Commerce at that time indicated in a very simple and direct way that there was not going to be any disclosing of information - here we are: "It has been our policy to respect the policy of the Development Fund itself in maintaining in confidence all its financial relationships with individual client and we intend to continue this policy." No way of knowing who was applying for how much and at what percentage rate of interest. Deliberately refused. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition in 1967 when he became Minister of Industry and Commerce said among other things, "Mr. Speaker, as Minister in charge I have no intention of discussing the individual loans of the Manitoba Development Fund." Now they would pretend that nothing has changed and that in fact they were much more open and we are being secretive. Mr. Speaker, that is prime evidence of amnesia.

A MEMBER: That's right. That's right.

MR. SCHREYER: Our policy, Mr. Speaker, which we have lived with consistently and followed as consistently as we were able since we have been in office, is to make public documents, records, information that has to do with the running of the affairs of this province. We have said all along that two major caveats on that openness in government have to do with matters that might be under current negotiations, we've said this all along, and matters having to do with personnel relations in the public service. But beyond that, Sir, we certainly have practiced an openness of government that my honourable friends never dreamt of when they were in office.

Mr. Speaker, the other day there was a news report to indicate, at least to give the impression that we were resisting the idea of having new methods used in the presentation of estimates of spending to this Assembly. Since this is the government that introduced and established in law the office of Ombudsman, that brought in legislation to provide for far more disclosure with respect to Manitoba Development Fund or Corporation financing, it goes without saying that we certainly will also be the government that pioneers in this province the presentation to this Assembly of estimates of spending in a format that is far more detailed than it has ever been. So let there be no suggestion that we are somehow desirous of not innovating, of being less than open.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested that there's ample evidence in the last four years of Conservative administration to indicate they were just as guilty as any government ever was in this country, and perhaps more so, of indecision and bungling in administration. Anyone who wants to have a prime example of that need only turn his attention to an investigation of the events leading up to the decision to build the Nelson River Power Plant at Kettle Rapids and to proceed with the Diversion of the Churchill River. We have had honourable members in the Conservative Party actually try to say that it was never part of their proposal, was never part of their agreement with the Government of Canada to proceed with four specific things: No. 1 the building of the Kettle Rapids Power Plant. No. 2 the building of the Direct Current Transmission Line from Gillam to Winnipeg. No. 3, and it's provided right in that agreement, the diverting of the Churchill River at South Indian Lake. And No. 4, right in the agreement as well, the Regulation of Lake Winnipeg. The last couple of years honourable members would like to forget,

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) amnesia again, they would like to forget that agreement, that document exists, they would like to pretend that what they had in mind all along was to proceed with a high level flooding at South Indian Lake. Sir, that was a decision that they came to after they signed the agreement with Ottawa. They started a project and after they started they began, because of indecision to try to change some of the basic factors or features involved, and the rest is history.

Now they would like to argue that this government is making mistakes in the Hydro Electric Development Project, that because we have gone for the regulating of Lake Winnipeg that we have incurred unnecessary additional costs and that somehow some day we could have saved a lot of money if we had gone ahead as they tried to with the high level flooding at South Indian Lake. Well, Mr. Speaker, one can see that already in the fact that the Member for Riel and other honourable members are intimating that Manitoba Hydro's rates will have to increase and because they will be increasing that this is a direct result of the diversion of the Churchill River or the regulating of Lake Winnipeg. Depends which camp you're in. The Leader of the Liberal Party will argue that this is because of the diversion of the Churchill and the Tories will argue the opposite, because we haven't diverted enough of the Churchill and because we're regulating Lake Winnipeg.

