

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 6, 1973

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 87 students of Senior Grade of the Millbank Collegiate of South Dakota. They are under the direction of Mr. Dickhaut. They are our guests this afternoon. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we closed off for the dinner hour I was just beginning to reach the Member for Lakeside. I believe I was starting to touch a nerve and I was saying that prior to 1969 the political climate of this province was very drab and dull, and now since 1969, Mr. Speaker, not only is the economy of the province vibrant and pulsating, but our economy is also vibrant and pulsating. Some of the remarks that the Leader of the Opposition made this morning - I may go over a few of them - was that this government had not done anything to help small business. Well it's funny, Mr. Speaker, that prior to '69 the Manitoba Development Corporation did not have a small business loan department, and since 1969 the fund has been amended and there now is a department to assist small business enterprise to establish themselves and to become more viable. I'm quite sure that there's -- in my constituency I know several people who have availed themselves to the services provided by the Department of Industry and Commerce and also have received assistance from the Manitoba Development Corporation to assist them in their free enterprise operations. So here again we have a statement by the Leader of the Opposition which is not conversant with the facts as they are. He mentioned that a lot of unemployment figures, he mentioned that some of our citizens were not tabulated when they tabulated the unemployment figures. He was quite emphatic about this. He forgot to mention about the unemployed Conservatives that there will be after the next election. And there will be a few, I assure you. Mr. Speaker, I'm getting to the Member for Lakeside again. I'm starting to reach him.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable member for a moment. In the loge to my left I'm informed we have a former MLA and an MP of the House of Commons, Mr. Peter Magnus. On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few comments on the speech by the Leader of the Liberal Party who has been absent for a few days. I understand he has laryngitis, or is not well anyway. We wish him a speedy recovery and that he may come back and take part in the proceedings. I was not present in the House when he made his contribution. I understand it was quite lengthy. I read some of the reports in the press and I was looking at the meat of his speech, the ingredients that he was proposing for the Province of Manitoba if - and there was a possibility which is very very extreme - but if there was ever a possibility that they would be forming a government, and I was quite amazed at the contradictions in the remarks that he made and the proposals that he presented. And they're very glaring contradictions, in my estimation, and for instance one of the proposals was that -- and I am quoting from the press which is not always accurate but nevertheless we have to accept this as being correct -- "Freezing of the size of the civil service and non-replacement of persons leaving or retiring until a ten percent overall cut is achieved." This is one of the proposals that the Liberal Party will instrument if they are elected and if they ever form a government.

Just right next to that they have other proposals here. One is opening of Manitoba trade offices outside the province. Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a contradiction to the first proposal that I have read because it's going to require extra help, extra civil servants to operate this trade office outside the province. And another proposal here is creating of an international force of industrial development commissioners, paid by commission to attract industry to Manitoba. We'll require some more people.

## BUDGET

(MR. ADAM cont'd)

Number three - establishment of an energy of mineral resource division of the government, will require some more people.

Number four - additional spending on tourist promotion and opening of new provincial wilderness park. Well it's a noble, noble proposal but it would require more people again.

And five - here is another one, a screening agency to oversee foreign takeovers and new laws to guarantee sensitive industries against becoming foreign-owned. I say, Mr. Speaker, all these proposals may be valid; nevertheless they will require additional staff or is he asking the present staff to absorb more responsibility, work longer hours or what? I would like to know why the glaring contradiction in these proposals? Now since anyone can immediately see the contradictions in these proposals I'm sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party is well aware that these proposals are contradictory in themselves. So therefore one has to try and analyze the reason why they would put proposals which are contradictory, and the only reason that I can see at the present time, that I have noticed a struggle going on in the opposite side, a struggle going on for second place. There's a struggle going on to be the Official Opposition. It appears to me that both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party have accepted the fact that there's very very little chance of them being able to defeat the present government in the next election, and therefore they are vying for second place.

And the Leader of the Conservative Party is very well aware of this and he's trying to maintain his present position as Official Leader, and the Leader of the Liberal Party is trying to replace the Conservatives as Official Opposition. And the way they are doing it, the way the Leader of the Liberal Party is doing it is to try and be as contradictory as possible in his statements in order for the members on this side, the government side, to react and take up the argument to refute and to show the contradiction in his statements. In that way they can portray outside of the House and to the people of this province that the debate is not between the Conservatives and the Government but rather between the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Government and that the Conservatives are on the way out. This is my impression of the strategy of the Liberal Party. I doubt whether it will work; I doubt whether it will succeed, particularly when you have the province now plastered at the present time with bulletins all over the place, personality cult like you would see in Russia perhaps, where you have pictures all over the place. We have the picture of the Leader of the Liberal Party all over the province now and under it says, "Stop, Look and Listen."

A MEMBER: Yes, that's it. Nothing else.

MR. ADAM: Stop, Look and Listen. This is what the strategy is of the Liberal Party.

MR. MALINOWSKI: But where is the action?

MR. ADAM: And to my estimation this is a very good definition of nothing. Stop, Look and Listen; do nothing, just stop and look and listen.

MR. MALINOWSKI: It means stop; it means doing nothing. No action.

MR. ADAM: An interesting point came out at the Public Utilities on Thursday when Mr. Bateman, Chairman of the Hydro, mentioned that there was a possibility that given certain water levels on Lake Winnipeg, there was a possibility that we may be short of power in 1974. Now this was very interesting. I didn't see the press take that up; they didn't mention it anywhere. I never noticed it in any of the articles. However, this is a very important statement, Mr. Speaker. If there is a possibility that we're going to be short of hydro to service this province in 1974, I fail to see how we can afford to stop, look and listen, and I think it is time that a lot of people start thinking about this. The province since 1969, this government has not stopped to look and listen. We are progressing forward. We have changed the economy in this province regardless of whether the opposition wish to accept that or not, and I don't expect them to agree to that. I'm sure they don't want to do that.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake mentioned in his contribution that many people that come to this country from other lands to be free, to be free, and now he said he had met many people in his constituency who are becoming concerned about the giveaways which he termed as giveaways in this province. I would like to know if these people came to this country what country did they come from that was giving away, where there were giveaways. We are very pleased that they came to this land, we are very pleased that they pioneered this land, but that does not alter the fact that we must move forward. And I want to say again that prior to '69 the economy was stagnant and we had the stagnation of politics, stagnant politics.

--(Interjections)--

## BUDGET

(MR. ADAM cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 when I was campaigning, I did a considerable amount of door to door campaigning and I'd come to some farmer's yard and he would say, "Oh well, you can't do it; they couldn't do it; we've heard this before." There was a great deal of apathy on the part of the people, very suspicious of politicians and rightly so, and they were really hopeless; they were really living in hopelessness. They said, "We've been told this time and time before. We see a politician every four years and after that they're gone. Nothing ever happens. Nothing ever changes." Nothing ever changes and that's why I say we had stagnation. You were not reaching the people.

Since 1969 the people are becoming politically aware that there has been a change in the politics in this province; they're getting involved; they're talking; and the press is helping us and we thank them for it. We think it's good. --(Interjection)-- Well, the Guidelines was introduced by the First Minister as a document for discussion and I don't intend to go into discussing it now because that's why it was introduced, for discussion, and I think the Leader of the Official Opposition really did start the ball rolling. He got a very good discussion going on the Guidelines and this is what we want. I'm sure that we will have a lot of discussion in the next few months and we'll be looking forward to the other editions that will be presented in due time.

I would like to speak a little bit about agriculture - I'm an agriculturist myself - and there has been quite a bit in the news the last few days with regards to the cost of living, the price of meat and so on, and I have been one that has always believed that in order for a society such as we have here, a free enterprise system, if it is totally free I've always felt that someone has to subsidize it and I believe that the farmers, the primary producers, and the workers have always subsidized the economy. And knowing this, knowing this, federal governments as well as provincial governments have adopted and supported policies, that they've supported cheap food policies. There were two ingredients that was required for the survival of a free enterprise system, and one was that you would have an abundance of cheap food and a surplus of cheap labour. These are the two prime ingredients. As soon as these two ingredients disappear, you're in trouble. And the proof of that is in what we are witnessing today as far as the meat boycott is concerned. We have seen where, well, people who strongly believe in the free enterprise system now are willing to boycott that free enterprise system by boycotting.

Now I want to say that farmers are the biggest free enterprisers there is. They're the strongest supporters of free enterprise. They will compete on the international market which they are doing now. They are quite prepared to compete on an international market and they'd be very happy to do so providing that every sector in our economy does likewise. And farmers will not have any problem. Am I right? The Member for Rhineland supports me and he's nodding his head so I believe that I have at least one supporter in the House. I am sure that if I could carry 550 bushels of wheat to Germany I could bring back a Volkswagen. But if I want to buy a Volkswagen now I have to take 3,000 bushels to the elevator to get one in order to have enough money to buy one. So this is what I mean when I say that to compete on the open market the farmer is prepared to do so, but unless you want to have the industry as well to compete on an open international market, then someone has to suffer and the pricing of primary production has always been left to the four winds.

The pricing policies have been in the hands of those who control our economy - and it's a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, that the moment that a steer leaves my yard or the yard of the Member for Lakeside, and I know he has, I understand he has quite a few as well, the minute that that animal leaves the yard there's a price tag on it. As soon as it gets to the gate there's a price on it and that price follows it right to the meat counter. And nobody loses in between. Nobody loses. Everybody takes his ripoff all the way down the line. But not the farmer. And we've had a few very important people I heard a couple of comments made by people who are supposed to be well versed in the economy and they were trying to relate the cost, the high rise of cost of meat on the cost of production. And this is a fallacy. This is a fallacy because the cost of production has never entered into the price of beef or anything else as far as the primary producer was concerned. And I think the Member for Lakeside will agree with that. It doesn't matter if your feed is high or your costs are high, you are left to the four winds as far as your prices are concerned. The prices are set by someone else other than yourself, and that is why I say that in order for a system such as we have here in Canada, in order for it to survive we must have some segments in the society to subsidize it, and until you have a completely free --

## BUDGET

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . you either have to have a completely free and open market on everything or else you have to have controls of some sort.

I am sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside will be getting up to speak after me and I hope you will contain yourself, Sir, until I am finished. I had some difficulty in getting the floor and I would like to continue.

I think that we have to sympathize, I have to sympathize with the housewife and the consumer who go down to the store to buy, and she's confronted with suddenly a high price for red meats, and I say that we have been lulled by the government. The Federal Government has always supported a cheap food policy and we have become to accept that as a fact. And suddenly comes a rude awakening when this can no longer continue. This can no longer continue and we're not prepared for it. But part of the blame, part of the blame for the high cost also we have to bear ourselves as consumers, because we have demanded Cadillac shopping centres, we want to shop in centres that are under-utilized, perhaps used to the extent that they should be only on weekends. But these cost money and there is duplication. There is duplication.

