

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock Friday, March 9, 1973

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We are considering the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, resolution 82 (a) (1). The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few preliminary remarks before I get into the body or the substance of what I want to say about the estimates. I too, like my colleagues before me wish to congratulate the Departmental staff, pay tribute to the former Deputy Minister Winston Mair who having served this province well for so many years and been such a tremendous asset to the industry that comes under the department, is no longer in his position, and I wish well the successor, Mr. Cawley, in his new job, and also to extend my congratulations to the Minister on the -- and I mean this sincerely -- the efficiency with which his department operates. It's one of the -- possibly the best operated in government, and that's no small credit to the Minister but of course primarily to the people who work in that department..

Mr. Speaker, the contribution of the Minister this morning as the hour closed was a typical performance on his part. We on this side of the House are fairly used to the twisting and the legalistic debating techniques that he often resorts to, and he didn't disappoint us in that respect this morning. As usual, he has ascribes heinous, or impossible, or foolish, or ridiculous views to members opposite, and then spends his time manfully, courageously, with power, great integrity, destroying the straw men that he creates. First he suggests that it's our position that we would want to see the mining companies taxed out of existence, and then he proceeds to build the case that because we have said that a reasonable return may very well be available from the mining industry, as is available from most other industry, through the tax system, the Minister purposely twists this into suggesting that a reasonable return is 100 percent, and no one has ever suggested that. Of course, once you accept his premise that the only return that's reasonable to the people of Manitoba is 100 percent, then obviously anyone who wanted to tax to the tune that he thinks is reasonable would in effect, confiscate. Mr. Chairman, I put it on the record that that is not our position, nor has it ever been, and I'm sure the Minister even perhaps knows that.

Then at another time he suggests that the scoundrels on this side would in effect, give away everything we've got. First we want to tax the people to death in the industry, and then we want to give everything we've got to them; and while this is entertaining Mr. Chairman, it doesn't in any way contribute to the debate. He would have us believe that only he has a monopoly on honesty; only he really cares about the people of Manitoba; only he wants what's best for the people of Manitoba, and only he knows what that is --(Interjection)-- But is it true? What does he really want, Mr. Chairman? He sees the mining profits, they tantalize him, so he wants them all, that's what he said. He wants them all.

Well that, Mr. Chairman, is of course a socialist view. I don't say that is some kind of a crime but it is the essence of socialism that the profit from production should belong to the state. That's the way you get the best - the members opposite suggest that the state and the people are synonymous. I suggest that they in the case of this government, are certainly not. --(Interjection)-- There we go, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister says "I suggest that General Motors are the people". Of course, of course, Mr. Chairman, that is the hyperbole, that is the propaganda, that is the technique that this government uses to shout down, intimidate and frighten people into thinking that the mongol hordes from over the hills are going to come and take away the little cookies from the little men that the NDP protects. Well, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to be drawn into - I don't propose to be drawn into or baited into that kind of a discussion. What I am saying is that I don't suggest, although the First Minister seems highly sensitive on the point, I don't suggest that socialism is a crime. I do suggest that is not in the best interest of the people of this province. And, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister, rather the Mines Minister is in effect suggesting, not in the estimates, but in the speech he made, that 100 percent and nothing less would satisfy him. Now we know that's the case. He saw the auto insurance premiums and he said, "We want those," and he perhaps has seen the life insurance premiums and he wants those too perhaps because where does it stop? Next he'll say --(Interjection)-- Well he says in his speech this morning, that we Liberals would confiscate through taxation the profits, the entire asset in

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) effect made by the mining industry, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion is so ludicrous, so impossible that I won't answer it, because in other speeches he and other members of his party have delighted in portraying me as the great counsel to the industrial complex to enable them to evade taxes. So in one breath I would tax them out of existence, and in the next breath I would be saving them taxes, and it shows the style of distortion that I referred to this morning, the style that is presumably designed to frighten little children or somebody; but certainly grown men and women will try to look at the debate under discussion with a little more rationality and a little less invective and a little less hyperbole and a little less of the Minister's well known theatrics.

It says that we, on this side of the House, or me particularly, will say anything that's convenient, anything, whether we believe it or not, whether it's good or bad if it sounds good, we say it. We are prepared at any time, and certainly not in this Chamber to waste the Chamber's time matching our records for consistency, but let the Minister remember, let the Minister remember that it is he, not I, he whose quotations from Hansard were read into the record during the Speech from the Throne debate. It was he who said, "we will have public hearings and we want an independent inquiry."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker on a point of . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the honourable member just quoted me as saying that we will have public hearings. He says that he finds that statement in Hansard. If he will find that statement in Hansard, I will consider my resignation, "that we will have public hearings on the Hydro development program." He has said that I have said that.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, what I said in the Speech from the Throne debate was that the Mines Minister, I said earlier, is inconsistent because it is he who said in 1969 there were two things that I read into the record:

1. That he stood in favour of public hearings on South Indian Lake; and
2. That he stood in favour of stopping the project because he believed, he said, that we could do the Hydro Electric project without flooding South Indian Lake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: On a point of privilege. The honourable member said in his earlier remarks, and we will check Hansard, because I listened to it very carefully, that I said that we will have public hearings. Mr. Speaker, I said that if the Minister of Resources was bringing a bill into the House suggesting that we vote for a licence, that that Minister had to give us the facts on which that licence would be based, and one of the ways of doing this was to have an independent commission which would find those facts and bring them to the Legislature. I suggested that with respect to a bill that was being presented, I never said that in the future we will have public hearings with respect to such a program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: I don't propose to debate what the Minister says he said in 1969, what I reiterated, was what I said in the Speech from the Throne Debate, and I don't propose to have the limited time that I'm allowed, taken up with the interjections by the Minister.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if on the point of privilege, if I Mr. Speaker, again have misquoted what the member said today, where he said that the Minister said that we will have public hearings, that if I am now quoting back to him, something which he did not say, I will apologize in advance. I would ask the member to do me the same courtesy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the point is well taken if the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party cannot produce the statement in Hansard . . .

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal party.

MR. ASPER: That's very kind of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, the debate on the estimates of the Mines Minister are coming at a very important time primarily because of the filing of the Kierans Report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ASPER: This is, in our opinion a very valuable document a very valuable report because it draws attention to a very troublesome problem facing not only this province but all

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) resource rich provinces, particularly in western Canada, and there is a growing and a very gnawing persistent feeling amongst people throughout the west, but all through resource provinces generally, that they are not getting enough from their resources, that they are not getting a good enough return, and we predict that the pressure will grow over the years for a greater return - this is happening in other jurisdictions. And so it becomes clear, as I'm sure it's clear to all, that a new resource policy is required. Other provinces are groping, other provinces are reaching out; Alberta has taken its particular route, and there'll be others. And we agree to o with the Kierans hypothesis, or implicit in the Kierans Report is the statement that it isn't enough to look at the resource industry and evaluate it on the basis of jobs created alone, because there are other factors, there are contributions to our environment, to the tax revenue of the province, to the development of the north, and the native peoples' integration into the work force. But looking at what Mr. Kierans or Professor Kierans says, basically three or four things:

1. The government should explore for all the minerals.
2. It should then mine them through Crown corporations going into the mining industry.
3. It should presumably sell the production of the mines for further milling, refining and processing to outside industry.

And the basic objective is that the hundred million dollars or so whatever the report suggests was made by the industry in 1972, would therefore have been in the public hands.

Now what I'm saying Mr. Chairman is a preliminary comment because what this report suggests is of profound importance, very deep, The decision we ultimately make will affect us for a long time to come, so before we state a final position we would be consulting much more broadly than the time has allowed us to do. But we do see some things that are wrong, and we do see some things that are right, and we have some alternatives to suggest that the task force that the Minister will be a temptation on the part of many people to evaluate or look at the Kierans Report and dismiss it out of hand as socialist dogma. That would be unfortunate. It may have a socialist objective, or it may not, but that is not the issue, . . . it's not quite true. It doesn't take into account a lot of other things that should have been taken into account in a report like this that we think the task force should address itself to.

For one thing, it doesn't take into account infrastructure contributions the industry make, not adequately - I'm talking about roads, hospitals, schools - and it doesn't answer the question who would if we were to, for the preposterous example, take over International Nickel, what would the position of the people of Thompson be? For example today, International Nickel not on its tax bill but on its agreement with the town provides 55 percent of the cost of maintaining, I think its schools and other infrastructure, in any event, I don't have the agreement in front of me. And if that were to come off, if the mining company were not to make that contribution, of 1.5 million dollars per year, roughly, then it would take 33 mills on the property tax of every home, every building in Thompson to cover that, and so we would want to hear from the government a commitment that the kind of policy it ultimately brings forward would not take away existing privileges that northern communities have.

Also a fault I find with the report is that it does not tie into a general industrial strategy, and one can not look at one sector of the economy in isolation, and it must be, it must be part of a coherent strategy (Interjection)-- and we would hope, we would hope that the ultimate plan Guidelines for the 70's that the Minister speaks of will provide us with the total picture and at that point, and only at that point, can Manitobans really comment conclusively on this report.

It appears in many respects that this report has been prepared in a vacuum because it doesn't answer a lot of questions. When I say a vacuum I mean, it doesn't seem to take into account the fact that we live in a world with other provinces, with other nations and where we must - whatever we produce must be competitively priced and also is based on supply and demand principles.

We aren't told how Crown operation of the mining industry would produce the management required, the international management. We wonder whether Crown corporations in the mining industry could compete effectively and I must say that while the report has some very attractive features, it seems weak in the area of implementation, and we would like to know what the international dimensions and the discussions that would be required in order to bring this out, and bring this about in the form that Professor Kierans suggests.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd)

But there is, as was said earlier, a need for a fairly quick decision because the atmosphere in Manitoba has now become clouded by yet another report which is not government policy. I'm referring to the earlier document that's been dubbed "The Manitoba Manifesto" which has not been adopted by the government nor has it been denied.

A MEMBER: It's all government policy.

MR. ASPER: And there are evidences on the horizon that adopted or not, is in fact government policy in many areas.

We doubt that much development can take place or will take place until this issue is resolved because the cloud hangs heavily over the whole community.

Mr. Kierans suggests that the profits to the companies are too high but that isn't related to the national picture and to the world picture, nor does he explain the relationship between losses and profits in the industry as a whole. For example, we are told, and we have no documentary statistical evidence to support this, but we are told that for every dollar that's made in that industry, more than a dollar is lost by someone else, and so that somebody who has a monopoly on the total industry may very well be a loser; we don't know that, we want more economic data on that.

Mr. Chairman, there are many problems and we all know them with state ownership. We want to know and the people would want to know what happens to a mine if the mine becomes unprofitable, is it closed down, or does political influence, political consideration or political fear intervene and keep a mine open that should be closed? We want to know how government would attract the management skill and the international marketing associations that are required. We want to know why the report doesn't deal adequately but just dismisses the whole subject of refining and processing. Because one of the greatest problems in this province and in any province with resources is that we are exporting jobs, everyone knows that, and the report seems basically silent in its dealing with that particular problem.

In conclusion on that aspect, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Kierans Report does not justify on the surface at least a case for state ownership. I have a feeling that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines, perhaps Mr. Kierans too, are hypnotized by that \$100 million. What we want to know and we would like some statement on perhaps in the guidelines document that will eventually come forward, is if we see a hundred million here and we want it and we see thirty million here and we want it, what about the grocery store?

A MEMBER: We'll get it.

MR. ASPER: What about the insurance industry - the life insurance, and so on? And so some clear . . .

A MEMBER: We'll get them, we'll get the farmers too - collective farming, we'll get that too.

MR. ASPER: . . . some clear statement as to where the government wants to go in seeing profit and saying we want it for the people. Mr. Green, the Honourable Minister is not the only one in this Chamber who wants the most for the people of Manitoba. The quarrel obviously will always be and perhaps should properly be the techniques as to how that should be achieved.

Now, there are options and I sincerely commend options to the task force that the Minister is setting up, and I don't want to see this resolve itself into people dismissing it and making a violent attack on socialism or as opposed to working with the document and developing reasonable alternatives which we can then debate. Because there are alternatives to public ownership. Public ownership has never guaranteed that the public interest will always be protected. Hydro is not in my judgment projecting the public interest in its current plan. CNR has not necessarily protected the public interest and CBC leaves something to be desired in its monopolistic protection of the public interest. But the alternatives don't appear to be under consideration.

A MEMBER: I'm talking about the CNR operations.

MR. ASPER: Because the report has a bias for public ownership and it states its bias, it states its bias and therefore considers nothing but. Now we have a basic agreement with the report, I'm sure everyone in this Legislature does. It is clear that the public of Manitoba owns the resources of Manitoba and, secondly it is also clear that it is a responsibility of any government of the day to maximize the benefit that the public of Manitoba get from those

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd)resources. And the issue will be, and let's not get into a philosophical issue here, the issue will be, what is the best technique, and I am satisfied that it is not necessarily through Crown corporations and Crown ownership. I'd like to suggest one alternative.

One of the possibilities is that we should begin by taking a complete inventory of every resource we have in the province - I'm talking about mental resource, mineral resource. We do not have that inventory. We've got a partial inventory and the first job of government as custodian of those resources is to make sure we have a complete inventory. That doesn't mean just blindly surveying this province but what it does mean if you believe in some sensible cohesive development, that you've got to do that exploration obviously in a priority sense in the areas where existing development is located, where there's road, where there's infrastructure, so that corridor development can take place in this province rather than scattered development. So we take inventory. Now that doesn't except the concept that private individuals cannot participate in the inventory taking, private prospecting is not necessarily to be outlawed. In fact private exploration should be encouraged on a finders fee basis, on a finders fee basis where ore is discovered. Fee would be related to the size and the quality of the body and especially to its accessibility to existing infrastructure. That is the inventory process we must go through in Manitoba, just as we do and should do with our trees and other resources. Following that you now can begin the development process.