Let it be very clear that the Manitoba Hydro electric utility has managed thus far to keep utility rates constant for the last four years and at a level which even after an increase of the kind that is under contemplation, will still leave Manitobans with hydro-electric energy that if it isn't the lowest will certainly be the second lowest in Canada. And to the Tories I simply point out, in this Globe and Mail headline here, that Ontario Hydro wants a 30 percent rate hike, that Ontario Hydro is programmed in on a 10 percent per year for a minimum of three years increase in hydro rates. Is it because they are regulating Lake Winnipeg? What manner of nonsense is that that would prompt honourable members opposite to try somehow to confuse the public mind by equating a rate increase in 1974, it's been postponed for quite some time if one compares it with other provincial utilities, with whatever engineering works are being undertaken. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the point is very simple. If an energy utility does not build for the future, if it merely sits with whatever old plant and or equipment it has then for a period of time it is possible to maintain very attractive, artificially attractive low rates. But if, as it should, it builds for the future and for future generations then in the incurring of capital costs it will be required to charge a rate that will cover its interest costs and then some.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, there of course are many examples of how the honourable members of the Conservative Party have suffered from amnesia all along. I don't want to take the time in this particular debate today to relate again to honourable members and to this House the sequence of events between February of 1966 and July of 1969 at which time they brought about the signing of four agreements to lend \$92 million to Churchill Forest Industries. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to make at this time is that in 1970 the Honourable Member for Riel was asking me in this House whether or not the fourth of those four agreements had in fact been signed while they were in office or after they were out of office. Something as important as that, Sir, the signing of an agreement amounting to many millions of dollars, they weren't even sure whether that agreement was signed and executed, and yet it had to go over the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. All Cabinet Ministers present surely would have been aware of that. Mr. Speaker, they pretended again, because of amnesia, that they weren't sure when all these agreements were signed.

I would only say to them for their own edification and for their own improvement of their own memory they should obtain a copy of the United States Security and Exchange Commission document, which document lists the pleadings and charges against those very same people that they signed these multi-million dollar agreements with. While for the moment they remain as allegations, Mr. Speaker, nevertheless the document is at least recommendable in that it will help them to refresh their memories.

They would attack us, Mr. Speaker, for financial problems that are incurred by some of the companies that are borrowers from the Manitoba Development Corporation. They would attack us for the Sprague Forest Products financial losses and even that of the MS Lord Selkirk. They have forgotten that in the years 1963 to 1969 the indebtedness to the Manitoba Development Fund or the Crown of the Sprague operation steadily increased and whenever the going got tough they merely lent it more money. And they wouldn't report to the House how much nor at what interest rate; that was information they would never give. And, Mr. Speaker, they would have people believe, although the last election proved that people were not believing in the way they would have liked them to, they would have people believe that we were somehow responsible for the decision to put public money by way of loan into the MS Lord Selkirk. The fact remains that it was between 1968 and the spring of 1969 that the loan was processed by the MDF under the Tory administration. Again, Mr. Speaker, a case of amnesia by my honourable friends. In truth, Sir, they would by innuendo, by implication, like people to believe that they were such great administrators, that they were such great administrators these Conservatives, that they avoided many of the administrative problems we have encountered. I mean, Sir, perhaps they're right, they didn't have administrative problems with respect to nursing home care financing or with municipal forgiveable loans and grants for the installation of municipal services and improvements, they didn't have problems with that; nor did they have administrative problems with veterinary clinic financing or livestock production expansion or with public housing or with Autopac or with bringing of winter roads to northern communities or with patient air ambulance. They didn't have administrative problems with any of these things because they didn't do any of these things. (Applause)

I would be even more generous, Sir. They didn't have any administrative problems with respect to the redevelopment of the town of Churchill, because for 14 years that community was neglected while two levels of government quibbled. The decision was taken after we came to office by two levels of government to commit something in the order of \$6 million each towards the rebuilding of this northern community. And it was much needed, and it's being done, it's well under way. People of the community appreciate it, I'm sure, but everyone in the province can take a sense of satisfaction from that particular project. But let it not be thought, Sir, that there aren't administrative problems. There are many.

They didn't have any administrative problems in building a new community out of the virgin wilderness such as at Leaf Rapids. No, they didn't have any administrative problems because they let the mining companies do it. The mining companies would move in and build the town and have it operate as a company town. Until the 1960s that may have been good enough but by the 1960s that was not the spirit and mood the people living anywhere in our country and in our province, that they in order to avoid administrative problems, in order to

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) avoid incurring the symptoms of tiredness and progeria they sat on their thumbs and didn't do it. So they didn't have to be tired. I think half the time they could have gone to a country club to do all the work they did.

A MEMBER: Aw, come on, I think it's the Manitoba Club . . .

A MEMBER: I'll bet there were many decisions made there by your government.