You go down to the Polo Park Shopping Centre and you have I don't know how many huge million dollar installations delivering the same services. These increase costs. And another thing I believe that does increase the cost of food is the packaging. People want to go in and buy little bits of little pieces of processed food all sealed in cellophane and what have you. These all add to the cost. Advertising, over-advertising also causes price increases. And also there are thousands and literally thousands of articles on the market which are absolutely useless. Thousands and thousands of them and we are urged to buy, we are urged to buy this by high-powered advertising and I speak for myself, I just have to look around my own home and, you know, who needs a back scratcher, electric back scratcher? I don't need it. --(Interjection)-- You know, if I need my back scratched I can get my wife to do it. I don't need an electric back scratcher made in Hong Kong or wherever.

Now I say that we spend a lot of money foolishly. You know, it's interesting to note that when the price of milk goes up two cents a quart, when milk goes up two cents a quart, you don't hear the end of it. But I believe and perhaps I could stand to be corrected but I understand that the consumption of milk and liquor is identical in Manitoba. Seventy quarts per annum. --(Interjections)-- Now it seems to me that if the cost of milk is too high, it seems to me maybe you should forego one bottle of booze and maybe buy a little more milk and forget about crying the blues about a couple of cents. --(Interjection)-- But I'm not a milk drinker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes. Before he proceeds I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade 10 standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Stubbs. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Let me also remind the gallery that they should not interrupt the proceedings in the House by any undue noise. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

BUDGET DEBATE (Cont'd)

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me the extra interruptions. I'll be closing very shortly anyway.

I think that the boycott is a sad situation. I sympathize with the people who take part in the boycott because I understand what they're up against, but I think it would have been more dramatic, not that it would have helped, but it would have been more dramatic if they'd go down and parade in front of the big distributors, farm implement distributors, saying, "Down with the high prices to farmers so that we can have a good supply of food at a reasonable cost."

I would like to, in closing, quote from an article that appeared in the Globe and Mail this morning, and Scott Young was interviewing this farmer in Ontario and they were talking about the hassle over the meat prices, and I quote the farmer saying there was a time when he used to love getting up in the morning; farming then was a good thing. --(Interjection)-- "Farming was a good time. But I've been thinking seriously about the whole deal, especially since this last hassle over prices. I work seven days a week up to 12 hours a day or 16 or 18. If I happen to drive a load into the stock yards, which I usually do at night because there is seldom any

## BUDGET

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . time during the day, I've always got my neck on the line at the bank. Sure, we get by but only because my wife works as well. She buys the groceries and pays the hydro, the phone, the heating bills. I meet the mortgages and the bank loans. I just don't think the public knows what we're up against and I don't know how much longer I want to do this at all."

You know, this reminds me of my own house. My wife had to work. She buys the groceries, she pays the hydro, the phone bill, and I pay the mortgages and the bank loans.

He goes on further to say here -- he was asked if he had shipped any cattle this week by the reporter -- had he shipped any cattle this week? "No," he replied, "I won't unless the price comes back up," he said. "I think I can hold out for a month. Last week I bought twelve cattle on the Tuesday and the price dropped \$2.00 a hundredweight on Wednesday. That cost me \$240.00 right there. The supermarkets and the packers can ride that kind of a situation, but I can't." So, Mr. Speaker, this is what's happening and I think we'd better all think about it. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to at this time add a few comments to the numerous ones that have been made in this somewhat unique and singular reply to the Budget that we've had in this last little while. There have been some new innovations, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure you personally are aware of, and before I deal with the budget with its many ramifications in the way that I choose to, allow me to attempt to pick up the threads of some of the remarks, some of the contributions, some of the speeches that have been made on that subject, indeed the setting in which the very budget was brought down on that evening by the First Minister, the Honourable Premier of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall in one of the initial Throne Speeches of this government, that with a degree of new-found joy and pride indicated in that Throne Speech how they're going to cast out the hidebound traditions that were obviously, in their opinion, only presenting the kind of progressive things that should be taking place in this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Budget, an event of this Budget Debate demonstrated one of those traditions which, I am sure you will agree with me, proved its value beyond any misunderstanding to all of us in this House.

I refer, of course, Sir, to the breaking of traditions of having the galleries staffed with one's party supporters and the clapping and the noise making that took place on the night of the presentation of the Budget by the Premier. Only, of course, only of course to be entered into by the group that I represent and then by the other groups. Mr. Speaker, what it proved, the only point that it proved was some of the very worthwhile traditions that have been handed down to us in the British Parliamentary system of government, have some pretty significant value, because if it is that kind of a game that we want to play, then of course as my friend the Honourable Member from Inkster indicated to me in private conversation, we would soon degenerate down to the kind of mob rule by the galleries, etc. And so I take some pleasure in pointing out, pointing out to my progressive fellows opposite, that before they ridicule and before they embellish in Throne Speeches the necessity of doing away with traditions of the past, that many of our traditions stand the test of today and stand the reason of today and are as good today as the day they were enshrined into our system of parliamentary democracy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Honourable the Member from St. Johns is not in his chair. I say this not in the manner that I might attribute it to some other members because he usually is in his chair, and I say this sincerely because he also raised a point in his contribution to the Budget Speech that moved me to some extent and that caused me some concern, I'm sure, that has caused some concern to most members in this House. And that has to do with the general level of acrimony that has developed in the House in this Chamber during these sessions of this Legislative Assembly, and this one being no exception. He particularly castigated members opposite, members of my group, for sinking to the new low of zeroing in and singling out, by person, individual members of the Civil Service. I think specifically and I don't want to mince words, he referred to the kind of attack that we have made from time to time on the chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Cass-Beggs. And he indicated in his remarks that this was not the kind of situation that existed at the time that he remembered, the time that we were government in other times. And I have to concur with him, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. But I have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I would be asking you to transfer this to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, if he can remember, if he can remember when the last

## BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . time it was that a senior civil servant of this province publicly ridiculed a member of this House, a former Premier of this House, called his serious attempt at representation before a committee of this House as "amateurish, school boy, high school arithmetic and not to be reckoned with or to be given serious consideration of."

Mr. Speaker, that kind of a response by a senior civil servant deserves every kind of attack that we in the Opposition can mount on him. I ask you and I ask the Honourable Member for St. Johns to remember when can he recall, under previous administrations or previous times, that senior civil servants in that bracket would accept speaking engagements for any specific political Party inside or outside this province as the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro did when he spoke to the NDP convention in Edmonton, Alberta, and made his partisan politics known under those circumstances, and could be used and allowed himself to be used in that manner. Then Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies, absolutely none, for the kind of attack that we have from time to time visited upon him. Mr. Speaker, anybody that chooses to enter the arena of public debate and public politics in that manner cannot at his convenience slip behind the normal and the traditional security blanket of the civil service and expect to go unscathed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, who is not present, that, Sir, accounts for some of the deviations, deviations that I do not concur in and that I regret that have taken place in the past little while in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns took upon himself to castigate us also about our remarks or our attempts to cast some question about the integrity and the validity of the person who wrote the last famous document for this government, Professor Kierans, in the Mines Report. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology. If that honourable, venerable gentleman can get up in front of national television and say that the only reason I'm attacking his report is because I want to have my election paid for in the next election, I'll attack him across the width and breadth of this province. That is precisely what he did. Professor Kierans thinks he can get in front of national television and suggest to a national audience that the reason that we have shown some opposition to that document is because we're looking for campaign funds from the mining companies, then Sir, fine. Clap your hands. But then let's understand, let's understand the partnership, let's understand the kind of situation that we're getting into. Just don't have the Honourable Member from St. Johns get up there in any pious manner, sanctimonious manner, preach to me about what is proper and what is ethical with respect to the treatments of civil servants, public servants in this province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest, I suggest to you, I suggest to you it is that kind of conduct on the part of the members opposite that has led to what the Honourable Member for St. Johns chose to spend some time on during the reply to his budget to castigate us for sinking to new lows.

Mr. Speaker, I say this with some regret but I say it nonetheless because the First Minister is present, the First Minister has led in this brigade of this kind of acrimony. When the First Minister suggested that I and other members of the previous administration used to meet contractors in the private back lanes of this city to exchange greasy 500-dollar bills on a five percent kick-off on contracts, that, Sir, is what the implication that the First Minister left, that, Sir, is what set the tone and the tenor . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . of the kind of opposition that we've had and the acrimony that we've had in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, my point of order is a point of privilege. The Member for Lakeside didn't mince words. He said that I had said that he and his colleagues used to meet in some back lane to exchange greasy 500-dollar bills. Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement, nothing of the sort. I'm wondering where he got that impression. And as I have not said it, my honourable friend really ought not to attempt to quote me to that effect.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, one has the privilege of paraphrasing, of stating an opinion, the implication. I ask the Premier, I ask the First Minister what was the implication, what was the meaning of the statements that he made when he, not in terms to the people of Manitoba made them here, but rather on the west coast, indicated at the outset of his career that the former administration was in the pay of private contractual firms and received regularly five percent kick-backs on all contracts offered by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

## BUDGET

MR. SCHREYER: It's a far cry; even the latter paraphrase is not accurate, but inaccurate as it is, it's a far cry from what my honourable friend said about one minute ago when he talked about . . .

MR. ENNS: Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm on a point of privilege. I said nothing of the kind. Certainly at no time did I intimate that members of the cabinet had been meeting anyone in any out of the way place in order to receive any amount of money for personal reasons. My honourable friend should know that that's not what I meant at all. I was referring to the historical pattern and the way in which the old Parties received their financing, and I can document that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is what has been documented I believe is an apology by the First Minister in that respect, and I do not withdraw or apologize the implications that I choose to draw from that kind of a remark. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and I'm bringing together, I'm bringing together a few threads that, you know, the Member from St. Johns, as can a few other members, they can reach me and they can move me when they get up on that side of the House and speak to me and to members on this side of the House, and I take valuable time from the little time that I have allotted to make these few points, because the Honourable Member for St. Johns chose to place the blame and the responsibility on this side of the House for the level of the debate from time to time, for the level of acrimony and attack from time to time, and I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, in this brief resume of history, and it goes back, as I said, to the day that this government took office, to the time of the automobile insurance debate when it was said with regularity, with unison from the other side, that all of us were in the hip pocket pay of the insurance corporation, etc. And yet, Mr. Speaker, yet Mr. Speaker, any suggestion on our part that there might be a bias on the other side, why then the piousness of the Lord Almighty is put to shame by members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the crowning touch of course was put on by the kind of particular attack that I resent so much, and I regret having to say it because I have to say it to a man that I have some respect for, the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, when just in this last little while he put the option to the people of Manitoba that either you maintain a people's government or you return it to the divine-inspired aristocrats. Mr. Speaker, is he referring to me as the aristocrats of this country and of this province? Is he referring to the Honourable Member for Charleswood as the aristocrats of this province? Is he referring to the Honourable Member from Virden as the aristocrats of this province? Mr. Speaker, I could understand it if he was referring to the Honourable Member from Swan River. But, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of deliberate, this is the kind of deliberate divisiveness that this government has engaged in with a design, with a deliberate design from the day they have taken office and we of course, recognizing that we're approaching an election year, know that it will be renewed with the kind of vigor that we've yet to experience.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I deny that kind of nonsense. I say to the honourable member through you, Sir, that if there has been any - and I suggest there has been - drop in the general level of debate in this Chamber, if there has been an increase in the manner and the way in which we abuse each other in this Chamber, I would suggest, Sir, that a great deal if not most of the responsibility has to lie with those who govern us today, namely the treasury benches and the people who are expected to set the tone and tenor of how we conduct our affairs in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with some matters that I thought were missing and were not commented on in the Budget, and mostly of course I have to come back to the position of what in fact, what in fact is in this Budget, what in fact is in the conduct of this government as we approach the close of their four-year tenure of that period of office? What is there that could give hope to the private sector to continue, not only to continue to performing as they have in the past, but to continue to invest and improve that performance in the future? Mr. Speaker, if I were any objective observer listening closely to the comments that have been made, to the actions of individual ministers and in particular certain ministers, they would have to shake their heads and suggest that there is little or precious little encouragement, little or precious little room for the private sector in the future plans of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Portage raised a question having to do with a mining company and its concerns about finding explorations in the province here in Manitoba. Now what was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resource's response in reply? It

## BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . was -- you know, well I won't stop them from doing something; you know, I won't stand in their way; I won't, you know, if they -- I'm not concerned if they do or don't. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe that could, if you took it just on its face value, that could stand as a neutral position. But of course that isn't the case. If you read the Guidelines of the Seventies, if you read the recommendations that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources mostly wrote himself into the report of the Kierans Report, if you read the actions, if you read the actions that already have been taken by this department in respect to cancellation of leases, no renewal of leases, and the obvious direction that this government intends to take; if you take that into consideration with the statements made by their own Planning and Priorities Committee about how the public sector is the sector that has to be encouraged and developed; how the public sector is the sector that needs a new financial structure to make sure it will develop; how the municipal structure should be encouraged to develop within the public structures of economics and so forth, certainly, Mr. Speaker, all the estimates, all the speeches, all the statements in any positive way by this government talk about the involvement of the public sector, and if there's a question asked, if there is a concern expressed for the private sector, it is given a neutral shrug of the shoulder, at best we get from them the pious comment that, well, we have nothing against the private sector; we'll let them compete with us and if they can stand up to the competition, fine and dandy, we're not going to eradicate them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this really, really the kind of encouragement that a developing province requires, that a province that requires the entrepreneurial skills of all of us, and those indeed that we haven't got here but can attract? Is it really the kind of answer that is going to bring forward the kind of development that we need in this province? Mr. Speaker, I challenge them. I challenge them on their own integrity to be honest and forthright with the people of Manitoba.

You know, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, he took great exception to the attempts made by members opposite to throw in the Red scare, to talk about Communism, to talk about socialist government takeover and so forth. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge them and tell them to rationalize their position. Where in the crying need of social concern do they put the two questions, for instance, you know, the necessity of automobile insurance which they felt as a burning social issue to nationalize, to take a thousand people out of work and to bring in some total government control? Now why, Mr. Speaker, would they not take that same attitude to the chain stores? The Honourable Member from Crescentwood has suggested it for them and quite frankly, you know, it is a national concern, it is a social concern; we have boycotts going on right now in the province. Are they suggesting to me that the same arguments, the same arguments that they applied in the insurance debate, that of wasteful advertising, doesn't apply to Safeway or Loblaws or Dominion? Are they suggesting to me that there may not be an over-expansion of facilities, that if a government took it over could properly avoid? Mr. Speaker, they sent down their government spokesman, Red Rudy, or Willie Janssen, I think it is, from the Department of Agriculture, to the House of Commons' hearings on food prices, and he gave the position and he said that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my matter of privilege has to do with that citation of Beuchesne that relates to the appropriateness and acceptability of referring to someone in this Assembly to someone who is in the public service and therefore, by definition, not able to be here to defend himself. The reference to Red Rudy or whomever, I take it is a reference to an Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Agriculture, I believe, and I think it's not only inappropriate, I believe it offends the rules, Sir, and I would ask that that citation be evoked.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has a point.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to rewrite the rule book because if this government is going to send senior civil servants down to Ottawa to make presentations on government policy on behalf of this government, and if this same civil servant who I refer to, who also feels himself free to make political speeches on whatever occasion moves him, Sir, then obviously, Sir, we can't be tied by the kinds of conditions that the Premier now wants to evoke, because this person spoke on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, and I would suspect that in the future then I think they'll be sending the Minister of Agriculture, or they should be sending the First Minister, or somebody else, but if you want to send senior civil servants down to Ottawa to make those kind of



## BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd)... presentations and put forth those kind of positions for the Province of Manitoba, what in blazes do you think you're going to do? Stifle the opposition by preventing us from talking about it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Until the rule is changed, the rule shall be abided by. The honourable member knows that there are ways of changing the rules but not at the present time. The honourable member.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll not pursue that point. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that I challenge the members opposite, I challenge the members opposite, because we have been accused from time to time of suggesting a path that leads to a degree of socialism that even they at least profess in this House is unacceptable to them, a degree of proletarianism that they at least profess is unacceptable to them and I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that I would like them to tell me how do they rationalize their position on some of the important matters that face us. I suggested one, the food industry.

You know, if they could tell us that because of the social consequences involved, because of the savings accrued to the people of Manitoba, they could nationalize the auto insurance industry, why not the food industry? Mr. Speaker, if they can tell us and they're telling us now that there's mineral resources of this province belong to the people of this province so therefore we should expect to nationalize those resources then, Mr. Speaker, why not so much more the land resources themselves which are finite and of which there are a very limited number - we don't know what our mineral resources are.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this is the kind of resolution that we can expect from this government opposite. "Whereas farm communities are dying and the quality of life in rural areas is lower than in the major urban centres, be it therefore resolved and enacted that: one town in each 20 mile square be designated as a concentration area - that's not concentration camp but concentration area - and (b) this area be fully provided with adequate levels of utilities and public services and recreational facilities and (c) and all other towns within the 20 mile square be closed and the land redeveloped for agricultural and industrial purposes and (d) all farmers within the 20 mile square shall take up residence in the town, assisted by housing loans and (e) all lands in the 20 mile square be taken over by the town and farmed co-operatively on a share contract basis and (f) all property tax on farmlands be abolished." Well that last one comes close to our policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of resolution you know, this is the kind of resolution surely, that the kind of arguments that the members opposite have put forward with respect to their rationalizing of taking over certain industries - mining industries, auto industries - is what they should be telling the farmers of Manitoba, if you have any integrity, any belief in the principles that you espouse. What you are doing of course, Mr. Speaker, is following that age-old well developed technique of socialists throughout the world of taking a little bite here, a little bite there -- tramping on just a few toes at a time, the pharmacists here, the auto insurance people there, the doctors on another occasion, in any case never disturb the majority. Just disturb a minority and you won't get hurt, Mr. Speaker. And at the same time, make sure you lace it over with a lot of icing. Give back a lot of tax premiums, give back whatever you can, Mr. Speaker. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I object to and that, Mr. Speaker, is what we are seeing in the kind of budget that's being presented by this government, the kind of socialist programs that are being presented to us by the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the honourable members opposite and particularly the Member for St. Johns, you know, who took note to suggest to us that he took great discomfort and great - showed some considerable disgust with the suggestion that there was an association every once in a while with the Social Democrats and that of the communists and he stood up to indicate to this House that none had -- none who are aware of history, would make that kind of a statement because of the kind of ongoing spite that the Social Democrats have fought with the communist party. Of course the fact that the same statement could be made of the Nazi Party is irrelevant, because I suspect that they fought them in the same way. Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government stands on very shaky, shaky ground with respect to how they rationalize their particular position and attempt to stand before us as though they are, you know, above the simple playing of politics, above the crass you know political opportunism of the day, that they stand as a party of principle, that they stand as a party that will put principle before political opportunism and, Mr. Speaker, I ask them to perform. I ask them to perform

## BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . in that manner, in telling us clearly what in fact is the blueprint of the next four years should they be returned to office and not the kind of gobbly-gook, not the kind of gobbly-gook that they've given to us in the Guidelines of the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we have some idea of what we can expect from the members opposite. And the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Commissioner of Northern Affairs, gives us a pretty good insight into what can be expected - a most revealing quote, when he had occasion to walk into a place of business lately or at least he indicated and he mentioned - I quote from page 1334 of the Hansard when he said, "Mr. Speaker," he was talking about his visits to the forestry complex at The Pas. He says, "Mr. Speaker, I do that on a regular basis." That is visit it. "Mr. Speaker, the management was very embarrassed one day. They found one labourer that hadn't come from northern Manitoba. They were very embarrassed about that and they promised to rectify that and make sure that it would never happen again." Mr. Speaker, does that mean that any Minister of this Crown is going to walk into a place of business and say, "and I didn't find one NDP in this place of business and I'll rectify that immediately." Does that mean I can walk into this place of business and I found some Jews hired in this place of business and I want that rectified immediately. What kind of bloody nonsense are we talking about? When a Minister of the Crown, when a Minister of the Crown, Minister of the Crown walks into places of business or can walk into any place in this province and says to the management, I want to see your list of employees and if you haven't got enough Ukrainians on that staff, Buster, you'd better answer to me. And if you've got a few too many Jews on your staff you'd better answer to me and if you haven't been hiring the Germans you better answer to me. Is this what we are walking into, Mr. Speaker?

Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I ask you the audaciousness of -- that, this innocent quote in the Hansard provides us with. You know. We talk, we talk about future authoritarian governments, Mr. Speaker, we have it. Mr. Speaker, we have it, - amazing, amazing, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this government, this government, this government has designs on the people of Manitoba, that they are well camouflaging, I think, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's no accident that the Honourable the First Minister delivered this budget. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there may have been other reasons for the Minister of Finance to remove himself from office for a short period of time but I would assure you of one thing, Mr. Speaker, that the principal reason was, the principal reason was to make sure that the Minister and the First Minister had the occasion or was in a position to deliver this Santa Claus budget because, Mr. Speaker, this government and this party does not intend to go to the people under the banner of the New Democratic Party. It intends to go to the people solely and strictly under the banner of the "Schreyer Government". This government will hide itself and will hide the New Democratic Party label to the greatest extent possible and they did it most effectively by an accommodating Minister of Finance who removed himself from the Finance portfolio in order, in order that the First Minister, their star could perform properly in that, and which we have to acknowledge as an Academy performance, we have to acknowledge his Academy performance where he could announce the reduction of the Medicare premiums. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is not the New Democratic Party that did this, it is the Schreyer Government that did this. It is not the New Democratic Party government that provided nursing care homes for our aged, it is the Schreyer Government, the Schreyer administration that did this. Mr. Speaker, that is of course the purpose, that is the design that this government and this clever group of political opportunists presents, and that is the way they will present themselves before the electorate when they next meet that same electorate. Well, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I say it is cynical, I say it is cynical and I say it is deceptive and, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity, and I welcome the opportunity of challenging that on the hustings when that comes.