Government must, and I would be referring it one possible alternative - to a highest bidder system of development. The government analyzes an ore body, the relative markets, the price trend and competitive market. The government should also under those circumstances after determining what revenues we could expect from the development, analyze the social factors, environmental factors - northern development, native peoples integration. Then the government could establish a minimum bid for that particular development, and say this is the minimum we must have, we the people must have. These are the minimum conditions we will accept for this development, timing, conservation, the total --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry. the member suggests that all we're getting now is exactly what I'm saying and that's of course quite inaccurate. What we get today is a system where the company finds the ore and simply goes ahead and mines it regardless of what the -- where there are regulations. But fundamentally develops it regardless of the social impact and so on. What we are saying...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ASPER: What we are saying is that having made the analysis the government can then put the development out to bid. As I say conservation should figure prominently, rationing if you like or husbanding of resources. The profits the company makes would still be taxed; private mining companies could bid on the development, and in fact Crown corporations could bid on the same development and if they can promise the public a better deal than the private sector then of course you would do it that way.

Second alternative to that would be the contracting out system of development where the analysis is done, the ore bodies analyzed, the markets are analyzed and where the social factors, environment, development, regional growth, northern development are all put into a package. Again government sets its limits and says this is what we require socially and economically from this project. At that point rather than a highest bid system the government would tender the contract for the development setting minimum criteria. The contractor, the private enterprise company would get a basic return for its service, it would be chosen on the basis of its cost, the cost of the development, the return that it would guarantee to the people of Manitoba, the contractor would get a basic return and if he is efficient and creates greater profits we would have an accelerating, escalating kind of profit-sharing plan where the contractor produces benefit in excess of his commitment. As well we would have a penalty system and the right of cancellation where the contractor does not deliver what the public should have.

The third alternative is the joint venture system, much like the Pan Arctic system of development. Here government again makes the analysis that sets the minimum criteria and enters into a consortium with the private sector, which has the management, which has the marketing ability and which has the, I suppose, technological know how to make the thing go.

There are lots of other alternatives in the consortium concept, in the joint venture system, but these are only some of the alternatives, Mr. Chairman. But because the Kierans Report is now public - and obviously I should say that we on this side in the Liberal Party will

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . lean toward a resource development policy which is (a) integrated with our total policy of industrial strategy; (b) which has as its fundamental objective after development the retention within this province of all of the jobs or the most jobs humanly capable of being retained through restriction on export of the raw materials; and (c) a system which leans toward the public getting its share without taking the risk and where the private sector is the mining industry and not the public.

Because of the fact that the Kierans Report is now public, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the task force and the Minister to deal with this expeditiously, report to this Chamber so that more reasoned, more in depth debate can take place. I would refer the task force to the findings--and I don't seem to have brought it with me but I intended to read it-- of the Science Council of Canada this year in January and I'm sure the Minister has read it, where in the last . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The time allotted to the member has expired. Does the member have leave to proceed? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I would just like to answer very briefly if I can some of the remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Liberal Party and I'll try not to take too much time. The honourable member is aware that we only have 30 minutes the same as the rest which is not like the old procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to know that he is first of all behind the times with his alternatives. In Manitoba there are three alternatives: private industry can invest money, develop and earn a profit. That alternative is there, has been exercised and is still available to private industry. The public can invest money, explore and develop. That alternative is there and has been used for the past two years. The consortium alternative is in concert with the public and the private. There can be exploration and development. That alternative has been available for the last three years without the urging of my honourable friend and is being used and is now being used. So the three alternatives which he is presenting. . .

MR. ASPER: Where is it being used?

MR. GREEN: It is being used by the Manitoba Mineral Explorations Company. If my honourable friend would listen and was here last year, when the president of that company reported to committee, he indicated that Manitoba is engaged in joint exploration ventures with other companies. The same way as the Pan Arctic scheme, Mr. Speaker, which is what my honourable friend referred to, and therefore the consortium system, the public system and the private system, the three alternatives thought upon on March . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, the point of order is the Minister is once again misquoting taking something I didn't say and making a speech on it.

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

MR. GREEN: I don't know what the honourable member didn't say, I heard him say something about consortiums and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have the consortium type of development at the present time --(Interjection)-- Oh I see what the honourable member wants. I really didn't believe that he wanted that -- I didn't really believe that he was saying that. He is saying, Mr. Speaker, that we go 50-50 in exploration and when we find the mine we give it to them, that we not be involved in the mining, that we only be involved in the . . . exploration.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I concede that I'm not a rules expert in this House, but surely I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, there must be some procedure whereby this kind of distortion of what a member is saying can be permitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I know the honourable member is sorry for what he said but nevertheless he will read Hansard tomorrow and see whether that is not what he said. When I corrected him he said, I'm not talking about explorations I'm talking about -- I'm not talking about mining I'm talking about explorations. Which means, Mr. Speaker, that we go and do the hard work -- which is the other suggestion that he makes -- that we should have a complete mineral inventory in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the whole business in mining is finding where it is. If we knew where it was there wouldn't be difficulty in having the inventory.

The mapping of the preliminary exploration work by means of mapping has always been

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) done publicly and the mining industry has urged us to do it publicly because then they can come to the public map, see where the potential anomaly exists and do the on site exploration either by electro-magnetic studies or by drilling. Well I see the honourable member who talks about hearing and everything else, he doesn't listen, you know. --(Interjection)-- There's a good reason? Well, Mr. Speaker, honourable members will know that despite this man who listens to nobody and won't hear and won't listen and won't hold hearings, that honourable members will know who have been here for the past six years, that I listen to every public representative, that I am-- that I can tell you about speeches that have been made and their content by every member of this House, by every member in this House, but the honourable member who is running around all over the city during the time that the House is in session did not even know when his own motion for want of non-confidence was being presented and had preliminarily planned not to be here on that evening; doesn't listen to anybody. He claims to be listening to everybody but he is seldom in the House listening to what the elected representatives of the people are saying. I listen to him despite my opinion of his remarks because he happens to be the elected representative of Wolseley and despite my opinion of whether the people of Wolseley, of whom I am one, exercised good judgment or not I accept the fact that he is the representative and has to be listened to. I listen to every other member and, - Mr. Speaker, not only do members know that I listen to them but I can say what they have said from various times. The honourable can't say that and I'm asking him to listen. That the fact is that you do not conduct a mineral inventory without exploring and there are two types. We go with the initial mapping which the public has always done and from which industry has gained considerable advantage, and then we explore ourselves. And that is now being done by private people and it's being done by public people and it is being done in consortiums. And if I have misconstrued my honourable friend's alternatives I am sorry but nevertheless we are involved in all those three options, or any sophistication of those three options and we are proceeding in that way.

With regard to Bissett, Mr. Speaker, with regard to when the public will come in and spend money just to save itself let me say that that is a problem with public enterprise or private enterprise. It all depends on who's going to benefit. When Bissett was going down the public came in and bailed them out. It wasn't a question of it being a public enterprise or a private enterprise, a question of jobs and the public decided that they were going to go ahead and bail this mine out. I see no greater desirability of bailing out a public enterprise or a private enterprise. I think that each one is equally being bailed out and can happen whether you have it done by the public or whether done by the private.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are not only members on the opposite side who probably think that I should yield the floor but members on my own side who feel that I should yield the floor but members on my own side who feel that I should yield the floor and therefore I'm not going to deal with all of the remarks of the honourable member. I just want to deal with two. One is that he says that I have been inconsistent because I wish to have it both ways. On the one hand I have said that they are willing to tax the industry out of existence. I hope I didn't say that but if I did I didn't mean exactly that. What I said was that Mr. Asper said, or the Leader of the Liberal Party said that you don't have to do what Kierans is suggesting because you can get the money that he is talking about by taxing. Mr. Speaker, that is the direct implication. If my honourable friend feels that that is unfair I am going to say that that was the direct impression that was attempted to be created through the statements that were at least reported in the newspaper and my friend will probably say, and it's possible, that he is as much troubled with the newspapers as any other politician, but the fact is that he let it be understood, or it was intended to be let understood on his behalf that you don't need Kierans because the money is available through taxation. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an absolutely indefensible position.

A MEMBER: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: My honourable friend did not take that position . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I said in my remarks that what I said was not what the Minister has just said, and yet he compounds it by repeating it. What I said so that the record is clear, Mr. Speaker . . .

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. That is not a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that I am now dealing with the impression which I say was let out . . .

MR. ASPER: Nobody else.

MR. GREEN: Nobody else. Well, Mr. Speaker, if nobody else got that I will bring you the newspapers who at least got that impression from what you said, I will bring you the newspaper accounts if you say nobody else got - the newspaper account said as near as I can recollect "Mr. Asper says why take the risk you can get the money by taxation", and that's what was said, Mr. Speaker, the money that Mr. Kierans was talking . . .

MR. ASPER: No.

MR. GREEN: Well they were all discussing the Kierans Report; they weren't talking about three men in a tub; they were talking about the Eric Kierans Report, and the suggestion was, "You don't need Kierans, don't take the risk, but get the money." That was the substance of the position.

MR. ASPER: Not, Not, Not.

MR. GREEN: I say, Mr. Speaker, that that was the substance of the position, that is an indefensible position.

My honourable friend says on the one hand I have said, tax them out of existence. I repeat what I think I said, and I hope it will show up that way in Hansard, and on the other hand I said, that they are giving away the resources, and that I cannot have it both ways, that the Liberals can't be doing both things. Well I don't remember making the second remark; I do remember saying that the Member for Wolseley said that we are giving away our resources because Americans are selling hunting rights, and that he should not, and that some other government said, that I was giving away our resources. And then I said what about nickel, what about copper, what about steel, would you give those away. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, the honourable members says that I cannot have it both ways and I agree. All I am saying that he is putting it both ways, I am not having it both ways. I am merely indicating, Mr. Speaker, that he makes this statement on the one hand, he makes the statement that the resources of this province should not be put into the hands of Americans for the purpose of exploitation; on the other hand he says, he doesn't make the same remarks and takes an entirely different position with regards to nickel, iron, zinc and the other resources, then he takes his regard to deer and other animals. And I am suggesting that that is the case, that he has taken those two different positions. The honourable member then says, and repeats, even though he does what he says I have done, that he's taken two inconsistent statements of mine, and even though he knows that I am supposed to know that I have made them, I keep repeating the fact, or that he keeps -- even though I have denied the implication that the Honourable member attributes to those statements - he keeps repeating it without suggesting that there has been any denial at all.

A MEMBER: What are you doing?

MR. GREEN: And the two statements are as follows, the two statements are as follows: one was that I said in 1969 in discussing South Indian Lake, and am now I'm paraphrasing not quoting, we have reason to believe that the Churchill River Diversion can be completed without the flooding of South Indian Lake. We have reason to believe. If honourable member will look at that speech he will see, Mr. Speaker, that I never ever suggested that there wouldn't be a diversion; that I was talking about something of a low level diversion; and that above all I never ever said that after investigations that we might not even be required to proceed with the high level diversion. That I always -- oh the only thing he can do is investigate - and the one who would be tripping me up the most if I made that type of statement is the Member for Lakeside who has consistently said, I give the honourable member credit. He never ever said that he wouldn't proceed with the high level diversion. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Lakeside who would have ten times the reason than the Member for Wolseley to have fixed that kind of statement on me if I made it, won't do it, surely, surely it would indicate that at no time, at no time did I promise that there would not be a high level diversion, at no time did I promise that there will be a low diversion. What I said was that we will not go for the existing plan, we will review that plan, we will take into account psychological factors, and then we will present our program. That is all I said, and the Honourable Member knows that is all I said, and yet he continues to insist that the Member for Wolseley - that the

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Minister promised that there would be no flooding. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a good way, there's a good way of examining it because there's a Winnipeg - one of the Winnipeg newspapers is also insisting that I promised that there would be no flooding in 1969.

Now here is an interesting feature. One of the Winnipeg papers says that I made that promise and it was relied upon. I was the spokesman for Mines and Resources under the New Democratic Party, if I had made a promise that there would be no flooding in 1969, it would have been considered, I suppose, sufficiently newsworthy to the media to report that here is a spokesman for a party that has promised that there will be no flooding if his party gets into office. I challenge that newspaper to find that significant item of news in their papers in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, he said that it's in Hansard. I repeat, what is in Hansard is I said, that we have reason to believe that this could be accomplished without flooding of South Indian Lake. Now the honourable member hasn't been here a long time. But I am telling you that I said we have reason to believe that we would investigate it, I didn't promise that it would be done, and I didn't promise that we would not proceed with the high level program. But even taking the statement even taking the statement as my honourable friend wants to put it let me say to you, that in 1969 flooding meant flooding the community.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. GREEN: That it did not - well honourable member scoffs. I now produce a newspaper, September 24, 1970. "Indian Community Won't be Flooded", and this is September of 1970. When the 50 million plan for Lake Winnipeg was announced which involved the diversion for South Indian Lake, they said that the Indian community will be flooded because everybody who spoke --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, everybody, including Bobby Bend for God's sake, who spoke about flooding at that time was talking about the community, and the Liberal Party came out with a program of a low level diversion plus Lake Winnipeg regulation, it is reported upon in a newspaper and, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member says that that is not a fact then he doesn't know what the Liberal Party said in 1969. Bobby Bend came in with a program of a low level diversion, plus Lake Winnipeg regulation during the election campaign. It was --(Interjection)-- well, Mr. Speaker, he says that that is not coming from him and I agree, but the Liberal Party Leader also said that our program has -- the Liberal Party program not the Asper program - that the Liberal Party program has been consistent since the - before, during, and after the election campaign. And during the election campaign, Bobby Bend, who then had a position of some importance in the Liberal Party said: low level diversions plus Lake Winnipeg regulation.