MR. SCHREYER: The other day the Member for La Verendrye, Sir, he made a good contribution to the Throne Speech Debate, but one point he made that caught my ear in particular was his great sense of dissatisfaction with the fact that the fencing around the public housing in some rural community, I believe it was Steinbach, was not to his liking. And I felt very sorry for him because, I mean, if the painting is not to his liking and if it doesn't look esthetically pleasing then it is unfortunate and the Minister responsible would like to know what practical suggestions there might be for having it painted some different colour or maybe removed altogether. And I admit, Sir, that the Conservative government never had any administrative problems or bad fencing around public housing in rural Manitoba towns, because, Sir, in eleven years they didn't build a single one. (Applause) And, Mr. Speaker, anyone who has grown up or lived in rural Manitoba at any time and many citizens of Winnipeg will know that in many rural communities the need for an adequate and a better supply, a better stock of new and comfortable and adequate housing for low income families was as great, greater of course, five, ten, fifteen years ago than it is today. But they didn't want administrative problems, so they didn't build a single one. And the same could be said about so many things. (Applause)

I will admit, Sir, that we are having administrative problems with respect to the construction of remote housing in Manitoba's northern communities. We are having substantial administrative problems, and we are having obvious administrative problems with respect to the building of airstrips and winter roads. They didn't have those problems and I'll tell you why. Because in ten years, in ten years they built an average of ten remote housing units a year, ten per year. Mr. Speaker, with ten remote housing units per year I should have thought that the Minister responsible could have built each one personally. (Applause) We are committed to proceed and are proceeding with 100 to 200 per year and intend to increase that figure.

And of course with respect to winter roads they didn't have administrative problems, because what they did, Sir, was to leave it to the local residents to pay through their freight rates on their food and supplies an amount of money that would make it worthwhile for the freighter to build his own tractor road. Now, Mr. Speaker, that may have been okay in the 1880s and 90s, it may even have been all right at the turn of the century, but no one can be serious in suggesting that that is good enough today. (Applause) No part of our province, Sir, no part of our province can be left as a feudal fief to some individual who will build roads across Crown land and then prevent other people from using it. If my honourable friends think that there were no problems with the old system, I would invite them to ask for further details because the files are quite voluminous, letter upon letter from people in the north complaining.

Sir, we regard the new system of winter road construction as being in the nature of an experiment, one in which at least removes the necessity of people having to pay through their grocery and supply freighting costs, the cost of building those winter roads. The cost of living in the north is high enough as it is. And if my honourable friend wants an example: Under the old system a gallon of gas would cost in a northern community of 300 miles or more from the end of conventional road, \$1.60, \$1.80 per gallon. With the winter road system if weather cooperates that price can be brought down to something approximately 50 to 60 percent of that, and that is something worth trying for.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I made an error when I said that they had no administrative problems because they built no airstrips in remote northern communities. I am in error, they built two; they built two in the years in which they were in office. But, Sir, let me point out that in the four years in which we have been in office we have built approximately 22 and we've had to finish the two that they started. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party to comment just very quickly on some of the observations and comments he made during the

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) debate. I know that he described the Throne Speech as barren, lethargic, disappointing, disillusioning, platitudinous, ideological and innocuous, that's how he described the Throne Speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, we could all on this side sit here and be entranced with his alliteration than his use of adjectives, but after he had thus condemned the Throne Speech I really wondered if he expected to be believed. I rather suspect that he didn't really expect anyone to believe him in any case. For the moment I just want to summarize what he said during the course of his address which was what? - I think on Tuesday last.

On the one hand the Leader of the Liberal Party is going to do a great many nice things, goodies he would call them if somebody else was doing them. He's going to do so many things for the people of Manitoba by abolishing or reducing a whole series of taxes. He says he's going to - and here I'll paraphrase as he is wont to do - he's going to abolish the sales tax, abolish the estates tax, he's going to abolish the gift tax, the capital gains tax - no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: The First Minister is deceiving the House if he says that anything in the Speech from the Throne made any reference to what he just said. Estate tax - what else? Mr. Speaker, the First Minister can find no reference in the address that I made to an abolition of sales tax, any reference to sales tax or any other of the taxes he refers to. Try to stick to the facts, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to stick to the facts and I hope I have at least as much success as he did. Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary to take a fine-tooth comb through the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's address and through his election promises of last June, I'm sure we will find reference to the abolition of certain - yes, of quite a number of taxes. Certainly he would like to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we have a high level of taxes here in Manitoba and that for those in lower levels of income the tax burden is so onerous that speedy measures are needed in order to reduce the burden of taxation on Manitobans and especially those of pensionable years, I think he mentioned single parents with dependents and those in lower income levels generally.