A MEMBER: It'll be the last time, Harry; the last time, Harry.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think what is happening as we approach this next election is simply of course, simply of course a reaffirmation of the position taken by the First Minister at the time of one of the earlier New Democratic Party conventions held in this province when the Manitoba Premier, just back in Winnipeg after his three-week trip to Japan told the 1,000 delegates that their prime objective should be winning elections even if it meant bending their principles a little. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we'll see a great deal of bending of principles, we'll see a great deal of bending of principles particularly at election time.

## BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his matter of principle?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now to the motion. Oh I thought you were finished.

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Well then I'm rising on a point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't -- Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I just don't want to be shafted here, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . the First Minister quite regularly rises on a point of privilege or a point of order. I make it a habit of sitting down any time my Premier arises but not to give up the floor necessarily.

MR. SCHREYER: Well I'm sorry. On a point of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was rising on a point of privilege, and someone was suggesting . . .

A MEMBER: You don't know what it's all about, George.

MR. SCHREYER: Someone was suggesting that the Member for Lakeside was terminating his debate. If he is not then I will state the point of privilege, and it is that the article that my honourable friend is referring to is one that has been referred to on one other occasion which at that time I rose on a point of privilege indicating that it was a press release, or a press article rather, it was not the text of my remarks. Those are not my words and the attempted paraphrase left something to be desired.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I accept the remarks by the First Minister because the events of the past three years since he reputedly made that statement have proven that his actions have indicated that he is prepared to bend his principles when they choose, when they choose to serve, when they choose to serve the political aims of that particular party. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we then have in this budget that has been presented to us with such fanfare are of course many things that a good number of the people of Manitoba applaud and a good number of people will be happy with. Mr. Speaker, time will not permit but I could certainly suggest, and certainly indicate, how a base carefully tended to and nurtured by the previous administration to develop the kind of background for a healthy secondary industry in this province, blessed with an event that even they haven't got the callous gall to take credit for, such as crop failures in Russia, or drought in Australia, and what have you, a booming agricultural industry, coupled of course with a deliberate misconception and deception of their colleagues in Ottawa, and I call them their colleagues in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, it's worthwhile to just dwell on that for even a moment or two. Do you recall the time the tax reforms were brought in by the Trudeau administration. There was quite a quarrel developed between the Minister of Finance of Ontario and the federal authorities. The federal authorities insisted that this was not a tax increase, that this was merely a tax reform, a shifting of taxation policies favourable to the lower income groups but would not, would not end up as an end benefit as far as new taxation revenues were for the Ottawa government. Ontario, and Ontario computers, took an opposite position. They said in fact that this was a major tax rise measure, that there would be between six hundred million to a billion dollars of new tax revenues accruing to Ottawa under this tax reform proposal. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the events have proven the Ontario tax people, and the Ontario computer accurate, that in fact the tax reform measures introduced by the Federal Government were in fact a tax -- a tax rise and a tax increase, and that resulted, as much as the buoyancy in our agricultural economy, in the kind of windfalls this government has received to enable it at least partially to bring forward the budget that they brought forward this past week.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for the position of our party with respect to our response to this budget. We believe, Sir, that essentially that it is an inflationary measure that the First Minister is bringing. We believe that particularly in this time that there has been a great deal of concern expressed about rising living costs, rising food costs. The Member from Birtle-Russell just indicated the other day how a relatively minor, appearing to be minor, matter such as an innocent section in The Farm Implement Machinery Act could increase by five percent nearly the price of all farm machinery in this province, and we purchase about 50 to 60

## BUDGET

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . million dollars worth of farm machinery in this province in a poor year. Five percent of that alone -- and you're talking about -- what kind of additions are you talking in terms of the total cost of food production in this province? We told this government last year that when they were proposing the production sales tax on production machinery that this was going to add to the cost of all services and all, particularly food, services. They ignored this suggestion, and I think the indication that my Leader in his speech in the reply to the Speech of the Budget indicated by just how much this expansion of the sales tax, which of course this government likes to keep telling us they've never added any taxes. This expansion of the sales tax did in fact increase their revenues. Mr. Speaker, time doesn't permit but if you'd list the list of services, the list of fees, you can't fish, hunt, camp your trailer, you can't transfer your land, you can't sell your house, you can't do something like that without paying double and triple the costs that were in effect just a few short years ago. -- (Interjection) -- You can't even get married the Honourable Member for Rock Lake tells me without at least tripling the cost. You can't have a taxi without tripling the cost of the fare. So, Mr. Speaker, we will catalogue, we will catalogue, we will catalogue the kind of price rises that have been effected by this government to destroy any suggestion, any suggestion or any credibility at all that the goodies that this budget hands out to the people emanate from any other source, of course, other than the people's pockets. It is a transfer of funds from one pocket to the other pocket but, Mr. Speaker, oh the loss in between. Mr. Speaker, let me say this. What worries me most, what worries me most about this government, what worries me most about -- is the direction this government intends to go. But I believe very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday I enjoyed a level of freedom, personal freedom, and individual liberty that I do not enjoy today. I know that today I enjoy a level of personal freedom and individual liberty that I will not enjoy tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. And I say that, I say that in fairness whether -- I would say that if I were government tomorrow, because it happens to be a part of the complex nature of our society that we are just not going to have, we're just not going to have the degree of personal freedom and personal liberty that in theoretical arguments that we might wish that we could have. Our society doesn't enable us to have it. But, Mr. Speaker, I'll fight as long and as hard as I can to assure that that loss of personal freedom, that loss of individual liberty isn't accelerated in the manner and the way in which this government intends to accelerate it. Mr. Speaker, they are accelerating it. A further vote of confidence for this government will mean a further loss of personal freedom for the people of Manitoba, will mean a loss of individual liberty for the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, will mean an ever-increasing degree of government takeover, government involvement in our daily lives.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to conclude the debate on the 1973 Budget, I want to follow the traditional course which is that of thanking all honourable members who have participated in the debate. I want to express my thanks also for the many compliments, obviously not coming from the Honourable Member for Lakeside, but from the many compliments directed from the other side and this, to myself and to the government for this Budget.

I want to take note of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party have acknowledged that this must be a budget worthy of remembrance because they did devote quite a bit of time to their address in reply to the Budget. And I rather suspect that the Leader of the Liberal Party -- I'm sorry he's not here -- must have been very greatly impressed by the Budget because I understand he gave some 46 pages of consideration in his reply. That is of course ignoring the fact, Sir, that as my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources pointed out, there was an average of about two errors per page in his 46-page address. Still it is something that we should take note of.

The extent to which you honourable members opposite have been complimentary is acknowledged and the extent to which they have been uncomplimentary is acknowledged too and I will have an opportunity now to reciprocate in kind.

They say it was a political budget. I suppose that one could say that every budget since the beginning of democratic government in this province has been a political budget in the sense that it was arrived at after consideration as to the best and most feasible way of proceeding in efforts to maximize the public interest. What does the word "political" mean? You know it must be getting rather difficult for those who have an appreciation of the meaning of words, the way the word "political" is misused is getting really quite sickening. All that the

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . word "political" means is matters having to do with civil society. Political comes from polis which means the state, the city state in the days of ancient Greece or whatever. I don't want to be academic about it but everything that has to do with our affairs as a civilized society is "political", and, Sir, there can be no finer pursuit or dedication of one's efforts than to political affairs. So in that sense, in that sense this was a political budget and I am happy to acknowledge that fact. And I suppose it has to be said that the rebuttal or that the debate from the other side was equally political and that's fine. We're not complaining.

Taking the Honourable the Member for Lakeside first since he spoke last, it rather took me off guard that he seemed so preoccupied in the initial part of his speech with the rules and decorum of this House. I am pleased to see that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is sharing a concern with the Member for Swan River with respect to trying our best to preserve decorum and good procedure in this House, and in that way to help you, Sir. But frankly I can't agree with him that this House is an unruly House or that we are on both sides of the House sort of vicious with each other. I suppose at times we come perilously close to being that. But on the other hand what is the honourable, my honourable friend's standard of measure? With what other House is he comparing it to? And with what previous Houses or sessions of Legislatures of this Assembly? I just don't think, Sir, that this is a particularly unruly House or particularly venomous one side to the other. I have seen Houses that have been worse than this, and not many years ago; 1966 for example in the House of Commons — far worse than anything we have come close to here, and that's only an example within recent years. What about the parliament of 1913? Has anyone researched that? The enmity and venom that was exchanged between the two sides of the House in those years?

But anyway, Sir, I thought it was ironic that the Member for Lakeside should show this concern about the propriety and rules of this House and then proceed himself to about every five minutes like clockwork to proceed to transgress the rules and show bad taste. What did he say? Well he lit into me, and that's fair game, but he proceeded to misparaphrase what I had said about four years ago relative to the way in which parties in our country go about financing their affairs. I should have thought that by now there would be consensus on both sides of the House that whatever way we have been using in the past in financing political parties has lent itself to abuse and that maybe by now there would be enough consensus for wanting to reform, to go towards a system where there is some per capita so that political parties need not be dragged through the kind of grey zone of having to reply on money that was pretty close to being tainted money in many cases. You need not take my word for it, Sir; I would refer my honourable friend to the words, the admission of a former Prime Minister of this country, that the way in which the Liberal Party had to raise money from time to time dragged him through the valley of humiliation. Those are the words of the former Prime Minister MacKenzie King. The Beauharnois scandal; the scandal here in Manitoba in 1915. What was all that about? Was that because the former Premier of this province was dishonest, or was it because by the very nature of the way political parties used to finance themselves it almost necessarily meant bringing these people into disgrace or close to it. Why do my honourable friends persist over the years in pretending that the way in which political parties finance themselves is so fine and so acceptable and above reproach and therefore not needing of reform? My friends know that there is desperate need to do something and, Sir, as you go across the political spectrum, that need is most evident in the old parties. It's not that we don't have problems within the New Democratic Party, but Sir, history is replete with examples, provincial and federal, of scandals and near scandals, all emanating from the way in which political parties have financed themselves historically.