The second statement which he attributes to me is with regard to the hearings. Mr. Speaker, I've explained it; the honourable member persists in pursuing it as does the same newspapers, when the Member for Lakeside introduced a bill and asked us to vote for a licence rather than him signing one, and that was a problem which I sympathized with him, and which he was forced into. I said if we are to be part of the administration we have to be privy to administration material. We therefore need the reports and we need the information, and if there is a controversy and the Legislature is being asked to decide, then what is done in this type of case is that an independent commission is appointed, and that independent commission makes a report to the House, and the House then has information upon which to proceed. But it was in relation to a bill that was being presented to the Legislature. I never said that we would proceed by bringing a bill into the Legislature, or that we would proceed by having an independent commission, I said that in the circumstances of that bill being presented to the Legislature, that that kind of thing was warranted. But that's a long way, Mr. Speaker, from saying that if the New Democratic Party comes to power we are going to hold public hearing to determine whether we should conduct an administrative act by issuing a licence on a hydro development project.

And, Mr. Speaker, I campaigned almost as much as the Leader of this party during the election campaign, and my honourable friend can look at what the public said about what I was saying during that election campaign, I was saying that there would be a review of the proposal by the Conservative Government to flood South Indian Lake to the extent of 30 feet and there would be a reassessment of that program. That reassessment took place exactly as indicated and my feeling, which was expressed a year ago on very little information, that

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) there was reason to believe that the program could be proceeded with without flooding the community of South Indian Lake is reflected in the story of September the 24, 1970, the Winnipeg Free Press: "Indian Community won't be flooded".

Now the honourable member seems to think that things have the same meaning at all times. Let me put it to you this way. Well the honourable member laughs. If again we had the unthinkable hypothetical situation that the Leader of the Liberal Party became the Premier of the province and stopped, looked and listened, stopped looked and listened, had his hearings and came up with a program that raised the level of South Indian Lake by three feet, had no problems associated with it, eliminated maybe half the flow that was going up to Churchill, and was a much better program, which I would agree, if we could only go three feet and do the same thing, and had a much better program. Would the honourable member say that he has bastardized and betrayed the people of Manitoba by coming back with a program which reduced the level of South Indian Lake flooding from ten feet to three feet and then proceeded, because that's what he's suggesting. He's suggesting that by going from 30 feet to 10 feet we have bastardized ourselves and betrayed our commitment to the people of Manitoba by reducing that program by 20 feet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, different things are spoken in a different context. Ten, three, four years ago let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, four years ago, ten feet would not have been considered by anybody in this House, by anybody in the public, including the people at South Indian Lake, would not have been considered flooding South Indian Lake because when we spoke, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection) -- Oh now we are back to public hearings. We said -- there were two things where he said I was inconsistent. I've dealt with one and that is that I said that there would be no flooding. It's absolutely astonishing, and secondly, that I said that there would be public hearings. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, my honourable friend will go out of this room, he will go to some hearing where they are stopping, looking, and listening, and I would suggest that that is the motto for the Liberal Party that when they are in power they will stop, look and listen. That is exactly what they will do they will stop, look and listen.

A MEMBER: And then act.

MR. GREEN: The people of Manitoba, the people in any democratic system, have been frustrated, Mr. Speaker, by numerous governments that they elected with very high hopes and that when they got into power we said, yes we did think we would like to do this but now we have to stop, look and listen, because there are implications which we didn't consider at the time that we went to the people. And when the Liberal Party comes out with its program, which it's now saying that it's being formed, I assume that it will contain 50-- he said 300 categories -- and these are the things that they are going to do, I'd put a caveat on those, Mr. Speaker, because once they are elected they will say, oh yes we had 300 things in our platform and you elected us to do these things, but don't forget that everything was predicated by stop, look and listen, and that we have to have hearings now, that our real program is that when the Liberal Party comes to power we're going to have hearings.

A MEMBER: God forbid.

MR. GREEN: We're going to have hearings to determine everything that we do; our program is to have hearings. We don't have any policy with regard to medicine; we don't have any policy with regard to education; we do not have -- but we do have a policy with regard to hearings, and after we are elected we are going to hold hearings on all of these 300 questions, which are the policy platform of the Liberal Party, and when you are coming to those hearings we will stop, look, and listen, and after we have stopped, looked and listened, and we get the publication from these hearings, we will have hearings to see whether what is in these publications is worth doing as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second one is hearings. And I say, I repeat, the member will go out and say that I made an inconsistent statement and he will read it; the statement that I made related to the fact that the Legislature was presented with a bill asking it to perform an administrative act. When our government asks the Legislature to perform an administrative act, when I ask my honourable friend to be party to the administration, I will then agree that I have to give that honourable member the information which I have which is asking -- which is militated for the administrative step that I am taking. And if I don't give it to him then he can pull out that speech and say, in 1969 the honourable member said this, and I think that I will have to agree that I would have been inconsistent when that happens, not until then.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I enter the debate after observing a very interesting discussion between the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. A very entertaining presentation - and it was an entertaining presentation, well it was a masterpiece in one sense. And I have to give the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources credit. I think that there is no question without doubt he is the - one of the most effective debaters in this House, and he can avoid dealing with the fundamental issue of any question.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . by articulating his position on the side issues which basically have two results. One it diverts attention, if I can use the word diversion, it diverts attention from the main issue, and secondly, for many of the people on the other side it simply stimulates them to become involved on the side issues without realizing that in effect they've lost the thrust of the original presentation and the original point to be made.

And so, Mr. Chairman, for just a few moments, and very briefly, I am going to try and deal with the Kierans Report in a very fundamental way, and a way in which I believe the Minister has avoided a government declaration that has not -- has avoided stating a government declaration which for all intents and purposes, and I use the Premier's terminology, amounts to veiled nationalization and takeover of the mining industry in this province. I say that because we listened with great passion, at least with great passion expressed by the First Minister on the issue of western Canadian alienation, and he went to certain terminology which some may have considered extreme in describing the statements and the actions of the Liberal Leader. And we'll discuss that possibly today or later on, and I have a contribution to make on that debate.

But the interesting thing is that he suggested that the language was only indicative of one kind of conclusion, and right at this point, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the actions of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the refusal on the part of the government to make some form of declaration of position on this has without question brought to the attention of most people the fact that there really is only one ultimate conclusion to be drawn from the report and the actions they've taken so far. And, Mr. Chairman, we are speaking now not just of the sins of commission that are committed by a government in execution of policy that they have determined, but the sins of omission, and here I think is one of the greatest charges that can be laid against the government, because they know full well the implications of what this report means, and they know full well what the implications of it will mean, not just in the mining industry but in certainly increasing the fears that already exist in this province, by the total business community as to what the ultimate design and objective of the government is.

There is still, I would say, some doubt as to what the philosophy of the government is. The Premier periodically stands up and states that he's a social democrat and tries to define it in certain ways. In the earlier part of this administration he tried to describe it as something that was similar to Sweden, and he made references to that at that time. He indicated that many things were going to be introduced as a matter of fact that would follow the Swedish experiment, and we haven't, we really haven't heard too much about that. So we know that the Member from Crescentwood has made statements which are not policy of the government but to a large extent have not been disassociated by the Ministers in their conversations and discussions on issues, and on this issue as well, and I believe that the Member from Crescentwood will be making a contribution and I would like to hear about it.

Now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources earlier today read excerpts from an address that he presented to the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgical conference at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. He tabled it and I had an opportunity to read it because I wasn't sure until I reread it, as to the way in which he dealt with it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this memorandum only deals with one aspect of the Kierans Report and the Minister has given the impression that this is the answer to their position, but it does not deal with the question of the take-over. It does not deal with the question of the ten year period. It does not deal with the questions that in ten years the mining industry will be out.

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

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, my point is: I don't wish there to be misunderstandings. I didn't say that that was the answer to the Kierans Report, I said that that statement was made before I knew about the Kierans Report or what was in it, knew about what was in the Kierans Report, I knew that Mr. Kierans was researching a report. I also indicated that I felt that that was the statement of policy that the industry knew about. I didn't say it was an answer to the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party -- Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, this is very interesting. The impression that the Minister would like to create is that this essentially is the position of the government not just on this issue but in general. --(Interjection)-- No, no. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and this is a debatable position between us, I'm saying that the impression that you're trying to create by discussing this one aspect is to create an impression that this is our position. Just as the mining industry would like not to pay any taxes, the government -- as the government would like the mining industry to pay as much taxes as possible and to gain as much as they possibly can for the public as -- benefit as they see it.

MR. GREEN: That's my position with regards to Kierans.

MR. SPIVAK: Well that's interesting.

MR. GREEN: Not to Kierans, to the mining company.

MR. SPIVAK: To the mining company. Well, Mr. Chairman, then I think it's about time that they stood up as a government and gave us your position on the Kierans Report. I do not think that that requires a task force study. I think, Mr. Chairman, that what the people of Manitoba would want to hear from the government of the day is that they are not prepared to look to the final solution -- and I'm using the terminology of the Liberal Leader with respect to western Canada --- to the final solution . . .

MR. GREEN: Peaceful solution.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and the peaceful solution, and the peaceful solution or final solution . . .

MR. GREEN: No he didn't say final . . .

MR. SPIVAK: He said peaceful, I'm sorry --- to be the actual takeover . . .

MR. GREEN: The final solution is somebody else's.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I'm sorry. I apologize

A MEMBER: We'll take final solution, Stick to final solution.

MR. SPIVAK: I say the peaceful solution to be, the peaceful solution to be the takeover of the mining companies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the auto insurance industry, and in dealing with the auto insurance agents, in the earlier phases, the earlier stages of the government's decision --(Interjection)-- yeah -- what was that solution all about? In the earlier stages did the people who dealt with the government believe that there was some way in which there was going to be participation by them with the government? Well I think they had reason to believe that. I think they had reason to believe that the Pawley Commission would in fact be a commission that would come in with a recommendation ultimately that would some way recognize the place that many many people had in the insurance industry and that they themselves would be involved in some way. Now -- and there were statements by the First Minister as a matter of fact which would have indicated that. Now that really didn't happen. What really happened is a conflict took place in the confrontation which the government was faced politically with the reality that they had to recognize that the course of action that they wanted to take, which they really wanted to put through, they couldn't do it and that in fact they had to alter part of their plan. Now that's part and parcel of democratic process, and the right of any group, in any organized group, to be able to present its position. And I respect that.

But I am saying to the members opposite that having gone through this in the auto insurance industry, having allowed the Kierans Report to be produced as a public document and presented in this Legislature; having not at this point been prepared to stand up and say, you know, what our position is, but rather to suggest that no, what we are concerned about is we are going to have a task force that they are going to look at this and then we are going to determine what will happen recognizing that there are many on the opposite side, not only the Member from Crescentwood who would accept Mr. Kierans' Report and say, that is the

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) answer; having done that all they have done is simply stirred the fears of a vast majority, a vast majority of people, not just business people in this province, who look with fear at the present government at their intent, at their direction, and with what kind of society they visualize.

Mr. Speaker, the question was asked yesterday with respect to the control of land in B. C. and the legislation that was being introduced there and as to what is going to happen here. And the Premier indicated that you are going to be studying that. Now you're going to be studying that, you probably have studied Saskatchewan's position, you're going to study others. The people have been looking for some time for direction and for some understanding of where the New Democratic Party is really going in Manitoba. And at this time I suggest notwithstanding all the actions that have taken place back and forth between the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the members on this side, or the statements that have been made, or the quotations in the Free Press that have been corrected, or the constant dialogue that has taken place by the omission to have stood up publicly and indicated a position opposite to what I suggest is a veiled takeover and veiled nationalization of this industry, you have indicated the general tenor and tone and ultimate objective and desire of the New Democratic Party, and I suggest to the members opposite that that is not in harmony with the majority of people in this province. They are not prepared for this, nor are they prepared for other industries. And the question was raised -- and maybe in a joking manner -- what about the other industries, what about the groceries, who is next. And those fears are real, and those fears are real and you may suggest to me that --(Interjection)-- you may suggest to me that this is just an alarming statement to be made, a statement to alarm people. I suggest to you in all sincerity, to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members opposite that that's for real. You misunderstand the mood of this province. You misunderstand the desires . . .

A MEMBER: Whop uts up with the grocery stores in the last 20 years.

MR. SPIVAK: You misunderstand the mood of this province if you believe, as I believe you do, that somehow or other government should use its legislative ability to take over and continue to takeover one industry, one phase and segment of our economy after another. They are not interested in this. There are people who have fears of government regulations and control and government takeover; there are people who have, you know, questioned the judgment and capability of government to run; there are people who are concerned about the manner in which the political arm will be used to run government operations, and so we face a very basic division of opinion between our side, and I refer to our Party, and the present government.