I wonder if he is aware, Sir, that of the ten provinces in Canada nine have sales tax and a breakdown is as follows: Three Liberal provinces, a sales tax, not of five percent as here in Manitoba but seven and eight percent as the case may be. Three Tory provinces all with a sales tax of seven and eight percent as the case may be. Three NDP provinces each with a sales tax of five percent, and one poor little oil province that has none.

Mr. Speaker, when they make criticisms of our economy, the economic performance of our province, the stewardship of this government, levels of taxation, comparative tax impact criticisms, they should tell us what standard of measure they are using. Because, Sir, if they want to use as a standard of measure the impact of taxation in other provinces in Canada we are willing to have that kind of comparison carried out in the fullest detail because Manitoba's tax structure will compare very well indeed. If they want to make a comparison using as a yardstick of measure the tax impact as it existed on different income groups when the Conservatives were in power, we'd be happy to have that kind of comparison made as well because ours would compare very favorably indeed. But if they're making the criticism with no standard of measure in mind other than the upper limits of their wild imagination then I'm afraid we fall short. Because, Mr. Speaker, I do want to take just a moment or two to refer my honourable friends to a document which does show in chart form what the comparative tax impact is in Manitoba today at different levels of income, today as compared to 1969, and also in Manitoba as compared to five other provinces in Canada. We could have all but the width of the page prevented it. I am referring you to the 1973 budget papers which contain the chart. Mr. Speaker, to call this a biased or unbiased document is simply nonsense. It is the actual figures which can be calculated, mathematics doesn't lend itself to some kind of legerdemain as my honourable friends would like to imply but let it be noted, Mr. Speaker, that for example, for a family at the \$6,000 per year level, two children, if they were paying a total in personal taxes, income tax and health premium tax of \$362 in 1969 - today that same family is paying no tax. After one takes into account the tax credit there is actually a \$377 tax saving to that family at that income level today as compared to 1969. Even at the

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) \$10,000 per year level, if in 1969 the tax impact was a total of \$663, today it is in the order of \$388 and there's a \$275 saving to that family of that size.

If my honourable friends want to talk about old age pensioners and the kind of tax impact that they had to live with in 1969 and today, I would simply point out that in 1969 an old age pensioner, a couple, would have paid \$6,000 a year, which would be rather high for a pensioner I should think, they would have paid \$195 in income tax, \$204 in health premium taxes, for a total of \$399, say \$400.00. Today that old age pension couple would pay in income tax \$215, \$204 less than Medicare premium taxes, \$173 tax credit, either as homeowners or even as tenants, and so they would be paying a total of only \$42, or a \$357 tax saving.

Mr. Speaker, they may not think very much, the opposition, of a provincial tax credit system but I say to them that this system which we have introduced here in Manitoba and which is in force in at least another province in Canada, is a far far more equitable and effective way of coping with the problem of inflation as it affects people on lower income. Old age pensioners and families on lower income are far better served by a system of property tax credits, abolition of fixed taxes such as Medicare than by trying to cut income tax by one or two percentage points. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we were to adopt the old parties suggestion of reducing taxes so as to help those on lower income the results would be perverse. Let me give you an example: I haven't heard anyone this year, but last year some honourable members of the Conservative Party were advocating a percentage reduction in the income tax pure and simple. All right, let's say that we have a two percent reduction in the income tax, as I believe was done in one other province. A two percentage reduction in the income tax would mean, to a family at the \$5,000 income level it would mean about \$127 a year in tax saving; and to a family at the \$50,000 a year level of income the tax saving would be in the order of \$130.00. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly opposite to the kind of tax adjustments that are needed in order to help those who are most affected by inflation. So I tell my honourable friends without any equivocation or hesitation whatsoever that if they are advocating a simple percentage reduction in the income tax as a tax relief measure, forget it. We will have no part of it. And of course last year when we introduced the tax credit system and advertised in order to bring some public information and awareness there was great hue and cry by the Opposition and a good deal to be said through the Opposition, through some of the hotline shows and so on.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a paper of just the day before yesterday, Province of Ontario, full page spread: "Get Your Fair Share of Ontario's New Tax Credits". I am only pointing this out, Mr. Speaker, that last year we were no more guilty of irresponsible use of public information budget funds than any other province in Canada that carries out the same kind of public information program. But my honourable friends of course try and manage to get quite ahead of public attention and media steam up about things of that kind. My honourable friends they have had a lot to say about inflation in this Throne Speech Debate. One would have thought that they had somehow managed to avoid completely the effects of inflation when they were in office. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have, unfortunately for them we have records, Statistics Canada keeps records of inflationary price movements, and we find, you know, that between the years 1965 and 1969 that the Consumer Price Index moved up 17 points; 17 points in those four years. And they didn't bring in any, not one cent, Sir, of tax relief to old age pensioners or lower income families. They didn't bring the slightest kind of tax adjustment in order to help those people and those families cope with the effects of inflation. Of course they say we haven't done a very good job. I don't know what they expected a province to do but they said we haven't done a very good job of fighting the fires of inflation. Well everything is relative, Mr. Speaker, I note that in those four years between 1965 and 1969 that the Consumer Price Index in Canada moved up 18 points and here in Winnipeg moved up 17 points. So a point favourable comparison. Well for that we should be glad. I also note that in the last four years including the end of 1973, that the Consumer Price Index in Canada has moved up 25 points and in Winnipeg has moved up 19 points. A six point favourable differential.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend any great amount of time on the statistical indexes