Then my honourable friend goes on to mention one of the -- what I would regard as a very competent, economic analyst in the Department of Agriculture as Red Rudy. Well I know that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has probably done some reading about Red Rudy D. . . , or someone, and he is one, my honourable friend is one that will I know, despite good intentions, not be able to resist the mischief from time to time, of trying to equate social democracy with forms of totalitarianism and communism, and so therefore he will probably use the history of the Soviet Union and Alexander Korensky and that all too brief interlude of democracy, etc. and try to fudge the issue. But, Mr. Speaker, let it be very clear that there is a tradition in this House and in all Canadian Legislatures, that a person from the public

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . service is not ripped open to attack on the floor of this House just because he may demonstrate a political attitude that is discernible whether it be the centre, or of the right, or of the left. If it's a matter of wrong doing, and integrity, and matters that come under the Criminal Code, well that is a different thing, but an attitude of philosophy relative to economic policies, that is not a basis for opening up someone from the public service to attack in this Chamber. And in any case, I don't believe that a single one of my colleagues, I've not checked this but I'm so confident I ask now publicly, whether a single one of my colleagues has ever attacked anyone of the public service on the floor of this House when they were in opposition, and when civil servants may have been carrying out duties which they may not have, my colleagues may not have agreed with. I don't believe it ever happened. --(Interjection) -- Well my honourable friend likes to infer that there is, or suggests, that there is a difference in the way in which the public servants are being asked to carry out their duties and I for one, I want to believe that my honourable friend is as sincere as I when he suggests that we are somehow relating ourselves differently to the public service than they used to; and I am equally sincere when I say that I doubt very much whether there has been in the entire history of this province, or any other province, when there has been a change of government such a small turnover or change in the public service, and particularly in the senior echelons. I really believe that when I say that, and therefore it boggles my mind when I hear them talk about us having designs or an improper kind of relating to the public service of the Province of Manitoba.

I know that in some provinces when there's a change of government there is an exodus and a great transformation of senior personnel. That didn't happen here, we have no regrets about it, and I would hope that it doesn't happen if in some future date there was a change in government again, because if there is, then they will be setting the pattern for future retaliation, and I admit, I agree with my honourable friend that really the province comes out the poorer for it. But you don't accuse us of following the pattern of Saskatchewan, for example, where within a matter of days after a change of government 300 senior people in and out. I wonder if the number was 3, 4 or 5 here. So therefore, what point are they trying to make except to perhaps draw red herrings across their otherwise inability to score any points whatsoever? I suppose one must give them that credit that they have been unable, unable to find any plausibility to find anyone that will give sufficient credence to what they have been uttering all these past months about the performance of this government, the performance of Manitoba's economy, so they resort to the drawing of red herrings across the trail. They have the Honourable Member for Morris, the Honourable Member for Morris who likes to recite poetry about the Little Red Hen who became a Socialist, and then we have the Member for Lakeside who, instead of reciting poetry about the Little Red Hen, engages in red baiting, and then the Member for Fort Garry, who draws red herrings across the trail. They talk of liberty. They talk of Liberty. I feel very tempted to just digress for a moment to pick up the challenge of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside and his concept of liberty, its definitions, but for the moment I will leave that aside.

The Member for Lakeside, he likes to characterize a social democratic government and its budget as one that is somehow bending its principles, because we are not coming out fully and frontally for the Marxist slogans of state ownership of production distribution and exchange -- he accuses us of bending our principles. Well, of course, it's very simple, very clear, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend opposite would like us, whether we believe in it or not, he would like us to simply go in the direction of dogmatic Marxism so that they could then have a political field open to themselves, judging the mood and temper of the people of this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is as unfair of him to suggest we are bending principles, that we are deviating from what we would really like to do as a government, it would be just as unfair of him to suggest that as it would be for us to suggest that the Tories never had any principles to begin with. And in fact what are the principles if we are then talking of principles? What are these principles of Conservatism? I have tried to understand Conservatism, and I know that they -- oh yes, and there was reference too about -- oh yes, a deliberate design to so arrange things "so that I would be in a position to deliver the Budget in 1973."

Mr. Speaker, I know that sometimes the Member for Lakeside likes to say things for dramatic effect and in a half bantering way, no matter how ludicrous they may be, because he is doing it in a bantering way, but unfortunately it was not evident to me whether he was

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . being serious or whether he was just speaking entirely with tongue in cheek when he suggested that the Member for St. Johns was relieved of his duties so that it could be arranged that I would deliver the Budget. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Lakeside should know, if he wants me to become personal and relate some personal circumstances in the family of the Member for St. Johns I will do so, but it's most unfair to make that kind of suggestion in the knowledge, as I believe he was, that the Member for St. Johns had good and full and very personal reasons. The circumstances have changed and there is no problem, Sir, but please don't attempt to engage in what I would have to describe as bad taste in order to score a political yard or two, which doesn't exist in reality in any case.

Well, Sir, the Member for Lakeside accuses us of perhaps getting perilously close to the cult of personality, and it's strange coming from the honourable member opposite. It seems to me that the Conservative Party in Canada perhaps pioneered in 1957. I remember seeing an advertisement as big as a page, Follow John, and then four footsteps, four imprints on the ad copy and nothing much else. No content to the ad -- just Follow John and four imprints, footsteps. Well, Sir, what is that supposed to denote? What has happened of course since is history. The dependency on personality at that time turned into something else when certain Conservatives from Tuxedo here in Manitoba, did a bit of a knife job on that same John Diefenbaker, but of course they like to forget about their 1967 Convention in Toronto, and I would suggest my honourable friends desist from any reference to personalities because it is Conservatives themselves who have written such books as "The Night of the Knives", and that's about personality clashes within the Conservative Party. My honourable friends, if there were time I could relate them quite a few stories about the inside goings on in the Conservative Party in Canada, but I suspect they know some of those themselves.

I come now to something more fundamental, and that's liberty. Liberty. If my honourable friends think that they can somehow have to themselves the privilege, and it is a privilege as a free human being to talk about liberty, they're mistaken because we on this side claim every bit as much right to talk about liberty and the preservation of it as they -- any day of the week and more. When they talk about liberty, they should tell us liberty for whom? When they accuse us of not being accessible, they should explain accessible to whom? But liberty, Sir. My honourable friend is a Conservative, perhaps a sincere and genuine one. He has a pessimistic interpretation of the future of mankind. He said very clearly that today he has more liberty than tomorrow, and tomorrow he will have more than the day after, and so on to the end of time -- (Interjection) -- and have less than the day after, and this year more than next year, and so on until the end of time.

Sir, my interpretation is exactly the opposite, which makes us liberals as opposed to conservatives because a liberal, and I mean a small "l" liberal interpretation of mankind is that human history is the history of progress. That there is more meaningful freedom today for more people than was ever dreamt of by most people living a hundred years ago. (Applause) There were people in the 1860s and 70s no doubt who enjoyed great personal freedom, and they employed serfs, or semi-serfs and paid them two pennies a day -- great liberty, great freedom for those serfs or semi-serfs. The sweat shops of the 1890s, the 1930s, the 1940s even, sweat shops, miserable wages. Mine conditions: safety was unknown in the mines. Liberty? Freedom? For whom? Today, Sir, we move towards more equality of the human condition. It does mean some constraints on those who have the field wide open to them before but it means more running room for everyone else too. Surely that is important.

And as a specific example, Mr. Speaker, they mention farm machinery prices. It is interesting. Farm machinery prices, that can be related to this concept of liberty and freedom. Well you know two years ago when we introduced Autopac, the Member for Fort Garry said he could hear the muffled tramp of jack boots. Now it's two years later, you talk to Manitobans, you ask them whether they have been hearing the muffled tramp of jack boots lately and they look at you; they have no idea what you mean. The Member for Fort Garry, I think, probably has no idea what I mean either, which merely goes to prove how stupid that remark was from him two and a half years ago.

But now farm machinery, Mr. Speaker, and it's interesting the extent to which -- (Interjection) -- it's interesting the extent to which the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Birtle-Russell -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well one must not forget his speech the other night because he laboured long to make a point, and his point had to do with farm machinery

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . prices. Now he didn't quite want to come out and say that he was opposed to the changes we had made in the farm machinery administration but he wanted to say it and yet he just couldn't, he just couldn't with credibility do so. The fact is, Sir, that when we passed the legislation, check the records, did they vote against it? Did you vote against it? -- (Interjection) -- Did honourable members vote against it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: What's the privilege.

MR. ENNS: The point of privilege is the suggestion with respect to our position on that bill. Had we accepted the bill in its original form, we would have caused a ten percent rise in farm machinery prices. We amended it to only cause a five percent rise. That is a fact, and that is a fact. That's on the record, that's on the record.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the long and the short of it, Mr. Speaker, is that they did not vote against it in any recorded vote. They may have, as they often like to do, they may have talked one way in the House and another way out in the hustings, the community. -- (Interjection) --

The Member for Birtle-Russell should know that for years many farmers have been complaining about the inadequacy of the service and the availability of parts for farm machinery, and there have been complaints about farm machinery prices for years, ever since I was a kid. Nothing new about it. So then, Sir, this government through the Minister of Agriculture decided to take matters in hand and to at least try, at least try, Sir, to do something to bring remedial action. Now it's interesting -- (Interjection) -- There's a coincidence. I admit that 1973 is a year in which one of the major farm machinery companies is attempting to bring off a significant price increase, and, Sir, we might as well tell the whole story. That is the same farm machinery company which, far beyond all the other farm machinery companies, and there's a few of them, has the worst consistent reputation for maltreatment of its dealers and the dealers themselves will be the first to tell you.

The Member for Swan River should be one to know exactly what I mean because in his own constituency, only two years ago, was an example of a small businessman who had worked hard as a farm implement dealer and built a fair business, but because there was a slump in the agricultural sector starting in 1967, by 1970 he was in trouble and that company had absolutely no mercy for him, none whatsoever. He was closed out -- (Interjection) -- Three years ago. He was closed out; the treatment given him was not in comparison with what the other major farm implement companies are prepared to do when a dealer is closed out, when they buy back inventory and parts. So let us at least be candid enough to give the whole story. We're talking about the John Deere Company and they might as well know that we do not intend to accept with equanimity, any more than in the United States when the steel companies talked of raising their prices, we do not intend to accept with equanimity the prospect of one company, in isolation from all the others, just deciding on a course of action no matter how inimical to the public interest and to those of dealers and farmers in particular. We just will not take kindly to it. They might as well know it. (Applause)

Having said that, Sir, I do not want to mention any other farm implement companies because that would be, I suppose, I would be accused of advertising for them or something. But it should be known, Sir, that there is a particular phenomena at work. 1973 is a year of buoyancy in the economy as '72 began to be, and the farm sector is no exception. As a result there is a pent-up demand for farm implements, and because there is a pent-up demand and a backlog of orders to be filled, naturally there is this, well it's a very classical upward pressure in price. But don't try to be so dishonest as to pretend it relates to warranty. It would have happened warranty or no warranty. Why were there price increases over the past 20 years with regularity like clockwork? -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend, when he says that, should also say on the part of one company only, one company only. Don't pretend that all of them have said so. So there's the reason, Mr. Speaker. If it weren't so, then would someone please explain to me why it is that between 1955 and 1970 the price of farm implements doubled, more than doubled, no warranty changes of any consequence. So then what would have accounted for that 100 percent increase over a period of a decade and more?