Now there is no doubt -- and I'm going to go back to the economic development policy that was sort of discussed in a general way -- there is no doubt that an economic development policy for the 70's was required. And certainly I think you are aware that when I was Minister of Industry and Commerce we attempted to try and do that. And there can be questions and judgment as to how effective that was or not but a document at least was produced, a basis for other work to take place. The government for three years has tried to prepare, and there will no doubt be an economic guideline program to be prepared.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the government having arranged for Professor Kierans to have assisted them in a report on natural resources did not have to produce this report publicly. No. In the course of preparing their guideline report, just as in the course of preparing the White Paper and ultimately the legislation on Unicity, consultants were used and consultants presented to the government, and the government therefore finalized and formalized its policy based on a lot of input by a number of people who indicated their basic positions. And Professor Kierans was quite capable of giving the government the benefit of his knowledge and his position to the members of government in the formulation of a guideline policy. Yet the government basically decided to print this, to present it within the first week of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and basically to suggest that a task force of the government will be undertaken to review it, and that in fact based on the question the Member for Crescentwood asked yesterday, yesterday --(Interjection)-- Well we haven't been able to get everything yet, no. Well 90 percent then. And that surely would have . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well I would suggest to you that the government had an obligation to, if it felt so inclined, to produce this report, which is part of the report to deal with the guidelines for the 70's. . .

A MEMBER: No.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. SPIVAK: No? It's not going to be part of the report of the Guidelines for the 70's? The Guidelines will have its chapter in that area.

MR. SPIVAK: The Guidelines will have a chapter in this area.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. SPIVAK: And part of this report will have been dealt with by the people who are ultimately writing the guidelines, including the approval of the government. Is that not correct?

MR. GREEN: The Guidelines will have a chapter in that area.

MR. SPIVAK: All right. A consultant has been hired, a so-called expert in his field, he is making the presentation to the government, the government has seen fit to publish that document, and I suggest by publishing that document, by not being prepared to indicate a policy by being prepared to say that this is something worthy of discussion that what you have done deliberately. . .

A MEMBER: Deliberately.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . deliberately with full knowledge of the consequences . . .

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . but with I think a great misunderstanding of what this province -- the people in this province really are interested in or desire. But with an attempt to try and hold the shattered forces that make up the New Democratic Party with all its wings that having done this by the omission of not standing up and declaring a policy and by the presentation of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who has not dealt with a policy position here, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, he has not dealt with that but rather he has avoided it and dealt with only one aspect, and that aspect has to do with future mineral discoveries not with the present mining situation, by having not made the statements, by having not declared the policy, that in effect you indicate your direction clearly. And there is no one that can have any doubt of ultimately what would be achieved and ultimately what your desire will be. Now it's fortunate

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question? Did the honourable member not regard the statement which I made, which correctly -- was correctly reported verbatim by Frances Russell as being at least an indication of the present government feeling on the issue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm asking the government in this Legislature, not through press reports, I am asking the Minister to make a statement which will say that this statement is not going to be the policy of the government.

A MEMBER: Read the statement.

MR. SPIVAK: A fundamental aim of such a policy. . .

MR. GREEN: Mind you, I'm not going to declare your policy.

MR. SPIVAK: A fundamental aim of such a policy, Page 47 of the Kierans Report, a fundamental aim of such a policy shall be the repatriation by the Crown of all existing resources leased to the private sector and that a period not exceeding ten years be granted as sufficient to accomplish the transfer in an orderly fashion. Mr. Chairman, I'm waiting for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to stand up and say that this will not be our policy. I am waiting for the Premier to stand up publicly and say that this will not be our policy. I am waiting for . . .

A MEMBER: We don't set any policy. You're setting a policy. You're responsible for the policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: I am asking the government to basically state the proposal by Eric Kierans is not acceptable to them, and having said that then we can debate on other issues but until that is said and until that policy is declared, all you have done is skated around the issue, all you have done is used your great debating ability to try and stick handle through a situation because in effect basically this is the position of the New Democratic Party, this is the position of the caucus, and should you be elected in another election this is the program that will be undertaken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. Johns): Mr. Chairman, I think that ---I think that today has been a very interesting and useful, extremely useful, parliamentary day for

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Manitoba because we have had discussions on basic issues, and too often do we get hung up on trivia and spend hours on it without really getting down to basic discussions of philosophy. So I have found it most interesting to hear from both leaders of the opposition parties. The Leader of the Opposition, the Official Opposition, is trying to formulate a position where he is forecasting with predictions of dire threat the election which is about to come, and that's legitimate for him to do. For him however to take the position he has taken, I find somewhat peculiar and almost ludicrous. I remember sitting in one of the seats opposite in the years 1966, 67, 68, 69, and at times I was practically on my knees begging the government to just state -- or the Minister of Finance to just state in some general way what his philosophy was in regards to taxation. I remember stating the New Democratic Party's philosophy on taxation. I remember hearing the Member for Rhineland stating his philosophy on taxation. I could never ever get a statement of the philosophy of the Conservative Party -- I'm sorry, I should say Progressive Conservative Party, but I have difficulty remembering that word "progressive" especially when I look across the way and see how few amongst them are really progressive, although there are some. And that -- and the Member for Charleswood is one who makes it so difficult for me to use -- to remember the word "progressive" because he rejects it completely. So that I have that kind of difficulty. However the greater difficulty, the more important difficulty --(Interjection)-- Does the Member for Charleswood want to ask a question? Does the Member for Charleswood want to ask a question because I will give him the courtesy of listening to the question. Does the honourable member wish to ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): I would like to know -- ask the Member for St. Johns -- where is all his Ministers this afternoon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to respond and say to him that as . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. ORDER The Honourable for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the fact is we have two Ministers on this side who are anxious and able to minister to the needs of most of the members opposite at any time that they really need some assistance in that area. But the tradition throughout Legislative sessions is to know that when the Estimates are on this is the opportunity for Ministers who are not involved in those Estimates to attend to important business of government and never have I heard the question raised. I shouldn't say never. Hardly ever do I hear the question raised as to what they are doing because it is generally known that ministers have a great deal of work to do and do it. I wish the Member for Charleswood would talk to his leader and find out from his leader how important it was for him that when he was a member of the Treasury benches to be outside of this Chamber during regular sessions because he was attending to his business. And I can tell, I can tell the Member for Charleswood that very often one can see the Member, the then Minister of Industry and Commerce's chair vacant and I don't remember too much criticism of that because it was known that whether he was doing a good job or bad he was at least working at his job. So I'm sorry I've spent as much time as I did on the interjection by the Member for Charleswood. I should have learnt my lesson by now not to give him the opportunity to ask nonsensical questions.

I want to get back, I want to get back to this discussion about the Kierans Report and, Mr. Chairman, this is the arena where people should be discussing philosophy, they should be discussing policy in a dignified way so that one can form opinions. And I think that it is important that we start discussing programs and policies before they are formulated and nailed down completely because it is here we have the opportunity to exchange opinions. One should not rely on the media to be the vehicle through which, or the conduit, through which we can discuss matters that are basic and important for the people of Manitoba. This is the place we ought to be discussing that kind of philosophy; this is the place where we ought to be discussing the Kierans Report. --(Interjection)-- The Member for Roblin, I think that's where he's from, has a contribution to make. If it is in the form of a question I will give him the same courtesy that I gave the Member for Charleswood, I will hope that he will abuse it the way it was previously done. Do you have a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: No I just agreed with you.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh that's good. Well now I'm not sure that I said the right thing if the member for - I'll accept it however. I'm glad to have his support.

Last night for example, Mr. Chairman, in the waning hours of the evening, I started to discuss something to which I don't have an answer, and in which I have not formulated an opinion. But I thought that maybe I could stir up some discussion on the question of home ownership. And I got such a reaction on the other side that I found I was defending a question I was asking. Not having formulated an opinion I was already in a position where I was boxed into trying to defend a question rather than an answer. I hope to discuss that further but I want to indicate, I was really desirous last night, and I will continue to be desirous, of discussing principles, policies, such as I raised yesterday, the question of home ownership.

By the same token, I am most interested in hearing discussions on a decent level and, of course, bearing into account the fact that we all know that we're facing an election, where we can discuss the basic policies that are proposed by Professor Kierans. I had not seen the report until it was distributed; I have not yet read it; I do not yet know my reaction to it. I think that there are very basic and fundamental suggestions made by Professor Kierans. I think they ought to be discussed, and I don't think they can be discussed when people take sides that are firm to which they are already bound and therefore all you are doing is tossing invective back and forth. And I think -- and let me say this that this Minister of Mines and Resources I believe has had a longer continuous discussion with the mining industry, be it the employees group but more important the industry itself, than any previous Minister of Mines -- and there are two here, there are three in this House I believe who formerly occupied it.

But I had one occasion to attend one of his regular meetings with the owners of the mining industry and heard how they had obviously met so often before that they already understood each other to the extent that we sometimes do when you say one sentence you know what is behind it because you participated in discussions before. And I know that the mining industry must well know the developing thoughts of this government in connection with their industry - and I use the word developing advisedly because if we were firm about an opinion in 1939 and not changing it and not adapting it, then we would be in the form of a dogmatic approach that we so often find from the other side on issues of this, on issues of public ownership and responsibility for resources. I intend to deal if I have time with statements made by the Leader of the Liberal Party along those lines. I would hope that no position we have is so fixed that it cannot be discussed, and most important, debated in this Chamber at this level and hopefully with intelligent contribution on all sides.

The Leader of the Official Opposition talked about Unicity with which I had some contact. I can tell the honourable member, he must know, I don't recall one policy paper position which we hired to be done outside of government and which was filed with us; I don't believe we brought any forward I don't think we had any because it was a committee of Cabinet that was developing an approach -- it took a long time, took a year and a half -- with the help of outside consultants who were participating with us in the discussion, but no where do I recall that we commissioned anybody to do a paper, a policy approach which we then incorporated to the extent we agreed with it. And in the Kierans' Report that was a commissioned paper as I understand, and it came out as being the position of Professor Kierans which was requested and studied by him and brought forward by him. And I think that it was the right thing for the government of which I was not a member, I did not make a decision that it should be filed but I think it was right, that as soon as it was available should be filed so people in this Legislature, outside of this Legislature should start reading it, should start thinking about it. Because right or wrong you cannot reject the thoughts that a man of the stature and background of Professor Kierans has in this matter. And it should be studied and considered and not quickly rejected, accepted, not quickly dealt with.

The Leader of the Opposition suggests, and I guess he would have sat on the report, kept it secrets, studied it and not issued it until he was good and ready to make his statement. That is not participatory democracy as I understand it. Now he shakes his head, that's not what he would have done --(Interjection)-- What the honourable member said was that the government should have taken the report and not distributed it until it had a response to the report ready and available. That's the way I understood; if that's not what he said I'm ready for correction.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. SPIVAK: That's not what I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, only on that point. All I indicated was that once they were prepared to publish this report -- and I note that they have not necessarily published or filed in the House all the reports the Planning and Priorities have from outside consultants not only this one -- once they were prepared to do that they had to make a statement on this fundamental position that was expressed by Professor Kierans on Page 47.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then the honourable member does say that the report should not have been filed until there was a response made to one sentence in the report-- not the whole report; not the whole report but one sentence. Of course he thinks one particular sentence, every other member in this Legislature could pick another sentence and say why did you not give us a response to that one or the other sentence. I think it's ludicrous to accuse the government of making public a report which it has received and which it considers --(Interjection)-- pardon?

MR. GREEN: I made a response to that sentence.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, the honourable member - of course he did, of course he did. The Minister of Mines did respond to that sentence. But to call it sins of omission, to talk about increasing fears is exactly the opposite to having intelligent discussion on what has been filed and what is proposed. Because the fears that are being put in people's minds are really being put in by the opposition and are really being put in by the media that have a position - I don't mean the news gathering media, I mean the editorializing media which reacts instantaneously with responses. And there have been answers filed quickly by the leaders of the mining industry. But they know this government, and I say they know this government much better than they knew previous government because they've been meeting with this government. I don't know if I could count how many times I was party to discussions with the mining industry, I alone, and I have not been responsible in that area to the extent that the Minister of Mines has. So they know the continuing and ongoing position of this government in that area and they will not be suddenly so fearful that they'll run away and hide somewhere. There's no such chance. And they I assure you will carry on an intelligent discussion on the fundamental points raised in the Kierans' Report, because they know that they have a position to state which is their vested interest, which they will state as strongly as they can and their interest is not one which is to appeal to the masses of people to come forward and support them. It'll be one where they will try to protect their interests as against the interests of Manitobans or as against the interests of any government.

So I have to reject the concept of the Leader of the Opposition mainly because I want to support the idea that we carry on discussions here and not just postulate firm positions. It is in that kind of discussion that we can all learn and the people of Manitoba in the end benefit.

