

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 1, 1973

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. GREEN: If the members will excuse me for a moment, I've lost a page which I'll pick up later on.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to first of all express my pleasure to the Assembly and to yourself, Sir, for having the opportunity to once again participate in the Throne Speech debate for the, oh I would suppose seventh or eighth consecutive time since I've been a member of the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I was somewhat moved by various members who have already participated and who have indicated from time to time the profound reasons for their participation in political life and for the things that they hope to see achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the other day being in a rather relaxed atmosphere and someone said to me -- as a result I think of some meeting that I had attended where -- as the Honourable Member for Lakeside had indicated earlier, where people thought that it was a good occasion to jeer a minister, and they did and I think that that's the people's rights, and I think that that is one of the things that one has to expect in politics -- and someone said to me "Why do you put up with it, and why does a person go into public life?" And I said well I think that there are two reasons: The first reason is that he's got to be nuts and that I think that everybody who participates in public life does have to have some type of compulsive feeling which is not shared by other people in society unless they too have the same feeling, that they have to be involved in that field.

And that the second reason is that whether others will agree or not, and certainly whether it is generally accepted by the media or not, that I am honestly of the opinion that I am achieving something for the province, for my self-realization and for the people generally. And I think that in any individual session at any individual time that it's sometimes difficult to measure that achievement. I think that it's very difficult to try to examine during the day to day practice of government administration to try to identify those things which you feel are indeed achievements in the field of public office.

I know that there are many things that happen which I will frankly admit that would happen no matter who occupied the government benches. The day to day administration, the number of highways that are built or the number of drains that are dealt with and the various other multitude of things that come before public officials are not things that one can say are substantial achievements one way or the other. They are merely the maintenance of that government service which the people of Manitoba expect and have a right to rely on. Therefore surely achievement must mean more than the occupation in the day to day administrative details of government.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to for the first part of my speech try to put achievement into perspective. Today I believe is March 1st and four years ago the day exactly - March 1st, 1969 - I think we were convening another Legislature. It was the last Legislature of the previous administration and I remember that the Throne Speech that was delivered on that day had announced various programs. One of the things that was announced was the intention of the government to bring in a bill for the purpose of creating the Churchill River diversion. And I'm not bringing that out as a criticism I'm merely trying to put the House back four years as to what was happening at that time.

So I went back, Mr. Speaker, and I got some of the newspapers which are a day or so within March 1st of 1969 when we were in Opposition and I looked at what were the news items of that day. I have one paper, Mr. Speaker, which is March 7th of 1969, and one of the headlines says, "Medicare Costs Put at \$55 Million." This was an announcement that was being made by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, it was then called, the Honourable George Johnson, and what was indicated when we talked about the Medicare costs being \$55 million is the \$26 million would be paid federally and roughly \$30 million would be raised by public payment. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, the administration said -- and I believe that it was their sincere opinion -- that the best way of raising the funds for this Manitoba share of Medicare was to distribute the costs equally amongst all those families in Manitoba with the exception of those who were on social assistance; which meant that every family would pay roughly \$120.00 and every individual would pay roughly \$60.00.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are four years removed from that time, and I can remember that at the First Session of the Manitoba Legislature that I participated in, after an extensive debate on the question during the election campaign the first substantial achievement between those four years was that the Medicare premium was changed from \$120.00 a family and it was changed to an income tax. With the effect, Mr. Speaker, that if a person was in the \$6,000 or \$6,500 income group instead of paying \$120.00 a year in taxation he paid roughly \$35.00 or \$40.00 -and I don't have the figure exact.