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) because if the Leader of the Opposition didn't at least the Leader of the Liberal Party did, prove that you can do just about anything you like, and he has, with statistics. For example, he states in his speech that between 1960 and 1968, that in those eight years we averaged the creation of 4,800 new jobs each year. Said it wasn't very good but at least it was better than during the NDP's first mandate when we created an average of only 4,500 new jobs per year. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I take my figures from Statistics Canada not from the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party and he is approximately correct on the first part; between 1960 and '68 the average was 4,900 new jobs per year, but between 1969 and the end of 1973 the figure is not 4,500 but 7,300 jobs per year. (Applause) He says that job creation was too slow during our time of office. Well what is he comparing us with? The fact remains that in the eight years between 1960 and 1968 under the Tories 39,000 jobs created in eight years. In the last four years 29,000 jobs; 29,000 jobs in four years as compared to 39,000 in eight years. He says we didn't do as well. Mr. Speaker, I can't help my honourable friends if they are not able to do ordinary arithmetic.

But Mr. Speaker, if accuracy is not the strong point of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party then unfortunately neither is consistency his concern, because on the one hand he attacks us for these make-work projects and we heard him just a few minutes ago do the same thing - phony jobs he calls them, make-work projects, do nothing employment programs. But on the other hand in his same speech he called on us to establish a national park in the north as part of a winter works program with further work in the spring being offered to University students. This, Mr. Speaker, is precisely the kind of work that the government has helped to provide in Manitoba during our term of office. We have introduced a capital works acceleration program which has helped provide several thousands of jobs during off-peak, what would otherwise be high unemployment periods.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. SCHREYER: We have brought in the Provincial Employment Program, the Pensioner Home Repair Program, the Student Temporary Employment Program and, Mr. Speaker, one that amounts to close to \$14 million, a Special Municipal Forgivable Loan Program under which there has been the building of concrete worthwhile long-lasting durable public works that will serve a useful purpose for many many years in their respective communities. (Applause) Then he has the audacity to suggest --(Interjection)-- at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Then he has the audacity to imply that these programs and projects are phony make-work. Mr. Speaker, I would invite him to get himself invited, if he can, by Municipal Reeves and Councillors and Mayors and Councillors in the many Manitoba towns and villages to see for himself the kind of permanent capital improvements that have been put in place in so many difference communities in our province. (Applause) Mr. Speaker, I have a whole long list of quotations from my honourable friend's speech, most of it having to do with statistics, almost every passage of which is incorrect, inaccurate in the extreme and unfortunately time doesn't permit us to deal with that today. But here's one I will refer to in passing on population again, where he said, the Leader of the Liberal Party, that the past four years has produced a poorer population performance for Manitoba than did the previous four before 1969. Then he used certain figures, and you know I checked them and I had to look twice because there was something familiar about the figures and I discovered that he did use the right figures, but he attributed them to the wrong years. And I find for example, he said that the Canadian population has been growing during this administration's first term at 5.7 times faster than Manitoba's, and upon checking I find that it is between 1964 and 1968 that Manitoba's population was growing at 5.7 times as he said faster than Manitoba's, but that in the last four years it's not 5.7 it's 3.4, so if anything there's an improvement. It's an improvement, it's not a deterioration. I mean if one wants to get into a numbers game at least use the right numbers. Manitoba's population increased by 13,000 between 1964 and 1968; by 19,000 between 1969 and 1973, equal periods of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister's time is up, unfortunately.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I then just take one minute, literally, to put in a concluding statement here? That I must say that there is - it's rather appropriate, Sir, I've