Now the Leader of the Liberal Party made a number of statements which I would like to deal with, and they were as the Leader of the Opposition said sort of tangential to the main argument, but I couldn't just sit by and hear him say that the government took over the auto insurance industry because it wanted to get hold of the premiums. If ever I heard a more nonsensical statement that was it. No I've heard many more and issued by the same person already in his short birth and life in political life. But those premiums are so clearly sequestered as being premiums that belong to the auto insurance people who are being protected by insurance.--(Interjection)-- The motoring public, no. I want to go further. It is also there to protect the public which is being hurt by motoring accidents and the premiums belong there. And certainly the premiums are used and will be used, I don't think there's any doubt about it, for the better carrying out of an efficient and the most economically possible operation of the auto insurance. And the reason for the takeover was so clearly developed and justified because of the actual mishandling by the industry of that kind of an operation. And that is of course my opinion. It is also the opinion of many people in the auto insurance industry. It is also of the greatest concern in other provinces in other jurisdictions on this continent. Do you know that Alberta came out with a report long before we did? Studying it, British Columbia - long before we did had tremendous studies on it, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Maryland, Ontario are all aware of the fact that the auto insurance industry was taken away from its original intent of providing a proper service and

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) became a vested interest which disregarded the people it was serving. And I would say to the Leader of the Liberal Party as and when other industries indicate that lack of concern for the people they serve, then governments should play a role. And I say that as being my opinion, I hope I can convince more and more people that that is a proper and responsible approach. And I think that that is justified.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition - I mean the Liberal Party said, "What are you going to do when you have to close a mine? What will you do, are you going to close it or are you going to keep it up in order to continue it for political purposes?" Mr. Chairman, I can only hope that there will be enough integrity of future governments that when something becomes impractical, it will be closed down, but closed down in such a way as to create the least damage. I heard our leader speak of the Member for Emerson as being one who accepts the concept that there are times when you do continue something that is not economically feasible for some period of time in order to accomplish other goals, other ends, and I never heard the Honourable Member for Emerson speak along those lines. But if he was speaking of Columbia Forest Products then that it is good example where the previous government or its agent deliberately and knowingly continued to pump money into an operation which was continually and knowingly continuing to show deficits. And apparently -- and again I haven't studied the documentation -- apparently when they started dealing with Mr. Rod McIsaac, apparently they promised him then that if he takes over they will feed more money, as it was required, in order to maintain that industry and without any risk to him. Well you know I can't say that I agree with that. I can't say I do but if that is the approach that the Leader of the Liberal Party . . .

A MEMBER: That's what the judge found.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes that's what the judge found and I assume that that is the way that they approached it. Well I know myself from the records that we were shown much later after we got into government how this industry was maintained for any length of time beyond its use. But you know I was in this Legislature when Bissett Gold Mines was closing down and I recall very well that the then Premier, who was also Provincial Treasurer, came with a proposal and said, I think that we ought to openly support Bissett or the San Antonio Gold Mines in the hope that they will keep operating for awhile to try and prove their viability. And he showed that if they were kept on for X number of months there would be an advance made of X number of dollars as compared with their closing down and a greater amount of dollars being paid out to that community in order for it to receive welfare which it would have to do. And we on our side, and I believe the Liberals too, I'm sure the Liberals too, supported this loan that was made to San Antonio Mines as being an effort to keep the mine open a little longer to see how it would operate. So there's an approach.

On the other hand you know what happened at Sherridon where I suppose there's still some remnants of a ghost town. That was closing down of a mine, these things happen. And a government should look ahead. I am rather pleased with the fact that we made a little effort in it -- was it two years ago when we increased the mining royalty tax? -- when we put aside one-half of the 15 percent, which I guess means one-thirtieth of our revenue, for a special fund just for the purpose of attempting to have some sort of base, economic base with which to assist people who are the sufferers of that kind of shut down based on depletion of natural resources of this province. I think that was a good step. I hope we won't need to touch that fund but the principle is there and that would be my answer to the Leader of the Liberal Party were he here to hear it.

But you know he went on to say, hydro is not proving that it is - oh I don't want to, I don't remember the words he used -- but he indicated Hydro, CNR, CBC are not the kinds of public utilities or public operations that really worry about the people of Manitoba. I think he said something along that line, I could be corrected about the exact interpretation. That's my interpretation of what he said.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe anybody on this side has criticized Hydro in connection with a whole concept of high level Southern Indian Lake of the diversion, I don't think that we criticized -- (Interjection)-- Oh apparently the Leader of the Liberal Party did but I don't think on this side we did. We accepted the fact that the Hydro Act provides and the intent of the people of Manitoba and the governments in years gone by was that Hydro

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) should produce maximum return of power for the minimum involvement with the greatest efficiency. And nobody has ever questioned that. It was when we got into the question of ecological damage that we asked Hydro to get to work with outside engineers and start studying the impact of ecological damage, and never before was that question raised, never before was Hydro instructed -- I believe that that's the correct statement -- take into account damage to the ecology. How can you blame them for not becoming involved in those areas which they were not charged to do. I think Hydro has proven the importance of a public utility and to condemn Hydro the way the Leader of the Liberal Party did today is not just a disservice to the people of Hydro - let me say that the people of Hydro who planned and worked on all the studies before are to my knowledge still the people of Hydro who are still working on this project. I believe Len Bateman the present Chairman was the Chief Engineer -- I think he was mainly responsible for the surveys of Hydro. So let the Leader of the Liberal Party make his statements all across the length and breadth of this province but at least I have the satisfaction of knowing that I for one was able on the same day to disagree violently with that statement.

The question of CNR I think is again an indication of the lack of knowledge of the history of the development of the CNR. I have to appeal to my friend the Member for St. Matthews -- the Member for St. Matthews to give an historical lecture on the background and development of the CNR which I know he can do capably and I'm sure it would be of benefit to the Leader of the Liberal Party.

The CBC: If ever -- well I don't know the extent to which the Diefenbaker Government made inroads on the public utility aspect of the CBC but surely the Liberal Government federally has done almost everything it could to damage the development of the CBC as a proper Crown operation just as it is now doing and has been doing for some time with Air Canada. Everything possible to put problems in the way -- obstacles in the way is what the Liberal Government is doing today.

But you know it's interesting that he says that of course we have to protect our interests but we should still make use of the private industry to develop mines, and I want to close on that. You know it's what we do as people of Manitoba that makes possible the development and exploration of mines by the private industry and he should know. Leaf Rapids today would not be there and there would not be a mine there -- I am reliably informed -- had it not been for the fact that the previous government -- I think it was the previous government that built or at least planned a highway. -- (Interjection) -- Well the Minister of Mines and I guess the former Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: It was stepped up because - exploration was stepped up because . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh yes I do remember that now, that because of the whole development of the Churchill River diversion it was found advisable and necessary to proceed with the building of a highway, in a certain place. And when that decision was made and when it became apparent to the company which had the exploration rights there that now they would have access to that area that they intensified their search and went back and made further exploration for a mine and found the mine or the mine site at Leaf Rapids and Ruttan Lake. It was the work of the representatives of the people of Manitoba that in effect made possible the finding and the development of that mine. And I think that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party and all other members who agree with him should bear in mind that if because government does something which makes something else feasible then government ought to have a first chance to make sure that the benefits of what it does come back to the people in Manitoba, and that's such an obvious, I figure such an obvious truism that it really shouldn't have to be developed. And I wish it were possible to get people on that side and people on this side to be able to discuss again the philosophy of what we are about here, not get hung up on public enterprise, private enterprise, but approach the fact and the knowledge that except for some of the old entrenched antiquated, fossilized thinking, thinking on the other side of a few members, aside from that most of them should be able to approach a problem and look at it anew with all that we have learnt in the past of how governments and people have developed their progress to the extent where it is no longer a dirty word to say "public ownership", because was it 1911 when the Telephone System was taken over? I don't remember the year but it was a long time ago -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Taken over from private industry. The Government of Manitoba, and I don't remember which Premier it was, they took over the telephones. I think it was the former -- the preceding Roblin who was -- Rodmond Roblin,

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) right? He took over telephones. Oh terrible, terrible. But if only we would stop thinking in terms of these scare tactics and start thinking about what is practical and reasonable then we would be able to plan for Manitoba's future.

So may I conclude by urging members opposite to read the Kierans Report with an open mind and then to disagree with it if indeed they do, seriously disagree with it, and then come here not with abuse and not with attack but with an obligation -- a recognition of the obligation to discuss with people on this side whether or not what Kierans says is acceptable or to be rejected or the parts which are acceptable. That way you will really be performing the function of an opposition party which will then have an opportunity to influence the thinking on this side of the House in order to arrive at good opinions, proper opinions, proper policies for the benefit of Manitobans. Then you could do it. But as long as you scream and yell at us the danger is that we too will start thinking that it must be right if you're yelling that hard. So stop yelling, start reading, start discussing and let's try and do a little better for the people of Manitoba in the future.

. continued on next page

MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to be very briefly because, Mr. Chairman, for those of us that have been in this Chamber for a little while we recognize that when the Honourable the Member for St. Johns, the former Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources team up that we're about to get snowed on this side. When that gifted duo moves in then we know that there is serious concern on that side and I don't want to destroy the atmosphere that has just been established by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, in fact I want to remind him, and I'm glad that he after giving us one of the finest performances of a diversionary tactic in this House he got up initially to chastise us in a gentle way, in a smooth way that he is so capable of doing about not being dogmatic in our approach to this document here and indeed welcoming, welcoming the -- that's better than I can speak to both of you -- indeed welcoming the opportunity that this Friday afternoon has given this Chamber to discuss the more deeper and more serious philosophy behind this document. And, Mr. Speaker, what he was of course doing and what both these honourable gentlemen have been doing is very cautiously but very professionally avoiding replying to the very legitimate questions just put by the Leader of the Opposition. Because, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the honourable member -- is the Honourable Member for St. Johns really seriously believing that by his dulcet tones he was lulling us to sleep and to not even remembering debate, discussion that took place in this Chamber just an hour or two before? When for instance, when for instance I suggested and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources seemed to accede that certain aspects of this report are already government policy and are already being carried out. Now, however the Member for St. Johns is suggesting to us that this is the time before any firm decisions are made, before any action is taken that let's philosophize about the basic principles involved in this report. This is how we should be fulfilling our function in this Chamber, leaving . . . (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member asked whether I seriously felt that it could be discussed and I think yes it could be discussed because although there are certain principles apparently in that report which we've already established policy on and we can even debate those policies but there must be a great deal there on which there is no firm opinion. Nevertheless it should be discussed. And let me conclude by pointing out to the honourable member that I found it a very fulfilling task to be in opposition because every so often I was able to convince the government that they were going on the wrong way and helped direct them in the right way. I really believe that whether it's true or not.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's interjection is very welcome because there is no question that as this government either openly, slowly or more quickly moves in certain directions we will be attempting to make those suggestions meaningful, to make those positions known to them where we think matters can be alleviated. But that wasn't the purpose of the honourable member rising this afternoon.

The honourable member seemed to suggest to us this afternoon in very clear, very sophisticated tones that what we had before us was a document that deserved, you know, serious consideration, that he hoped that that consideration could be given prior to enactment, that we would not be facing faits accomplis, we would not be shouting dogmatic positions this side to that side. Mr. Speaker, he then went on to, you know as he was speaking it couldn't help but go through people's mind the situations that have already been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose it was in the same way that he was attempting to mollify the public opinion with respect to the auto insurance debate of a few years ago when we established the Pawley Commission, when the Premier who spoke to assembled, a mass assembly of agents and indicated to them that he was not bent on a particular point of view or hung up on a particular approach with respect to correcting the situations that needed to be corrected in auto insurance.

Mr. Chairman, I don't even like to remind members in this Chamber about the incompatibility of members of government taking a position and then appearing to do something that would give the appearance of inviting everybody to participate and to put an input into the decision-making when the decision is already made. I need hardly remind members of this House that that was the dilemma that I faced with respect to the hearings of South Indian Lake. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that was precisely what was the sham and the crassness

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ENNS cont'd) of the Pawley Commission with respect to auto insurance. The decision was made, and I can recall, Mr. Chairman, I can recall making a speech in this Chamber where I said I have never quarreled with the government's intention and carrying out of, bringing about government auto insurance. It was clearly stated in all their campaign literature, it has always been a platform of the New Democratic Party as long as I can remember actively engaged in politics and so nobody in Manitoba should have been surprised when auto insurance became a fact.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

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

MR. GREEN: Did not the terms of reference of the Pawley Commission itself state that the purpose of the commission was how to implement public automobile insurance and not whether or not we would have it? That it was never ever suggested that the commission was going to have a -- to determine whether or not such a program should go ahead but whether it should be implemented -- but how it should be implemented, not whether it should be implemented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, I suppose technically the Honourable Minister is probably correct. I can't recall offhand the actual terms of the setting up of that commission. However, however just as I was perfectly clear, just as it was perfectly clear in my mind what the original hearings of South Indian Lake were for and just as the people of South Indian Lake had it permanently very assuredly fixed in their minds what the original hearings of South Indian Lake were for, matters of compensation, I suggest to you that within, particularly within the people involved, within the agents, within the industry and particularly in view of the kind of statements the First Minister himself made on several occasions, four months, five months, six months prior to any firm decision on the part of the government, that the door was left open as to how auto insurance would be in fact introduced into the Province of Manitoba, to what extent participation the individual agents would have, to what extent their livelihoods would or would not be affected, etc. etc. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that that is not a proper approach for a government to take because it tends to leave people extremely distrustful of government action. It tends to make people more cynical of government action, and I would suggest to you that that was precisely the outcome of that particular commission no matter what its original terms of reference were.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Johns has studiously avoided even in replying -- not necessarily replying directly to my leader's speech this afternoon -- but has studiously avoided, as has the Minister of Mines, to discuss, to discuss the report with respect to the government's reaction to that report. Mr. Speaker or Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the reasons for that have been stated in this Chamber just a few moments ago by my leader, that the members opposite know full well the course that they are travelling on. They also want for their political purposes to create the very kind of conditions that the Member for St. Johns accuses us of doing by speaking about it here in this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I just found it noteworthy that it was felt necessary to -- I think this is one of the first times that the Minister of Finance has been lured into the debate, we will hope that it will not be the last time. But the -- (Interjection) -- pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Well the ex-minister, the former Minister of Finance for the first time in this session has been lured into the debate and -- (Interjection) -- Oh I see. Well unfortunately I missed it. I too try to hear most of the debates in the House. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact cannot be disguised no matter how skillfully it is done, that the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition and the importance of the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition -- and there was no dogma attached to the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition, no hysterical screaming coming from this side with respect to this document. Mr. Chairman, the publication of this document, the implications of this document, half accepted as policy or not accepted as policy or whatever, that responsibility lies on the government, the government has to make its position known and it should so in very short order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I generally come on the scene about 4:30 on Friday afternoon, historically I don't think anybody in this Legislature has made more speeches at 4:30 or quarter after 5:00 than McKenzie from Roblin.