So I now go on to the budget proper. The Leader of the Opposition spoke last night again, the second time, and this morning. And it's interesting to note that this was a budget debate but he decided to talk about the other document -- Guidelines for the Seventies. I



## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . suppose he was tempted to do so by the fact that he has found the Budget for 1973 to be impregnable, or virtually so, so he's turning to Guidelines hoping to stir up some agitation, and I suppose that's legitimate and understandable, but if he's going to do so I would like to have honourable members hark back to another guideline document. Here it is -- do you remember it? The TED Report, do you remember it? Some one volume, one volume only with approximately 400, 500 pages, one volume, and it was written, Sir, by hiring -- they asked how many people were involved in Guidelines? Where were they from? How many outsiders or so on? I would now like to take the time to read all of those outsiders that they had hired to write the TED Report. They obviously didn't have enough confidence in their own public servants so they hired outsiders, the following: The Economist Intelligent Unit -- \$22, 000; Hickling Johnston -- \$6, 000; Hedlin-Menzies -- \$80, 000. I don't know if that's before or after they moved their headquarters to Toronto; Hopkins Hedland Limited -- 27, 000; Tate Peat Marwick -- 18, 000; get this, Arthur D. Little -- 146, 000; they are from Cambridge, Massachusetts, real dedicated Manitoba public servants; P. S. Ross and Partners -- 18, 000, (if P. S. Ross knew that they got 18, 000 and Arthur D. Little 146, 000, you can imagine how they felt); Stanford Research Institute -- 15, 000; and so on and so forth. And so for a grand total of \$481, 000 for this document, that's what it cost.

Now what is the document? Was it a profound work of economic analysis? Was it a profound work? Well, Sir, I will read one of the main summaries in the report itself: "The Commission" -- that is the Commission on Targets for Economic Development -- "has set targets for 1980 in each sector of the Manitoba economy which it believes will, if reached, go far toward closing the gap between Manitoba and Canada's more prosperous provinces, as well as lay the foundation for even more ambitious growth in the decade of the 1980s." So that, obviously, even in 1968, there was some admission that the per capita levels of income and distribution and the various economic indicators did not compare as favourably as we would like with Canada's.

But anyway, this document goes on to say: "Reaching these targets will require not only understanding the opportunities and challenges of the next decade, but also determine intelligent coordinated effort on the part of a high proportion of Manitoba society." But now get this, and this is really the guts of it, Mr. Speaker: "The targets are not mere extrapolations of present trends, they are set so as to be challenging in the sense that to reach them Manitoba's resources will have to be utilized with ambition, vigor and imagination." It goes on to say: "The targets set out by the Commission are meant to be challenging but realistic. They are related to projections for the economy of Manitoba and Canada. These projections are extrapolations of reasonable modifications of recent trends." Now, after all that, they are saying that what they've done in effect, Economist Intelligent Units, Arthur D. Little, etc., they took the trend of 1960 to 1968, extrapolated it, gave it a bit of a boost for effect, and then put it in here. 480, 000 bucks. Extrapolation with a little adjustment, that's what it is.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting and I challenge all members here to read the TED Report once again, see what the target projections are, and then look at our present indicators in Manitoba in 1973 and see where we are in 1973 on those same targets compared to what they were projected for 1975 and 1980. To save my honourable friends' time, I have a summary here for them. It's now about one-quarter of the way into 1973, it's not yet 1975 or 1980. Well, let's look at the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party, let's look at their targets, the targets they said were levels towards which the province should realistically strive.

Well, let's look first at personal income per capita. The target, according to this document for 1975, was \$2, 811 and for 1980 the target is \$3, 347. Well, Mr. Speaker, the end of three months ago, personal income per capita in Manitoba was \$3, 571, and if I wanted to be as careless and sloppy with figures as my honourable friends opposite, I would say then we're eight years ahead of targets of this document. But that wouldn't be quite accurate, Mr. Speaker, because there has been an inflation factor at work, so let's take that and discount it to squeeze out the inflation and so we'll have a constant dollar expression. And on that basis we estimate that the purchasing power of the dollar in 1972 is about 82 cents in terms of the 1965 dollar. So we deflate the present figure and we find our personal income per capita at the end of 1972, expressed in 1966 constant dollars, is \$2, 923 or still \$100. 00 above the TED target for 1975. We're running ahead of schedule. (Applause) So even when adjusted

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . realistically and honestly, we're running a hundred dollars ahead of where we should be two years down the road, and then they say that we are under-performing, and Manitobans are suffering because of the presence on the scene of a social democratic government, Mr. Speaker. What about gross provincial product according to this TED report, this \$480, 000 document here? Well, Mr. Speaker, for 1973 we forecast an estimate with confidence, by the end of December, Manitoba's provincial product will be at about 5 billion dollars, easy figure to remember. The TED report said we should get to the point of 4.1 billion dollars by 1975 and to 5.4 billion dollars by 1980. Well in current dollars, we are almost at the TED's 1980 target now. We are there now in current dollars, and in constant dollars by the end of 1973, we will have reached the TED report's 1975 objective, two years ahead of schedule.

We realize, Mr. Speaker, that this TED report which we never adopted as policy, which by the way I don't believe they adopted as policy either, the reason we have brought in Guidelines for purposes of discussion is because this TED report is already out of date, so unrealistic in terms of the under challenge in relation to performance that we say it should go into the dust bin. And in fact, my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources and most of my colleagues were right in the first place, when they were tempted to do so right from Day One. They never had much confidence in it and I believe that they were right. One of the things I suppose that they tried to dress this document up with was a chapter on Residential Housing which was all very nice, except nothing was happening; a chapter on Uranium Enrichment. Now I know my honourable friends could not have endorsed this document as policy when they released it because they couldn't have endorsed a chapter on Uranium Enrichment, largely because I don't think they knew what Uranium Enrichment was. And if they did, they must have known it would require the complete dedication of two plants, Hydro plants the size of Kettle Rapids, just to enrich Uranium so that by the time they were finished building it, countries like the United States and Western Europe would be converting over to fast breeder reactors that wouldn't need enriched Uranium, etc., etc. Well, Sir, I'll leave the TED report -- it had a brief and not very exciting history. We are already in 1973 surpassing its goals for 1975 and 1980.

My honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, and I'm sorry he's not with us just at the moment, he and his Leader and the Leader of the Conservative Party keep coming back to rub away on the point about Manitoba's out-migration figures, the brain drain. And I keep reminding them, which I'm sure they're well aware of, that Manitoba has been losing its native sons and daughters at a certain rate and a certain pace ever since the 1930's. And if you were to go to Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver any time in recent years, you will find at many meetings -- it's like old home night -- people who had left 5, 10, 15, 20 years ago. And of course out-migration continues still but the out-migration from Manitoba in relation to total population growth is more acceptable, more favourable today than it was five years ago. Are my honourable friends prepared to admit that the net migration outflow in Manitoba from 1965 to 68 was 23, 000, whereas in the past three years, it's been 16, 000? So if they're complaining, they should have been positively flagellating themselves four or five years ago. I mean if they're complaining now, what were they doing when it was twice as bad?

And for the Liberals to talk about population movement is to ignore the fact that the Province of Saskatchewan under Liberal government, had the heaviest out-migration of the history of any province in Canada in the past 100 years. So if my honourable friends want to play numbers games we are prepared to play with them, but we would insist that it was really a waste of time. Our population by the way, depending on whose figures you want to use, Dominion Bureau of Statistics say that it's increased to 990 and some thousand which is fair enough, it's been increasing to that level. And the Federal Department of National Health and Welfare have accepted our computer hospitalization figures which are one million and fifteen thousand so perhaps one of these days we should have a ceremony to provide perhaps a little token or a gift to the baby that was estimated to be the one millionth Manitoban. But -- (Interjection) -- the suggestion, no I'm not looking, I'd better say nothing in that respect. -- (Interjection) -- Right.

Mr. Speaker, who was it, Sir, was it the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Liberal Party that whereas a few months ago was saying that we were over taxing, there should be tax cuts, now is attempting to say that we should perhaps instead of having these tax cuts

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . should have had more government programming (and by definition that means more government spending) because they say there is not enough being done to generate work activity, jobs and so on in remote northern communities and in native communities.

Well, Sir, we do not keep statistics on the basis of origin but we do keep statistics on the basis of geography, region and community. I would like my honourable friends to know that since 1970 there has been the creation of entirely new effort with respect to job creation in Northern Manitoba. We estimate that through the PEP program as it relates to band councils and reserves, that approximately 2,500 man-months of work were created this last winter; that under the new careers program, approximately 4 out of 500 man-months of work has been created. Under the Manitoba work activities projects under the Department of Health and Social Development, 1,300 man-months of socially useful work has been generated; under Bill 17 that terrible, terrible, evil Socialist Bill 17,

A MEMBER: That's what it is.

MR. SCHREYER: I knew my honourable friend would agree with that description. We have nevertheless, Sir, under that managed to create 1,200 man-months of employment through Channel Loggers, Manago, Moose Lake Loggers, etc. Moose Lake Loggers in fact, had its genesis when my honourable friend was Minister of Mines and Resources. It seemed, Sir, that he somehow couldn't escape getting his nice clean hands out of the dirty cesspool of socialism even then. But however he felt about it, the fact remains that certain jobs were created in that area, in that community and that is what makes all the difference and, Sir, are we alone. Oh before I mention that, Northern Manpower Corps, 4,300 jobs thus generated. And it must warm the cockles of my honourable friend's heart -- I think the Member for Swan River genuinely so -- that for example in the Community of Churchill whereas there were a certain number of persons chronically on unemployment and welfare rolls have in the past 18 months been steadily employed even through the winter in prefabricated housing fabrication and in the erection of some thirty units of housing and that's only phase one. I believe that there were only two adult male persons able-bodied, only two adult male persons in the Community of Churchill in the last twelve-month period that were on social allowance. Now this is an accomplishment. It is using the instrumentality of the state as a tool, as a useful instrument in order to combine things, socially useful and needed housing, and job activity. And we combined that with tax legislation and tax changes that provide tax relief to all on an equal basis instead of dumping it all in the laps of the affluent and, Sir, I think we are well on our way to meaningful freedom and liberty. That's what it's all about.

But lest it be thought that we're all alone, and Eric Kierans has been cursed down now by my honourable friends opposite, perhaps, perhaps it would be interesting if I were to refer to another senior Canadian political person, who has no longer been able to contain himself to see the kind of nonsense that one ends up with if one has a dogmatic reliance on private or whatever type of enterprise -- Walter Gordon. Is my honourable friend aware of his thinking, a senior person in the former cabinet of this country. -- (Interjection) -- Ah, my honourable friends opposite say he's a nut too. Mr. Speaker, if I had to, if I really were compelled to choose as to who have been the greater nuts, those who have started to speak out like the Eric Kierans and the Walter Gordons, and those, well at the risk of sounding congratulatory, I would say like the late J. S. Woodsworth, Tommy Douglas.