THRONE SPEECH

(MR SCHREYER cont'd) come to the end of the time and I've come to the last page of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech, and that is the only page, the only excerpt with which I can agree in all that he had said. Because he, Mr. Speaker, in speaking on resource and energy policy went on to say that there is an urgent need to devise a policy, that the Canadian Consumer's interest comes first, that the proposition that applies to energy sources apply with only slight variation to the whole range of non-renewable mineral resources, that fossil fuels may be the source of concern now but the time may not be far off when it will be copper or nickel or other widely used industrial metals that will be at issue. That it is possible and imperative to assert the national interest over foreign interest and the primacy of the public interest over the private.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this concluding paragraph provides a good theme upon which to conclude. That our natural resources are a public trust owned by the people of this province. It follows from this that the rate of development and the royalties of the public must be determined by the government but that the determination of the royalty must take into account two factors; whether it will affect the rate of development in ways that are consistent with public policy, and whether the royalty will be at a level that will provide the incentive for continuing private sector investment. Mr. Speaker, it is the last two factors that account for a good deal of past policy.

The emphasis in the past unfortunately has been so much one of growth for growths sake that rates of development were never thought to be high enough and so depletable resources were given out at incentive rates; such incentive rates, Mr. Speaker, that the Crown charged royalties of 7 1/2 percent. And on \$200 million of production of non-renewable resources the Crown received \$2.5 million, that was the legacy of yesteryear. Mr. Speaker, in 1971 we took the first step towards changing that. We increased the royalty to 15 percent, but it still, Sir, is related to a basis of calculation which in turn is based on taxable income under federal law. As a result, we still cannot say that we have a rational and justifiable resource development and resource revenue collecting arrangement in our province. So in the weeks and months ahead we will see whether the Opposition really believe in what they utter about the primacy of the public interest and natural resources being a heritage of the people, because when we bring in new proposals that will bring resource development and resource royalties into the modern era we will see whether they speak then as they apparently are speaking now. That, Sir, will be only one of many tests of that side and this side in the next four years.

I say in conclusion that this government deserves the confidence of this House because it has demonstrated in a way that has satisfied almost 200,000 Manitobans at the last election; that despite our many faults, and being human we have many faults, that despite our many administrative problems, people understand that many of these problems are a direct result of the fact that we are trying to cope with a broader range of human and social problems than any previous administration ever did. For those reasons, the fact that we are dedicated to the principles of bringing about more fairness and equity in our society, the people are willing and have demonstrated that at the last election, to give us another chance in this House, does see fit to give this government its confidence. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Subject to Rule 35, Subsection 3, I must now put the question on the amendment. I cannot proceed with questions or anything else except by unanimous leave of the House. Order please.

MR. ASPER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable member state his point of order.

MR. ASPER: During the course of the First Minister's remarks I asked him whether he would, because he was addressing himself to comments that I had made earlier in the debate, would he yield the floor to a question and he said, Mr. Speaker, that he would at the conclusion of his remarks. I think it's therefore appropriate that since leave was given from him to continue his

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman may extend whatever courtesy he likes on his own time. We are now on House time and I gave no time whatsoever. Would the honourable member not interrupt while I'm speaking? I am indicating we are now on House time and the only way we can proceed further is by unanimous consent. If there is

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) none, I must put the question.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SPIVAK: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the main motion.

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

YEAS

Asper	F. Johnston
Axworthy	Jorgenson
Banman	McGill
Blake	McGregor
Brown	McKellar
Craik	McKenzie
Einarson	Marion
Enns	Minaker
Ferguson	Moug
Graham	Sherman
Henderson	Spivak
G. Johnston	Watt

NAYS

Adam	McBryde
Barrow	Malinowski
Bostrom	Miller
Boyce	Osland
Burtiniak	Patterson
Derewianchuk	Paulley
Dillen	Pawley
Doern	Petursson
Evans	Schreyer
Gottfried	Shafransky
Green	Toupin
Hanuschak	Turnbull
Jenkins	Uruski
Johannson	Walding

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it, declare the motion lost.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, for your information I am paired with the Honourable Minister of Finance. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, under the Rules of the House we were to vote at 9:30 without any discretion as to any other time and I propose now to continue with my remarks, there are still two, at least two separate matters which have been dealt with in the Throne Speech debate by honourable members opposite which I believe require a defence by me speaking on behalf of the government of the province.