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to my feet today and welcome the thrust and the challenge that was offered by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the fact that we are elected people in this Legislature to stand up and defend the policies of the people that we represent and to espouse in this Legislature regarding government programs or programs that are anti-government could at least stand up on our own two feet and espouse the philosophy that we believe in. And I will recall, Mr. Chairman, the earlier days of my sitting across there in 1966 when this great man, Mr. D. L. Campbell, in my very few remarks of that day he came across afterwards and he said, you know, "McKenzie you'll learn in this House that those members that can stand up on their own two feet and espouse in this place and debate without the benefit of a prepared speech are the people that understand what this Legislature is all about."

I become very confused and very depressed at times with this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, for the number of members today who haven't got the guts or what it is to stand up as the Honourable Member for St. Johns did this afternoon and fight and battle a policy on their own two feet. I agree there are days the members of the Treasury bench have the right and the privilege to stand up and read policy into the records from a prepared statement. But other than those occasions, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are letting the people of this province, we're leading them down the garden path with the type of membership that we have in this Legislature where people are not prepared to stand up in this Legislature and debate and fight policy such as we are prepared to do today on this Kierans' Report. Now I happen to be one of those that I'll meet any challenge any time on behalf of the people of Roblin constituency, and try with my many limitations and with my limited knowledge to debate all issues that

come before this Legislature. I welcome the remarks of the Honourable from St. Johns who I have respected and everybody in my constituency has respected from the day I arrived in this Legislature. A great debater, a very capable man and one that can stand on his own two feet and meet the challenge.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us go back to the Kierans' Report, and again I get led down the garden path by the wisdom of this government. Why in all your wisdom, after listening to the speech from the Honourable Member from St. Johns do we have to have a task force, do we have to have another board, do we have to have another commission? Has this government not got the convictions or the courage to stand up and espouse exactly what my leader said today and scours the people of this province with more boards, more commissions. My gosh, Mr. Chairman, from day one that we've sat in opposition we've screamed and cried about the numbers of boards and commissions and task forces that this government has appointed. And here we have another one.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . permit a question? Would you permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: When I'm finished, Mr. -- I only have about two minutes. I've only just got on, Mr. Chairman, if you'll permit me. -- (Interjection) -- I don't care, I'm reading a report from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I have the Kierans' Report. I like to hold something in my hand that's paper to show that I'm not reading my speech, Mr. Chairman, if they'll permit me the pleasure.

But Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Honourable Member for St. Johns and I listened very carefully to everything that he said and he very severely criticized us over here for the fact that we are not prepared to meet the challenge of this Kierans' Report. I say we are. My leader made a speech this afternoon on our position on the Kierans' Report. Our Deputy Leader already espoused his philosophy. Now my concern becomes why a task force? Have we not, the 57 members of the Legislature not got the courage of our convictions to take that document in our hands, study it and stand up and meet it in the challenge of this Chamber without another task force, another board, another commission.

Mr. Speaker, we got task forces, boards and commissions in this government like they're coming out of our ears, and they're costing the taxpayers of this province thousands and thousands of dollars. And I as a member for Roblin constituency, Mr. Chairman, I don't buy it and I'm sure the people of my constituency don't buy it. -- (Interjection) -- I have already spoken in the reply to the Speech from the Throne on my few comments but in all sincerity if the government is prepared, the Minister is prepared to answer some of the questions that my leader has asked here this afternoon then we will get the continuing debate on this very important matter which is coming before us in this the election year of Manitoba.

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) But unfortunately Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns didn't answer any of those questions. At least if he did I didn't hear him answer the questions that my leader raised because that would have given me an in for a better speech than I'm making right now, Mr. Chairman; it may not be that good but how can I reply when the members opposite don't reply to the questions that we raise in debate? So what do they do? Another board, another commission.

A MEMBER: Another diversion.

MR. McKENZIE: Yeah another diversion. They get hung up, they can just go so far and when the going gets tough appoint another board, appoint another commission, appoint another task force. Mr. Speaker, I as the Member for Roblin constituency would like that kind of information that my leader asked here this afternoon and if the government can't give it to us how can we continue the debate on this very very important document that is before us now. I welcome and I like the thrust of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in this particular aspect of the Estimates. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, there is another member of the Legislature who has more aspects of -- my constituency is more related to his department than I think any other member of the Legislature, except for the one aspect: I haven't got anything to do as his ex air marshall of the Air Force, I haven't got any of the aeroplanes in Roblin constituency.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I note that the honourable member is coming into a new field so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 4:30 pursuant to our House Rule 19 subsection (2) last hour of every day is Private Members' Hour. Someone move committee rise and report. Committee rise call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Last hour of this day being Private Members' resolutions - The Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye,

WHEREAS present national policies encourage development in eastern Canada at the expense of development in western Canada and militate in most key areas against the realization of the potential of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS there is an urgent need for major change in these national policies that influence the growth and economic development of Manitoba;

WHEREAS the Federal Government has announced its intention to convene a conference between the Prime Minister and the premiers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia to discuss new policies aimed at promoting western economic opportunity;

WHEREAS it is essential that Manitoba speak with a strong and united voice at this conference;

AND WHEREAS it is also essential that this issue be dealt with on a non-partisan basis;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a special all-party committee of the Legislature to include the leaders of all political parties to formulate the Manitoba position that will be presented to the conference on western economic opportunities.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution speaks for itself. There is a conference coming, an unprecedented conference between the Prime Minister and four western premiers, to take into account, recognize and hopefully solve something that has been

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . smoldering for a long time, something that has been referred to as western alienation, western discontent, but in specific terms, economic opportunities. Mr. Speaker, it comes at a very opportune time in the history of this country and in the history of this particular issue, which is not new, which has been with us for at least 50 years, which has been at the root of many disruptions in our communal life right back to the days of Riel. And not only is it opportune but it's at a time when there is a new mood within the political sphere of this country and within the country itself, the public. The news media throughout this country are reporting in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, St. Johns, all over, analysis, comment, editorial, feature views on what is the west after, what does the west really want, is the question that's put. And for the first time since I've been associated with this issue which is approximately ten years, there is a willingness to accommodate.

Mr. Speaker, I've travelled over all of this country almost in the last two years since entering public life and spoken in organizations Canadian clubs, service clubs, to politicians throughout the country and I sense personally, and I think it's backed up by editorial viewpoints across the country, that a moment has come when the country is willing to listen very intently to what the west is saying and to redress the grievances that we -- regardless of what political party we support, we all share, we all know, whether we express them the same way or not. Western anger, frustration, discontent, alienation has manifested itself over the past year or so, of two years, three years maybe, in so many ways. You now have a current anger in this province that we are served with only one airline to the United States, our transportation to the United States is a monopoly by an American firm. We wonder why we haven't got a second and during the strike of the American airline, there was strong feelings expressed on this point.

There are people not only in Winnipeg, not only in Manitoba, but in the west generally who are arguing that the Crown Broadcasting Corporation, CBC, has failed in its duty to unify this country but has rather become a divisive force. There are people who claim that the banking system and claim rather loudly, many on the opposite side of this House on government benches, that the banking system has failed to take account of western needs for capital development risk. There are those who say that the political voice of the west has, in Canada, is not commensurate with its importance, not commensurate with true federalism. This comes at a time when not only those of us who have cried out against the present political structure but are faced with the prospect of seeing the west, Manitoba and Saskatchewan at least on the prairies lose political voice in Ottawa.

We complain through our studies, our resources examinations, our TED commissions that secondary industry is not permitted to establish here because of the economic strictures in which we live. We have an industrial potential in the west in Manitoba which we all know is there, the challenge is exciting, it's attainable and yet we face barriers to those developments, barriers which are not of our making. We see the lashing out of the Premier of Alberta in his oil policy, in his insistence that he be given a better deal for his people. We've seen grain thrown in the Prime Minister's face by angry farmers. We've seen people complain as consumers that there is a two-price Canada but that two-price is a one-way street, that it's the western farmer selling, the western oil producer, the western potash producer selling his goods in world markets subject to all the vicissitudes and vagaries of world market, but buying everything he requires behind tariff walls that were designed to protect less efficient eastern industry. We hear the brain-drain from all of the west, and I don't blame the NDP because it's been going on forever, because we failed to create job opportunities. Not because we're not industrious, not because we don't have the economic potential because we do have those things; but because we are hemmed in.

We hear successive governments in this province and in the west complaining that we don't have the revenue capacity to do many of the socially required things that governments should be doing. And we know that we don't have the revenue base because of the economic structure of the country. And we know that for every percentage point in income tax that the Minister of Finance of this Province were to raise, he would raise approximately \$1.80 or so roughly from every Manitoba citizen, but when our sister province Ontario makes the same tax raise it raises three dollars and forty-some cents per capita, because we don't have the taxable base.

We know that there are people who are demanding free trade zones in order to allow

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ASPER cont'd) the industrial plant of Manitoba to be able to reach out to the five million consumers who live within a few hundred miles of here in the United States and to whom, sale of goods is available if there were a better tariff, if there were a better freight policy. The question, Mr. Speaker, knowing these things and hearing these things is where is it going and where is it going to lead us. Because the consequences for any nation are not good if there is a union in which we expect the union to survive with disparity, where one group has advantages that another group does not have. And so for the good of this country, and we speak, in spite of the invective and the taunts we speak as confirmed federalists. We speak as people who love our country and who insist that it be kept together but know that there are strains against the union because of the discontent, not expressed in this Chamber but expressed throughout western Canada. It's well known, can be documented that groups exist who are studying the questions of where are we going as a region with all the implications that that may have. We know that there are differences in approach within this Chamber to this very problem. We don't have any trouble isolating what our problems are but we do have a problem amongst us in agreeing what those solutions must be. And there are political opportunists in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. There are people, there are people who are divisive and who use the demagogic approach to this problem and that does not aid us in finding a solution. They use an approach which would divide us on one of the most important issues facing us. They like to scream epithets at anyone who has a position different from theirs. Epithets like separatism; epithets like near treason. Or describe the taking of a strong position for the people of our region, for the people of our province as something that is offensive in some way. This is the very reason, Mr. Speaker, why this approach should be derived through an all-party committee of this Legislature. Everything else goes to an all-party committee of this Legislature, the Law Amendments Committee, the Public Utilities Committee, the Economic, but this issue doesn't go because there is nothing on the table before the Legislature to refer to committee.

It is not treason or near treason or knocking on the door of treason or ringing the door-bell of treason to insist that our children have the same equality of opportunity with all other Canadians -- and we have said repeatedly we seek nothing, nothing for the people of Manitoba that we don't also seek for all others in Canada. We don't claim special status, we claim equal status. We don't think it's treason to insist that the annual brain drain that plagues our province and exports our people and money should stop, because opportunity should be here, because it is here. And we don't think it's treason to inquire why our farmers have to buy everything they use for production in protected markets and sell everything they produce in world markets, subject to the vagaries I spoke of earlier. Nor do we think it's treason to insist that if Canada operates by population then the immigration and economic development policies of this country must be directed so as to deflect population to the under-populated regions so that there will be a meaningful representation by population.

Mr. Speaker, it can be argued that on the contrary it is not treason or near treason or any other of the epithets that seem to delight the government bench, it is rather an act of responsibility and an act of irresponsibility to ignore these issues. And it is perhaps even characterized as an act of fear not to seize this issue, not to seize the opportunity of the moment and to translate it to the rest of this country in very meaningful terms. -- (Interjection) -- Well the Honourable Minister of Mines says it is cowardly. That's his word. Let him live with it. We repeat for the Liberal Party that the position we take is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the honourable member has put on the record a suggestion that I said that we were acting cowardly may I, for the record, indicate that I was making fun of the honourable member's reference to us as "cowards".

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

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that this was the comedy hour but my honourable friend makes it such.

A MEMBER: You're surely acting the part.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the position that we take, so that there will be no doubt on the other side of this House, is a federalist position, but true federalism not colonial federalism, not imperial federalism, but true federalism, because that is what

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ASPER cont'd) Canada must become. And it is blindness on the part of anyone opposite not to recognize what is happening in this country.