A MEMBER: Like Paul Hellyer.

MR. SCHREYER: Paul Hellyer? No, Mr. Speaker, I give Paul Hellyer full marks for his taking the situation firmly in hand and making some sense of the organization of the Canadian Armed Forces. I give him 100 percent for that but beyond that, he never had any reputation for any economic brilliance. It's irrelevant, but he did do Canada this one service and I might say and it's greatly ironic, Sir, he did it over the greatest of fury and opposition of the Conservative Party in 1966, so who's kidding who? Now he sits with them like an accommodating -- well I shan't say it -- but, Mr. Speaker, I won't be diverted by things that are of no consequence. Crown Corporations. Well I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that Paul Hellyer having performed his great public service to Canadians by unifying the Armed Forces really he has done his bit and it's rather sad to see the extent to which he has been distracted and pulled into a sideline, a side road, a dead end cul-de-sac that's where he is now.

But what is important, Sir, is where are we going with our future development of our

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . mineral, natural resources? My honourable friends like to denounce and to be critical in personal ways even of those who are daring to be innovative, daring to take novel approaches, daring to be radical and by the way, do you know what the word radical means, Sir? I don't think my honourable friends do. The word radical means merely one who is prepared and determined to get to the root of a problem, that's what a radical is, and in that sense I believe we on this side, would all like to be known as radicals.

There were too many profound social and economic problems existing in this country particularly in the resource development field which my honourable friends and their ilk were prepared to slough over for too long. They were not prepared to get to the root of the problem and as a result, if anyone wants to call anyone else a nut I would say the ones that have been nuts, the ones who have been irresponsible are those who let it happen, that we should have alienated, for example, our oil and natural gas resources in Canada to the extent that we have succeeded in alienating them. You know the old adage about having sold our birthright for a mess of pottage, well, Sir, it comes pretty close to that when you read the history of Canadian fossil fuel, natural resource development in Canada.

It's still not too late. We have presumably indications of tremendous oil and natural gas potential in the high Arctic, very expensive to bring to market but it's there. And Walter Gordon is saying that Crown corporations should be developing oil and gas in the far north and the article goes on to say why he believes that this is the proper approach. Well it's either that, Sir, either we do use the Pan Arctic model which is a joint public-private venture approach which I believe makes sense, or else what Mr. Gordon is suggesting, or else the third option is to do it the way it's been done in the last thirty years which has been in my opinion, Sir, the height of folly. We have succeeded in alienating something in the order of \$50 billion of oil and natural gas, minimum, conservatively stated, for a capital investment of something less than \$10 billion.

And we repeat the mistakes of the past and that is why, I don't want to dwell on it further, it just, it won't wash any longer. I tell my honourable friends with sadness for them, that it won't wash any longer that they'll be able to scare people, scare them of the evils of using public instrumentality, Crown corporations, Pan Arctic Oil. People won't be scared any more. In fact, the tide has turned. People now will turn in disgust from old parties that insist in pretending that the old way that they used for development of resources is good enough for this and future generations. Ostriches, that's what they've been. How much supply does the world, the future generations have of fossil fuels? Why should we be anxious to have non-renewable resources exploited? Why should we be so anxious as to practically give it away, it won't rot. But that's been the sad story of the past -- anxiety for exploitation -- even of non-renewable precious resources has been so great that concession after concession has been granted.

My honourable friends, we have been lucky in that we have been living on the cream-skimming advantages of a short sighted policy, a short run advantage, that's what it's been. We have been lucky in terms of our present generation but we have been irresponsible to the next and those beyond it. But I hark back now to whether or not this government has in its budget, in its programming in the past year, done enough with respect to northern employment.

My honourable friends, I have just indicated to them, the number of new programs, none of which existed when they were in office, not one of them. All new projects and programming that have succeeded in providing 12,300 man-months of employment in the past 12-month period, that's incremental jobs.

In addition to that, we have been working in good cooperation with the Federal Government on a special ARDA program that I admit has been slow in getting off the ground but which now is gaining momentum and which I see some 31 projects approved that will provide financing by senior government, that will provide jobs in the order of 166 direct employment; direct without multiplier effect in northern communities so that is to be added to the list of permanent jobs. There have been very special, very hard-driving efforts made through Northern Manpower and other arrangements to try and match up men with histories of chronic unemployment with resource development and local employment.

Well, I know all that isn't good enough; my honourable friends will insist that we should have been doing more even though they did relatively nothing in that respect. They will say that transportation in the north isn't good enough, even though we have used public moneys

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . for the -- well in excess of a million dollars to upgrade air strip facilities in northern communities; even though we have really taken a dramatic change from history in contracting with native persons for the building of winter roads to their communities by themselves and because the weather was adverse in the sense of being warm, there would be those who would now try to use that as an indication that the native people didn't do very well but in fact they have. My honourable friends, they complain that we haven't been doing enough and yet at the same breath they have attacked us for great over expenditure.

My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says that our budget is inflationary; the Member for Lakeside says it's inflationary; government spending is escalating wildly in Manitoba. I would like to refer them to the fact that in Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, the rate of spending is about the same, slightly higher, in some of those cases. I don't want to bore honourable members with specific numbers but as I look to see if the 1973-74 government budget as compared to the last year's budget in Alberta, there is an increase of 13 percent; British Columbia 18 percent; New Brunswick 14 1/2 percent; Newfoundland 14 1/2 percent; Nova Scotia 14.6 percent; Prince Edward Island 10.9 percent; and so on. What point is my honourable friend trying to make, if any. That we've been spending too much but then he was critical we haven't spent enough in certain programs to reduce unemployment. Is he suggesting that we are over-taxing? I would like to recall to him a sequence of taxation which will give him some idea of what over-taxation is.

A MEMBER: He would rather not hear it.

MR. SCHREYER: In 1967, the Conservative Government of Manitoba came in bang, with a five percent sales tax; 1968 they came in with a hospital premium increase of about 50 percent, just, right into the -- a body blow; and 1969 they came in with health care premiums \$204.00 per family per year, bang, right in the teeth. There you have a sequence of three years in a row: 1967 -- a five percent across-the-board sales tax, monumental; in 1968 they doubled their hospital premiums, and the next year it's a grand slam, they come in with one of the highest flat tax health premiums in Canada -- one, two, three.

Then they talk about a pattern of taxation. Mr. Speaker, we have been doing our best. I guess with insufficient success to start rolling that pattern back in reverse; \$204 per family per year, we took down to 100 and then two years later, we got it down to zero where it should have been in the first place. (Applause) We continue with a sales tax which at five percent has not been changed since its inception. Other provinces, many other provinces have higher rates and one has one. Gasoline tax, motive fuel tax, Manitoba's is among the lowest in Canada. It has not been changed for many years. My honourable friends jacked it up in a ratchet way two or three times during the years I was here. So when they talk about taxation patterns, they just have no room for talk whatsoever.

They talk about the amount of increase in the province's budget. I finished explaining to them in comparison to the other provinces in Canada, it is just not out of line at all. In fact it shows restraint. They would like to pretend that the \$76 million in tax reductions are an expenditure. I'm wasting my time in explaining to them that 76 million in tax reductions are shown as an expenditure because of the nature of the reductions. We could have done it in the old-fashioned way which is the way they would have done it, simply reduced revenues by reducing income tax by a certain percentage, but how many times do we have to go over this, Sir? It would have meant peanuts, a few dollars to most Manitoba families, and it would have meant hundreds of dollars to those with least need for that relief. And so, Sir, in order to get the kind of selectivity, the kind of equity, the kind of equality and fairness in tax reduction that we wanted, it had to be taken in and streamed through and channelled through the books. But, Sir, that's a conduit operation which we don't apologize for because it enables us to use the instrumentality of the state once again in order to provide for a little better degree of fairness and equality for the people of this province.

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

I wonder if my honourable friend is aware of how the budget pattern of this province has been for the past 15 years because, you know, they were capable of escalating quite well on their own. I remember when I came here as a MLA the first time in 1958, the budget of the province was \$81 million and, Sir, by 1969 that it had been increased to \$378 million, which I calculate to be an increase - I'll play the numbers game now like my honourable friend - so I calculate that to be an increase of something in the order of 450 percent. Now he's critical of us for an increase of something in the order of about 80 percent. --(Interjection)-- Well 377 million to something in the order of 690 million. But of that 690 million, Sir, 76 million of the supplementaries are tax reductions streamed in and of course that ignores also that my honourable friends had adopted the habit of charging for certain services by paying for it by way of a poll tax and they'd better not talk to us about the fairness of our tax laws. A poll tax they imposed and you know, Sir, I just found out yesterday, - a correction, at noon today - from the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the Minister of Mines and Resources, that they used the \$204 per family per year poll tax not only to pay for the premiums, but people had to pay in those premiums in order to assume a \$4 million obligation that was properly payable by consolidated revenue - I refer to the welfare costs.

Now then, Sir, that, Sir, is the poll tax concept of taxation, is the kind that one would expect to find not any more but thirty years ago in the states of Mississippi and Louisiana in the 1940s, the flat poll tax. I thought that my honourable friends, conservative as they call themselves, were not that reactionary but apparently they were.

Well now, having failed to make any case with respect to the 1973 budget, they resort to the argument as they often do that well, we're not saying that any of the services you're providing are services we would discontinue but you have too many civil servants. We would reduce the number of civil servants and in that way reduce government expenditures and that would leave more money in the pockets of the people. That's my honourable friend's simplistic analysis. Well I would like him to be aware that the pattern of the civil service of Manitoba, the numbers, when taken in context of all provinces in Canada, is simply not out of line whatsoever. It just is not higher. If one takes it on the basis of departmental services only or if one takes the totality of departmental services plus Crown corporation employment, total provincial government employment, which include the departments plus the agencies, one sees for example that for all of the provinces of Canada there had been an increase of 18 percent last December as compared to December of 1969 - 18 percent increase. At the same time Manitoba's aggregate increase was 13 percent. Insofar as departmental services are concerned, just the departmental services, all of the provinces taken in aggregate an increase of 19 percent; in the case of Manitoba, an increase of 19 percent - exactly at parity with the national aggregate average. And that I assume, Sir, would include a few Tory provinces. So what point are they trying to make? Of course they could, I suppose, reduce the number somewhat by resorting to the hiring of the Arthur D. Littles and those but they're fooling the public if they think that that mean it will be cheaper. There are certain purposes for which consulting service is perfectly valid and desirable but they over resorted to consulting services to certain favorites. Usually those favorites were Arthur D. Little, Dalton Camp and Associates and one or two others, so I can leave that alone.

They have tried to make the argument that despite all the economic indicators, despite the fact and there is no way they can deny this, that the gross provincial production of Manitoba has increased as much in the last four years as it did in the previous nine and, Sir, when you discount out inflation and deal in constant dollars the performance of Manitoba's economy in the last four years has been as good and better as any combination of four years in their time. So there it is.