Among other things, the Leader of the Opposition the other day made some very pointed reference to the civil service and he alleges that the government is relating to the civil service in a way that is injurious to the public service and in every other way that he could describe most undesirable. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to draw the attention of the

THRONE SPEECH

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Assembly to some disturbing comments made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the civil service. These statements that he made represent a continuation of the attack that he started last year in this House on the competence and integrity of the public service of this province. I replied then and I reply again this evening, that the statements he made at that time and last week again were totally false and irresponsible. This year, Mr. Speaker, he has gone even further. He maintains that the practices and procedures of this government have led to misuse of public funds for the purpose of the party in power and to the politicization of the civil service. I believe the very words are his. In any case I refer to page 46 of Hansard of last week. He charges that this government has abandoned the merit system in favor of an outright spoil system.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat with all the emphasis I can muster that the civil service of Manitoba operates in the same way as it did over the last decade and before. The Civil Service Act is essentially the same one in effect as was in effect during previous administrations. The Civil Service Commission is playing the same role as it did in earlier years. Every civil servant, as in earlier years, takes an oath of office and an oath of allegiance when he or she enters the public service; they swear allegiance to the Monarch and they swear, and I quote, "to faithfully and honestly fulfill their duties in the government service of Manitoba." Civil servants are hired with that understanding and are expected to fill that responsibility. Every civil service appointment or promotion under this government has been in accordance with the standard Civil Service Commission procedure and the merit principle and other practices of the civil service have been followed.

As I pointed out last year, Mr. Speaker, we basically have the same Deputy Ministers who are serving this administration as they have served previous administrations. There have been some changes but nothing that could be deemed to be at variance with normal change with the flux and flow of time. The same can be said not only with respect to Deputy Ministers but relative to most echelons of the civil service. Many persons who have been many years in the public service have been promoted within the system. I said on one previous occasion, and I repeat now, that there were fewer changes in the civil service with the last change in government than is characteristic of most changes of government in relation to numbers or persons in the public service that leave. There was nothing undue, nothing unusual, in fact if anything the last change of administration was marked by a lesser degree of change in the public service than what one might find in other jurisdictions at other times in the past.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this government believes, to put it bluntly, that one doesn't have to be a Liberal, a Conservative or a New Democrat to be a competent civil servant in Manitoba. The present government has appointed civil servants for all we know of all shades of political opinion and expect them to carry out the wishes of those elected to office. We ask only that they do their job to the best of their ability.

I reject completely the demagogic attack that was launched by the Leader of the Opposition the other day. It was unworthy of his position but I must say, Sir, that I was not really surprised. So if one wants to look for evidence of politicization, as he calls it, or of patronage, if one wants to look for it one can contrive to find it. If one wants to say that some who are NDP or who are social democratic by inclination are therefore of necessity patronage appointments, then one can say that with respect to appointments that were made during the Tory years, or in other provinces by other administrations. There are in Manitoba after all some approximately 200,000 people who voted New Democrat in the last election. Is my honourable friend suggesting, as he ridiculously might, that therefore by definition every single one of those persons is somehow uneligible to even apply and certainly not to be appointed to the public service? Is he insinuating that only those who vote other than New Democrat are to be given all equal treatment in terms of processing of applications? Well that, Sir, is obviously the kind of childish argument than can go on forever. Surely there is no expectation that with respect to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointments that we should be appointing persons who are by political philosophy opposed to the kind of programs we are trying to implement. With respect to the other echelons I already stated we do not take any

THRONE SPEECH

(MR SCHREYER cont'd) kind of political reliability test, although my honourable friends talk in the kind of demagogic way that is reminiscent of the decade of the 1950s in another jurisdiction to the south.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to indicate the hour of 10 o'clock has arrived. I should also like to indicate that the Honourable First Minister is now speaking on the main motion. Once he ceased he does not have an opportunity again.

The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.