The Minister of Finance for Ontario only a few weeks ago used the same expression that provoked the First Minister into his obviously political assault on our position. He said that the actions of Ontario strained the bonds of Confederation. He was acting no differently than Premier Ernest Manning a few years earlier when he insisted that Canada start buying in eastern Canada, start buying its oil from Alberta instead of importing it from Venezuela, keeping Albertans out of work. No different than the words of the former Premier Bennett of British Columbia when he -- (Interjection) -- my honourable friend the Minister of Mines says Premier Bennett was a separatist. Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of comment from the government bench that makes it necessary that the parties -- that either the government is incapable of treating an issue as transcending politics, obviously it is party politics and here you have an issue that does transcend politics because it doesn't make any difference whether the very few months this government has left to be in office is replaced by itself or anyone else, the straitjacked I spoke of a few days ago will remain unless this issue is solved. And it can best be solved by sending to that conference a Premier who can speak for this province, not for the New Democratic Party or for the Liberal Party or the Progressive Conservative Party or the Social Credit Party, but for all people, and no man who has no mandate on the issue, who was not popularly elected or who is in no way accredited by the public of this province on this issue should presume to say to the Government of Canada and to the other side of this western issue, the four provinces, that he, he has the solution for Manitoba.

All we ask for is the most simple democratic process be observed, and that is to call into assembly and take out of the political partisanship this issue; call into assembly a committee, the leaders of the parties, representatives of both parties -- all three parties rather -- and then send our Premier to that conference armed with the fact that he can say as has never been able to be said before that this is the Manitoba view. Because our opponents to equality of opportunity in the west, those opponents who live in other regions of this country have historically divided us, have historically defeated us by saying, that's your view but the people of your province don't feel the same way. They've said it to successive premiers. We call, we call for an all-party committee . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable gentlemen permit a question?

MR. ASPER: I'll be through in three or four minutes. We call for an all-party committee that gives us that one voice. I appeal to members opposite, I genuinely appeal because I tell you having travelled as I say for several years through this country, having felt keenly about this issue, that I urgently sense that the moment has come when we can make real progress. And in dealing with the Province of Ontario or Quebec as we will have to in order to resolve some of our outstanding grievances nothing can be more powerful for our negotiating team than to be able to say, this transcends politics. This is above party lines. I do have a mandate from all of the representatives of Manitoba. And I don't say that it has to be the Leader of the Liberal Party, I'm quite content to have the First Minister of this province represent us at that conference. I only appeal to the members opposite to take in good faith that we want to arm him and send him to the conference fully capable of having the unique position for the first time since this kind of debate's been going on, and we would ask him to start by filing a White Paper, a statement of what he seeks to accomplish at that conference; then to the committee for debate, then he goes with the views of all of us. What could be more democratic and what could be more effective in achieving Manitoba's redress? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines wish to ask a question?

MR. GREEN: I believe the honourable member has one minute more and therefore -- two more. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Two minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member explain why the traditional line-up at federal-provincial conferences has been Ontario with Alberta and British Columbia up to very recently and the western provinces with the maritimes and Quebec having a completely unique position? Would he try to tell me how from that the Province of Alberta and Ontario -- that the Manitoba interests are related more closely to Alberta's interests than they are to the interests of the maritimes?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is too broad for a simple answer. On various issues in Canadian constitutional conferences and interprovincial conferences there have been various alliances, but the alliance I speak of is an alliance that western Canadian provinces have already tacitly agreed to make.

MR. GREEN: Alberta is coalescing with Ontario. Do you want us to coalesce with Alberta and Ontario?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we can't debate it. My answer is that on certain issues such as social welfare and control by the provinces of certain constitutional authority there will be different line-ups; but on the issues that I spoke of, the banking law, the DREE law, the immigration law, the transportation law, the immigration policy, the political restructuring of the Parliament of Canada, on those issues I would be profoundly surprised to find any great disagreement amongst the western provinces. But should that disagreement exist it in no way deters me from saying that this is the policy that Manitoba should pursue. I didn't ask for an all-province meeting, I simply ask and continue to ask that this province speak with one voice at that conference. And if -- as my honourable friend says it will speak with one voice, it will be the voice of a government which has no mandate on the issue, is a few months at best from election and has a minority of popular support. And we can fortify that position by passing this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Possibly this Legislature, this Chamber would permit a question of the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: And it's simply that I would like to understand from him what contribution he could make in the kind of committee he visualizes, possibly behind closed doors, that he couldn't possibly make in this very Chamber in discussing what the position of Manitoba should be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is very appropriate. There would be no difference if we were permitted a debate on this issue -- on the issue, on government time, not an hour to discuss something that is of crucial importance to this province but -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, my answer is this: a year ago a question was asked in this Legislature -- sorry, two sessions ago -- before the 1971 Victoria Conference where this government represented allegedly the best interests of the people of Manitoba and the question was put in this House, will you -- to the First Minister -- table a position paper that we can debate so that you go to Victoria knowing the views of all of us? The Premier gave one of the typical answers that have emanated from that side of the House. I still don't understand his answer and nor did anyone else, but no position paper was tabled and no debate took place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have an undertaking from the Member from St. Johns or from the government that they will table a position paper, not using up the 90 hours of Estimate time -- (Interjection) -- What on the Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in speaking today is to offer my views on the question of western Canada and this appears to be an appropriate occasion. I intend to confine myself very carefully to my notes today. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Liberal Party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: The Leader of the Liberal Party talked about anger when he talked about Canada. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have difficulty controlling my anger in describing the way I feel about the way this issue has been treated so far in this Assembly and in this province. Because, Mr. Speaker, no matter how much we desire the achievement of political office I am not prepared to demean myself or my party by fighting this issue on the level that we've witnessed in the last week or so. I think it's about time that we started to separate fact from fiction in this potentially controversial matter.

The Leader of the Liberal Party said that he is a confirmed federalist but on occasion

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) he's talked about the sabres rattling. He's talked about the possibility of being a kamikaze for the west and I believe for Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, he has inflamed this issue and is now on a publicity campaign of talking about a new deal for the west and at the same time in this Chamber asking that we all be non-partisan about the way we approach this conference. He suggests, Mr. Speaker, that in this resolution that what we are talking about is national policies. But, Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion he has talked about a reconstruction of Confederation and of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is a problem throughout this country. Would anyone suggest that an unemployed person living in Ontario, in Quebec or in the Atlantic provinces feels any less anguish because he happens to live outside of western Canada? On the other hand would anyone honestly suggest that an unemployed person in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia has no job simply because he happens to live west of the Ontario-Manitoba border? Anyone who suggests that such is the case is trying to take the voters for a ride. This party led by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Wolseley, the Federal Party recently used the slogan in the federal election that The Land is Strong. And I would say to him that the ranks of the unemployed across this land are strong and growing stronger by the month and perhaps that is reason enough for him and some of his tea drinking friends in Ottawa to try to focus their attention on other things.

Urban difficulties have nationwide significance. Problems associated with rising property taxes, urban core area renewal, transportation are real and pressing in Montreal and Toronto as they are in Winnipeg or in Vancouver. To a lesser degree they are just as urgent in Brandon, or Thompson as they are in Kingston or Trois Riviere. And let no one be deluded that these problems are exclusively western Canadian or that they can be caused or remedied by constitutional adjustments.

Pollution and resource depletion are countrywide problems. They may actually be less severe in the west because our population is less concentrated and because our renewable resources such as agriculture and water power are so extensive. National problems, Mr. Speaker, are a fact of life. To imply that one section of the country is discriminated against because it shares problems common to the entire nation is to conceal the real causes and solutions of our problems. To further imply that constitutional manipulation is the cure-all for our ills is to compound the error and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is nothing but deception. At the same time members of this Assembly must take note of the particular disadvantages which burden Manitoba relative to other provinces. Many of these disadvantages are natural: the absence of certain mineral resources or the climatic barriers to certain types of agriculture. Other disadvantages are political: The relative levels of transportation costs, the slower rates of industrial growth, the disparities in Federal Government spending. And these disadvantages are political, Mr. Speaker, they are not constitutional. I want to emphasize that point. The disadvantages I'm talking about are political disadvantages, not constitutional disadvantages. If Manitoba suffers high transportation costs and slow industrial growth the blame must be placed on the policy decisions of successive federal and provincial governments. And, Mr. Speaker, the blame cannot be attached to the British North America Act. A Constitution, Mr. Speaker, provides the framework for political action, it does not guarantee the results of that action.

Our goal in this Assembly should be to improve the quality of life in Manitoba by raising every measurable standard of economic or social achievement to or beyond the national average. We can go about this in two ways: One is to improve Provincial Government performance precisely in those areas where Federal Government performance has been most deficient. Take, for example, the question of economic development. We've argued and the members opposite will disagree again, but for several years that the New Democratic Party tax and development policies have failed to provide the quantity and quality of economic growth that this province requires. The reluctance of the Federal Government to do more to remedy regional imbalance is only one of the many contributing factors to slow growth. The Provincial Government must convince us that it is doing its level best before it can expect us to place the blame for failure on the Federal Government.

The second heat of progress for Manitoba is good government in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, we do not have such a government, nor have we had it during the last decade of the Liberal rule. (Hear, Hear)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a Federal Government with a clear commitment to a Diefenbaker style regional policy is required. Only then will this country experience the nationwide redistribution of economic opportunity which is essential to the preservation of our national unity. Reforms in tax policy, revenue transfer policy, development incentive policy and government decentralization are essential components of the regional policy that I am talking about this afternoon. Federal Government obstruction is a great barrier to Manitoba's growth and as a former Minister of the Crown, I can readily sympathize with the Ministers opposite who are thrown into conflict, frequent conflict with Ottawa.

Dealing with Ottawa or dealings with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, are difficult on bread and butter issues like tax reform, transportation policy, revenue sharing, program administration and so on. And I've encountered similar problems in my time. Mr. Speaker, unlike the Liberal Leader, I know what the problems of western Canada are in dealing with Ottawa. And unlike the Liberal Leader I know what it is to try and negotiate on behalf of Manitoba as the members opposite who are on the front bench know as well. Mr. Speaker, I remember the controversy of the Air Canada Overhaul Base and I do not have the time to recite that problem which was a problem of regional development. And the answer of the Prime Minister that he could not be concerned with something that did not affect at that time his cultural or social or political philosophy, this was an economic matter which was to be determined by a ...

Mr. Speaker, you have to really work hard to get your point across to the present Federal Liberal Government, and I don't believe that the Provincial Government, and I say this to you, has done a good enough job in that respect but the fault is only partly theirs. Negotiating with Ottawa bureaucracy and hierarchy dedicated to centralization and totally lacking sympathy for regional aspirations is a tough proposition. Fifteen years ago things were considerably different. John Diefenbaker's election triumph announced to all Canadians that this country was no longer a series of colonies dominated by the commercial empire of the St. Lawrence. For John Diefenbaker, Canada was composed of a number of different but vitally alive regions, each with its own need which could best be realized within a revitalized conception of Confederation based on actual economic and social realities.

Mr. Speaker, John Diefenbaker's northern vision attempted to inspire in Canadians the same confidence in their destiny as had the national policy during the western expansion. He never deviated from his conviction that national policy must be an amalgam of regional needs and interests. Although his one-Canada appeal conveyed different meanings to different people, to him it meant that regional policy at least had to become an integral part of national policy, not an after thought, or the object of pork-barrel politics.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that John Diefenbaker's approach was political not constitutional, political in the best sense of the word. I'm sure members of the present Cabinet understand that distinction and I only wish the member the Leader of the Liberal Party understood that. -- (Interjection) -- I'll answer questions afterwards, Mr. Speaker. Those who have had the experience of dealing with Ottawa know that their adversary is not the Canadian Constitution but the Liberal political establishment which has controlled and dominated Canada for most of this century.

Mr. Speaker, since the problems I have discussed are political, I believe that the solutions are also political. We need a determined Provincial Government with a coherent economic strategy and we need a sympathetic Federal Government with a generous regional policy. Neither the Liberals nor the New Democratic Party offer those qualities at either the provincial or the federal base level.

A MEMBER: Up to now we were friends.

A MEMBER: Carry on Sid.

MR. SPIVAK: In striving to improve Dominion-Provincial relations we must avoid artificial political squabbles. The Member for St. Mathews, who unfortunately is not in his seat now, who is usually rather doctrinaire displayed a remarkable degree of common sense when he pointed out the absurdity of attempting to measure political influence on a percentage scale. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Leader has attempted to make the mathematics of representation into a constitutional crisis. He has succeeded only in writing political melodrama for personal gain. I also regret that the Premier has chosen to respond hysterically to those allegations with the result of enlarging and inflaming unnecessarily at the

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) expense of more urgent priorities, the issues that face us.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude in the few moments that are allowed to me that the quality of representation is considerably more important than the quantity. In my opinion, John Diefenbaker was worth more than any ten Liberals or New Democratic Party members of parliament, and when on February 27th the Member for Wolseley said, and I want to quote: "It's very clear that our analysis, the root causes of our economic and social problems here in Manitoba can be traced to the constitutional structure of Canada", Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Leader is dead wrong. He offered us an over-simplification that amounts to a distortion and he has provided an escape clause for the Liberal and New Democratic parties who have not done their duties for this province and who seek an excuse for their failure.

Mr. Speaker, one Canada, one Canada, remains my constitutional policy. Uniform democratic representation for all Canadians is its cornerstone. We shall discriminate against no one on the basis of the region he lives in or the ethnic group to which he belongs. To suggest that representational formulas can be called into question or shuffled at the whim of ambitious politicians is to further add a note of discord to the national scene.