They want to talk then about, having failed there, they will talk about commercial failures. Well there too, let's look at the federal data and we see, if you look at all provinces, that Manitoba is not some unique phenomena. I would draw my honourable colleagues' attention to the fact that for example in 19 - where shall we start - well we can start in 1968, there were 65 commercial failures registered in Manitoba in that year 1968; there were 50 in Saskatchewan; 72 in Alberta; 121 in British Columbia - I'm sorry the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I'm sorry but there were twice as many in British Columbia as in Manitoba. Then we look at 1970 and we find that Manitoba commercial failures, there were 70 - - an increase of five;

## BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . Saskatchewan 80, an increase of 30; Alberta 136, an increase of almost 70; British Columbia 195, an increase of 70.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, 1972; Manitoba 87; Alberta 171; British Columbia 267, so Mr. Speaker, you know, what is the nonsense of all this? These figures are merely the figures which indicate the total number of commercial failures for each of the provinces, for each of the last seven years. --(Interjection)-- All right, my honourable friend I will refer him to the catalogue of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics entitled "Commercial Failures and Estimated Liabilities by Months, Provinces and Selected Cities with Cumulative Data." The catalogue number, I can even pass that on to him. This is a matter of public record but my honourable friends are in the habit of taking it in a way that is so selective and always with an effort, a deliberate effort on their part, to leave out the other provinces so that they talk about Manitoba in isolation. If you talk of Manitoba in the context of all the provinces, then we do not, Sir, have any disappointing unique statistical data that they can point their finger at.

But the Member for Ste. Rose is perfectly correct when he was speaking earlier this afternoon when he said that in 1968, 1969 Manitoba had an image in Canada of being a province that had run out of steam. There was not much interest in Ottawa or Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver as to what was going on here because there was nothing new and exciting and innovative going on at all. No reform, just regressiveness, reactionary conservatism. It didn't matter if you wanted to talk in terms of concepts like compensation for victims of crime, nothing; ombudsman, no; Human Rights Commission, no; the idea of paying for education heavily on the basis of ability to pay, not like today; the idea of paying for health services on the basis of ability to pay, no; a kick in the teeth, \$204 per family per year regardless of income; and even on the farm front, Sir, we had got ourselves into a slavishly dependency on cereal crops to the point - to the point where we were losing milk quotas to the National Dairy Commission and they were being transferred out to Ontario and Quebec. No imagination not even in the Department of Agriculture. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend can say that, at the same time I have to tell him that in the last couple of years we have retrieved those quotas.

It was incredible, Sir, the administration in 1967/68/69 despite all the efforts of my drummer boy friend, the then Minister of Industry and Commerce, my colleague the present Minister of Industry and Commerce was able to, by engaging in only half the selectivity that my honourable opponent does, able to read a story of gloom and doom. They, of course, have been trying valiantly to do the same but, Sir, the fact is that despite inheriting quite a sloppy mess in 1969, we have prevailed, we are through the worst, the province is looking up, the economy is buoyant, the people are happy, we look forward with confidence. (Applause) They will say, ah, but you should have perhaps refused to honour any contracts that may have existed. Well, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, I wonder if honourable members would like me to relate the sagas of induced development efforts in other provinces. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and I believe I have already told the story of the Nova Scotia Heavy Water Plant at Glace Bay, where a Conservative government, one who presumes and pretends to high office nationally now, took the province into an agreement with a certain Jerome Spivak, which caused the province to lose something in excess of \$100 million - no relation, Sir, I make that clear. There is, I understand, no relationship at all. Mr. Speaker, you know, that's the only rejoinder of the Member for Swan River that we cannot elect a New Democrat in Newfoundland. If my colleagues could be in two places at once, we would, Sir, but we can't.

But it does provide such interesting reading that I hasten to read it into the record where, when the present government in Newfoundland came to office, they found a certain pulpmill the cost of which was estimated in 1966 to be \$52 million, which was \$75 million by 1969. So when they came to office the Conservative government found that the province's commitment stood at \$104 million, so then what did they do? They bought it from the then owner. They bought it from him, so now the province has a commitment of \$166 million and the Minister of Finance has announced the other day that the province will have to put an outlay of more than \$220 million in the next two years. Well, Sir, that just goes to show that there is no easy answer to that kind of an approach.

There is also the case of private enterprise, Sir, and let me make it very clear that I will never take a back seat to the Member for Lakeside in terms of my appreciation and support for private enterprise where such enterprise is in fact private, owned and operated by those who are there, but when they talk about private enterprise and if they mean by private enterprise,

BUDGET

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . not where the owner is also the manager and working and operating, but rather where it's absentee shareholders, then I say to him that it does not appeal to my heart. I do not believe it has any kind of inherent efficiency that is greater than that of the public as a whole, and I will never, nor will I believe my colleagues, will never subscribe to the kind of nonsense they subscribed to in the decade of the 1960's of using the public sector as a sucker for certain inconceived deals which were private enterprise, because, Sir, in the 60 seconds remaining the question must be asked out loud, is it private enterprise if there is no risk or venture, capital put up by the so-called private entrepreneur? Is it private enterprise when the public takes all the risk? That is not private enterprise. That is not the way in which the people I know built their businesses. They took the risk; they put in the hard work. They are efficient operators. That is private enterprise at its best, and Sir, we stand behind that kind of private enterprise but not the kind --(Applause)-- Then they have the audacity to say, well, why did you respect our agreement, Sir? But in any case, let this much be clear. For the average Manitoban today, \$400.00 less taxes than when they were in office, in terms of personal taxes, health premium taxes and school taxes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. According to Rule 23 of our rules, on the 8th day, the half hour before adjournment, I must put the motion. The motion is the amended motion of the Honourable First Minister, amended by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and re-amended again by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the sub-amendment lost. On the motion as amended -

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Call in the members.

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

YEAS

- |         |             |              |
|---------|-------------|--------------|
| Messrs: | Barkman     | F. Johnston  |
|         | Bilton      | Jorgenson    |
|         | Blake       | McGill       |
|         | Craik       | McGregor     |
|         | Einarson    | McKellar     |
|         | Enns        | Moug         |
|         | Ferguson    | Sherman      |
|         | Girard      | Spivak       |
|         | Graham      | Watt         |
|         | Henderson   | Mrs. Trueman |
|         | G. Johnston |              |

NAYS

- |            |            |
|------------|------------|
| Adam       | Johannson  |
| Allard     | McBryde    |
| Barrow     | Mackling   |
| Borowski   | Malinowski |
| Boyce      | Miller     |
| Burtniak   | Paulley    |
| Cherniack  | Pawley     |
| Desjardins | Petursson  |
| Doern      | Schreyer   |
| Evans      | Shafransky |
| Gonick     | Toupin     |
| Gottfried  | Turnbull   |
| Green      | Uruski     |
| Hanuschak  | Uskiw      |
| Jenkins    | Walding    |

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21; Nays 30.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it. I declare the motion lost. On the motion as amended, are you ready for the question? I'm waiting until the member takes his seat.



## BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. JORGENSON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order, please.

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

YEAS

|         |             |              |
|---------|-------------|--------------|
| Messrs: | Barkman     | F. Johnston  |
|         | Bilton      | Jorgenson    |
|         | Blake       | McGill       |
|         | Craik       | McGregor     |
|         | Einarson    | McKellar     |
|         | Enns        | Moug         |
|         | Ferguson    | Patrick      |
|         | Girard      | Sherman      |
|         | Graham      | Spivak       |
|         | Henderson   | Watt         |
|         | G. Johnston | Mrs. Trueman |

NAYS

|         |            |            |
|---------|------------|------------|
| Messrs: | Adam       | Johannson  |
|         | Allard     | McBryde    |
|         | Barrow     | Mackling   |
|         | Borowski   | Malinowski |
|         | Boyce      | Miller     |
|         | Burtniak   | Paulley    |
|         | Cherniack  | Pawley     |
|         | Desjardins | Petursson  |
|         | Doern      | Schreyer   |
|         | Evans      | Shafransky |
|         | Gonick     | Toupin     |
|         | Gottfried  | Turnbull   |
|         | Green      | Uruski     |
|         | Hanuschak  | Uskiw      |
|         | Jenkins    | Walding    |

MR. CLERK: Yeas; 22; Nays; 30.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it, I declare the amendment lost. The question on the main motion.

MOTION presented and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, call in the members. All those in favour of the motion that the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, please rise.

RESULT:

YEAS

|         |          |             |
|---------|----------|-------------|
| Messrs: | Adam     | F. Johnston |
|         | Allard   | G. Johnston |
|         | Barkman  | Jorgenson   |
|         | Barrow   | Mackling    |
|         | Bilton   | Malinowski  |
|         | Blake    | Miller      |
|         | Borowski | McBryde     |
|         | Boyce    | McGill      |
|         | Burtniak | McGregor    |

## BUDGET

YEAS cont'd

|         |            |              |
|---------|------------|--------------|
| Messrs. | Cherniack  | McKellar     |
|         | Craik      | Moug         |
|         | Desjardins | Patrick      |
|         | Doern      | Paulley      |
|         | Einarson   | Pawley       |
|         | Enns       | Petursson    |
|         | Evans      | Schreyer     |
|         | Ferguson   | Shafransky   |
|         | Girard     | Sherman      |
|         | Gonick     | Spivak       |
|         | Gottfried  | Toupin       |
|         | Graham     | Turnbull     |
|         | Green      | Uruski       |
|         | Hanuschak  | Uskiw        |
|         | Henderson  | Walding      |
|         | Jenkins    | Watt         |
|         | Johannson  | Mrs. Trueman |

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 52; Nays, 0.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it. Order, please. While a division is taking place, until it has been announced, no member should move. This is one of our rules of decorum. I might also apologize to anyone that is watching the proceedings because it is most difficult to try and take a tally of the division while people are talking and making a lot of noise. If there was an error, I'm sure every member would be offended.

The ayes have it, in my opinion, and I declare the motion carried. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, Sir, it's only a resolution to go; the resolution to have the Speaker leave the Chair hasn't been put.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the motion written before me but it would seem from the Order Paper that the motion in a sense has been put, and I think, Sir, it remains for you to call the Honourable Member for Logan to take the Chair. I believe that's the stage in the procedure that we are at. If that is not the understanding then . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That motion was presented when you presented the Budget.

MR. SCHREYER: This is correct, Sir. I did move this motion at the conclusion of my address, the presentation of the budget evening, the very same motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll call the Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable House Leader wish to make his report for Monday?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, next week we will resume with the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture and we will also try to make some progress with regard to some of the bills that are on the Order Paper and perhaps some new ones will be introduced. After the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, there will be introduced the Estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General. Other than that, there are committee meetings that have been announced by the Chairman of the Hydro Committee on Tuesday morning. There are no other committees contemplated for next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.