The Leader of the Liberal Party, as I have indicated and I think all of us are aware, in addition to stop, look and listen, has been advertising a new deal for the west. If you look beneath the surface, Mr. Speaker, I believe that you will find that all he wants is a new deal for the western wing of the Liberal Party. -- (Hear, Hear.) -- I can assure you that if the Federal Liberals had swept the west in the last Federal election we would be hearing a much different tune from him in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of western Canada touches a nerve in all the people of western Canada and in Manitoba. Those who attempt to touch that nerve must recognize the consequences of touching that nerve and must realize at the time that the objectives must be clear in terms of what they want for Canada. I suggest that the presentation by the Liberal Leader today, the reference to the old Tory committee to be set up and the answers that were given to that, indicate that the Liberal Leader is prepared and has been prepared to touch that nerve with only one result to occur for him, an ability to make this into an issue to win the next election. He has no answers, he has no answers except to use the glib language that he's capable of expressing and articulating in the hope that by touching that nerve it will cause a result for him. But, Mr. Speaker, like a surgeon who when he touches that nerve does not know the consequences, he is playing with our future and has gone to an extreme and has made suggestions that are so ludicrous and so outlandish that they must rile anyone who is concerned about Canada. And when we talk, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- and when we talk about one Canada, we talk about one Canada as one Canada. We do not talk in the terms that the Liberal Leader has suggested. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he's prepared to discuss the political issues, if he's prepared to discuss transportation issues, if he's prepared to discuss freight rate issues, let him come forward and talk.

You know the Prime Minister suggested in the Speech from the Throne that the leaders of the railways are going to meet with the western Canadian premiers and they're going to talk. My God, these things have happened before and nothing is going to happen. You know, Mr. Speaker, this has been going on for years and nothing has happened. Now we're at the moment in destiny -- well we are -- we're at the moment in destiny for the Liberal Leader in Manitoba; we're at the moment in destiny for the Prime Minister who may not be Prime Minister very much longer and we are going to be able now to meet. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we should take advantage of the opportunities presented by this conference and I believe that the government must present a strong program for Manitoba. And I would hope that we would have an opportunity for that discussion in the Estimates and I think we are capable of doing that. I would be prepared also to see us set aside a few days for debate in the Legislature which I think by leave we could do and that would be satisfactory to me. I would be also prepared to see the government present a position so that we will be able to give our comments to it and add to it. I do not believe that the Premier does not have a mandate from the people in this province to talk as Premier of this Province. He has been elected under a system that we have lived for over a 100 years in Canada and there is nothing wrong with that system and he represents all of us. I have disagreement with him in this respect, I think I have a contribution to make and I think our party has. But I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to allow this issue to be exploited in the way in which the present Liberal Leader intends to

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) do not just now but in the future, because I suggest to him that he is touching that nerve and he does not know the consequences of what he is doing by touching that nerve.

MR. ASPER: Question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One half minute left of the members' time. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: In view of the description that the Leader of the Opposition has given to the futility of the negotiations and the impossibility of being able to accomplish anything, the difficulties -- my question is what would he do if he were the First Minister of this province and he ran up against that road block? Would he throw up his hands and quit or does he have some solutions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Twenty seconds.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has given me a short answer which is I guess the only one that's allowed in the time that I have. I would fight it politically, I would make the representation that has to be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to sit here and listen to the Leader of the Official Opposition make his speech. Of course if I had of written it I would have had him stop a little bit sooner because I almost felt like rising from my seat and say, let's grab Dief and we'll follow him; because he really did touch a nerve down in the east and of course we all know what happened to him because he did touch a nerve. Of course this brings up the point that we're talking about. And the leader of the Official Opposition touches it right on.

What the Leader of the Liberal Party has put forth, when he says it was a comedy hour -- you know, until the Member for St. Johns has made his contribution and he reminded us perhaps why we're here, until the Leader of the Official Opposition made his contribution, I thought it was a comedy hour. Because the Leader of the Liberal Party has the wont to put forward a position which reminds me of Baron Munchhausen, perhaps I am -- (Interjection) -- oh he, he called great facts. There were 50 hundred thousand -- (Interjection) -- that's another one. And he'd come down and he'd finally say well maybe there were ten and the guy would say well there still isn't any, were you there Charlie or something, because he keeps backing off. But it does remind me of the Member for Lakeside. It reminds me of this story and perhaps -- you know we haven't been dealing with facts this afternoon, it's rhetoric and fiction as we have heard. So perhaps I can best show my opinion of this particular resolution by telling a story of one of these younger people who had been engaged by the new group of messiahs that are going to lead the west back into confederation or something. So they -- (Interjection) -- I always keep it clean -- with Energine or something like that. But they sent this chap out, they thought perhaps he should practice on someone else so they sent him over to Africa and he came in to this one tribe and there happened to be one man in this particular place that spoke English and this fellow was holding forth before this group and the interpreter was interpreting for the tribe and he said "we're going to lead you back into confederation, we're going to have a meaningful role for the west to play." And the fellow interpreted; the people said "Hassanga." And he kept telling them you know, this Liberal Party has a policy, we're not going to tell you what it is until we find out but we have a policy. And it is in your best interests that we're going to find out this policy. And so the man interpreted this to the tribe and the tribe listened and they said "Hassanga." This went on and on and on. So this young fellow that was charged with this new Liberal spirit from the west thought he'd really got across to this particular tribe and he happened to speak to this interpreter, he says, you know, he says, "I see these prize bulls you have over in this particular compound." He says, "Can I go and look at them." The fellow says, "well sure but be careful you don't step in Hassanga."

Now Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure, I don't want to be unparliamentary about this, but it doesn't sound too good to me but if I find out that the semantics of the word and the translation of it are such that they are unparliamentary I'll withdraw the remark. But really, Mr. Speaker, I've been astounded all week. The Leader of the Liberal Party goes up and he talks about things and he says to stop, look and listen and really as one of the quieter backbenchers on this side I get a little confused at times. I agree with the Member

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . for Roblin. You know I thought that if you went to university and you had all these professors that acquire some knowledge that these professors would help you arrive at some degree of understanding, of some maturation that would help you be wise. And I sat at the University of Manitoba and I listened and you hear one professor say this and one professor say that and this one say this and this one say that. So I got one degree. I thought well maybe that wasn't the right degree maybe if I went over and got another one, maybe they know over there. And then one professor says this and one professor says that and another professor says something else. So I went to Greece, remember? I thought if I maybe walked where Socrates walked that maybe through the soles of my feet I could find wisdom. But then I came back and I listen to all these debates that go on and the position or the non-position of the Liberal Party, relative to everything including this inane resolution that's before us at the moment. But you know, Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe, with all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, I thought maybe somebody had found a way to float water up hill or something. So I went and invested, I went and invested \$27.45 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BOYCE: . . . because you know really I haven't been involved with hydraulics since 1955 so I thought maybe some of the, you know conversion factors and all the rest of it had changed. But you know it's nice to know that water still seeks its own level, you know it weights 62.4 pounds per cubic feet and a dyn is a dyn and an erg is an erg and a jewel is a jewel, and a horsepower is a horsepower, you know the terms haven't changed, it's nice to find these things out. But -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, 20 minutes, I only have 10 minutes to make all these -- to leave on the record my pearls of wisdom for posterity? But it is nice to know -- (Interjection) -- No, this tells you all about how water flows in a specific gravity, how high you have to stack it to push so much take through here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I am allowing a lot of latitude but I would hope the honourable gentleman will discuss the resolution before us.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know you're right. I accept you know the chastisement, but really I didn't contribute on the budget debate you know, and I've been sitting here, you know I know the Leader of the Liberal Party is a novice at this and he has -- has he had any practice in court? I thought maybe you know that he had brought into the House the procedures that our erstwhile attorneys use as advocates or adversaries. He still hasn't learned the rules of this particular House as far as debate is concerned -- so I did perhaps get carried away. But he does talk about you know a new deal for the west. Now I, like the Member for Roblin, I'm no great authority and sometimes -- you know the more I learn -- I could get rid of them all because that's one thing that I agree with Harry Truman. You know you take all the advice of all your experts and then it's up to you and I to make up our minds. That's right. -- (Interjection) -- Somebody suggested flip a coin, I'd better not comment on that one.

But let me tell you -- you know I'm a little older perhaps than the Member for Wolseley. I grew up in this part of the country and I'm a Winnipegonian first, I'm a Manitoban second, I'm a Canadian third. Now historically, historically Winnipeg was a very nice place to live and I guess when I was a kid I was a Liberal because I -- you know Liberal it had an appeal to me -- *laissez-faire*. Well I modified, you know, I believed that we should flood at 35 feet, I said you know now dropped it to ten and as far as political philosophy is concerned I've seen the light. But I believe that Liberalism meant *laissez-faire* type of thing and that you don't legislate anything unless it's absolutely necessary. And I'm kind of a Conservative in a sense in that I don't think it's a sin to make a dollar. But perhaps I can best make my point relative to this resolution this way: When I was a kid you know I looked around and I see people like Eatons. Now I know people talk about paternalism and paternalism is a bad word, we shouldn't have it. When I was a kid I believed that that's the way that things should be. And I think that within my terms of reference that Timothy tightwad Eaton did a pretty good job. He built houses for his employees, he had retirement on half pay and if a person got sick he carried them on his books for a while -- (Interjection) -- that's right, but the man operated the business according to his own personal conviction because he wouldn't sell liquor, he wouldn't sell tobacco and he closed his curtains on Sunday. He operated that business the way he saw fit, the way he saw it.

Now take a look at Eatons today. This has changed. Take a look at Shea's Brewery

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . across the street. This was a corporate family here in Winnipeg that acquired a few bucks. They could say at the end of the year, you know it was a very bad year in Winnipeg, we'll not declare a profit and we'll give a few hundred thousand dollars to build St. Paul's College or whatever. You take the Ashdown family, I wish I had done some research on this because perhaps I could give credit to some of the families that built this province. I think they should be given credit. McDiarmids, you know you could go on and on and on, Ashdowns, Reidles. Let me tell you this in the five minutes I have left. -- (Interjection) -- That's right.

Two months ago we happened to need for the Salvation Army Harbor Light Corps \$300 to get a washer and dryer. We were short. My wife's group had raised a certain number of dollars and they were \$300 short. So this happened to be raised in a conversation and it happened to come to the ears of the Executive Secretary to Mrs. Reidle who is 92. So this person said well I'm sure Mrs. Reidle would be glad to make up the \$300. And she did, she did. She made out a cheque for the \$300 and the Salvation Army got their thing.

But this is what we're talking about. And when the Leader of the Liberal Party in my mind comes before the people of the Province of Manitoba and says that this type of -- well, Mr. Speaker, I want to be parliament -- this type of an approach that he's dangling before the people is going to solve the problem, you know I think it's a great disservice to the people of the Province of Manitoba. Because what we're talking about is the transfer of this type of control out of Winnipeg into the east, beyond the east into the United States and even to Brazil. You know for heaven's sake why do we need Brazilian light and power to sell Labatt's beer? Why do we need a California company that is Calgary-based to pick up garbage in the City of Winnipeg? And that's one of the nuances of this thing that's before the city council right now. This dispose-all company that you see running around with blue trucks is a California outfit. So when we're talking about a new deal for the west, when we're talking about a new deal for the west, this type of resolution even to be considered as a solution to the problems that are facing this province is ridiculous, is ridiculous.

After this House has been in session, has been in session only the short time that it has, I have come to the firm conclusion that in Manitoba there are two alternatives. There's a Conservative Party approach to the problem or there is a New Democratic Party approach to the problem, because the only disagreement between them and us is how we do it. These are the problems, and they got the guts to stand up and say, this is the problem. I was proud to be associated with my colleague across the House today because he said, this is the problem. This is the problem and you heard the applause for my colleague. There is no disagreement between the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party as far as the problems are concerned of Confederation or development or anything else. It's a matter of philosophical approach to the problem. I'm sorry, I must apologize to my friend the Minister of Labour because he had a few words to say on this particular resolution. I have some notes here honestly, Mr. Speaker. I got carried away on that one thing, one point.

The Leader of the Liberal Party says he's a true federalist, a true federalist. You know Mr. Speaker, the people in western Canada do not believe the Liberals any more. They said it in British Columbia, they said it in Alberta, they said it in Saskatchewan and they said it in Manitoba. Why? Because no one in western Canada knows what the Liberal Party stands for. They have no philosophy, absolutely no philosophy. --(Interjection)-- Somebody over here says they are separatists. Well perhaps this is so.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have exhausted my time. Before I get on to the next point, when it comes up again I'll be able to continue on this so I suggest we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I adjourn the House, I would like to ask the House Leaders if they would be amenable to meeting with me some time next week to discuss this matter in respect to the private members' hour. There is always at the end of the hour sometimes a portion left and I think we should discuss it so we can negotiate how we would arrange that time. The honourable member has exactly six minutes left. Now should we bank it for him or should we let it go? The other member the other night had 14 minutes left to go. I don't think it is fair to cut him off. That's why I would like to negotiate with the honourable . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any need for meeting. I think that the same rules apply. If a man does not reach the end of the time, when the debate next comes up, the time that is left he is entitled to speak on it.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am required, and I'll do it very quickly, to indicate the business of the House for next week. We are continuing to proceed on the Estimates. The next Department that will be presented to the House is the Department of Agriculture and I'm hoping that several bills which were presented at first reading and which will be on the Order Paper for second reading will be printed by next week so that we will be into bills as well as departmental supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of 5:30 . . . the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, on the point that you really drew to our attention, may I suggest that on the Orders of the Day that the resolution No. 1 proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Mr. Patrick, as contained on page 4, should in brackets indicate that the Honourable Member for St. Johns still had the 14 minutes, and if we do that then I think we'll know where we stand at all times. And suggest that with the resolution proposed by the Member for Wolseley today would, when it goes down to the bottom of the Order Paper, indicate that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre still was on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The hour of 5:30 having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.