Mr. Speaker, I bring that up because since that time there has been a great deal of stress put by the Opposition on the question of taxation in the Province of Manitoba and when those Medicare premiums were changed the income tax was raised to that, as has been indicated by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party, Manitobans were indicated paying the highest income tax in Canada, that has at various times been referred to as the highest taxes in Canada. And I assume that when those people are making the position that the income tax is the highest tax in Canada and that that is a bad thing, that what they are indicating is a move in the other direction, that they would like to reduce income tax, and that they would like to pick up the same revenue in a different way. And that if the Leader of the Opposition who is complaining about that tax change became the Premier of the province we would go back to having a lower income tax, people would pay 35 or 37 percent of their federal taxes as the base and we would have a premium of \$120.00. But, Mr. Speaker-- and that being one achievement --that's really not good enough. Because, Mr. Speaker, if it's good to have taxes, income taxes at 37 percent of the federal tax base as against 41 well then, Mr. Speaker, surely it's better to have it at 30 percent. And if it's better to have it at 30 percent, Mr. Speaker-- and I know that the Leader of the Opposition should be interested in it-- then it would be better to have it at 20 percent. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the opposition Leader would be most happy if we had no income tax at all. And, Mr. Speaker, he has shown us the way, and the Conservative administration has shown us the way. We could eliminate the income tax. The income taxes raise - the personal income taxes raise for the Province of Manitoba roughly \$150 million a year. Taking a quick calculation, Mr. Speaker, if it took \$120.00 premium to raise 30 million, with five times that amount which would be a \$600.00 premium we could have no income taxes at all, and then the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party would be able to run around Manitoba, run around the country proudly extolling the fact that Manitoba not only has the lowest personal income tax but Manitoba has no income tax.

Now wouldn't that be a wonderful position if we accepted the logic of the Leader of the Opposition. It would mean, Mr. Speaker, that in order to buy out of income tax which may cost somebody \$150.00, \$200.00 a year they would be paying an additional \$500.00. But what's \$500 if I can say that there is no income tax. That's a wonderful thing. We could go to the United States and say, you know, Manitoba, no income tax. And we could go to the Province of Quebec and go to the Province of British Columbia and say Manitoba has no income tax. Manitoba has not the lowest income tax in Canada but in Manitoba we don't know what income tax means on a provincial scale. And I assume, Mr. Speaker, that that is the trend which the Leader of the Opposition proposes when he says that we should not have the highest income taxes in Canada we should go back to the good old days. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the first achievements that I say that I can look back to when I go and examine what the last four years in politics have meant to myself.

I've got another item, Mr. Speaker, February 27th. This is February 27th four years ago. The Opposition fired its first volley in the Third Session of the 28th Manitoba Legislature charging the government with using special standing committees of the House as a tactic to do nothing. In this article, Mr. Speaker, it indicates that the Leader of the New Democratic as he then was, the Honourable Minister of Labour, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk as he then was, Mr. Hillhouse, both indicated that the use by the special committee-- use by the Conservative administration of the Special Committee on Auto Insurance, was really to have a vehicle to do nothing. I bring that up again not as a criticism but to indicate that the second Throne Speech that was delivered by the New Democratic Party was one which saw the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, go into a major economic program. We said, and I believe that we are right and I know that there is opposition, opinion to the contrary, that the service that the people of Manitoba were getting from the automobile insurance

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . underwriters was too expensive, that it was unfair and that it was not administratively efficient. The New Democratic Party said that the people of Manitoba have got the wisdom and the capacity to do it better. We enacted at that second session of the Legislature a bill which made the people of Manitoba the joint partners in a \$40 million a year insurance operation which they are administering; and, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest they are administering well. That, Mr. Speaker, was I think one of the major achievements of the second session of the Legislature.

The paper of Friday, February 28th, 1969 - and I am sorry the Member for Sturgeon Creek is not here because he would be interested - it's got a headline, Mr. Speaker: "The City of Winnipeg was expecting a 5 1/2 to an 8 1/2 mill tax rise." Would members of the Opposition believe that municipal taxes used to go up in 1969 a 5 1/2 to an 8 1/2 mill tax increase. Now the way I hear it being spoken about now, the taxes in municipalities started to go up with the elction of the New Democratic Party government. But, Mr. Speaker, it's not true, here it is, Winnipeg Free Press, they sometimes have proper headlines - "5 1/2 to 8 1/2 mill tax rise looming for the City of Winnipeg". In another article, Mr. Speaker, "Metro's aim" . . .

A MEMBER: What year?

MR. GREEN: February 28, 1969. The administration then in power was the Conservative administration and strange as it may seem from what we have heard on the other side of the House when the Conservative administration was in power -- and by the way when the Liberal administration was in power - municipal taxes increased. Another headline the day before: "Metro's aim to avoid jumble", and it had to do with planning. And this, Mr. Speaker, brings again into perspective the next session of the Manitoba legislature where the Manitoba government looked at a tangled situation in Greater Winnipeg which then had thirteen governments and two levels of government which were continually at odds with one another and continually were having problems in various areas because of the, unusual would be a kind word, nature of the government's structure and something which people in Manitoba had been saying should be tackled for a period of ten years. And the New Democratic Party in spite of the fact that there was consistent opposition to this proposal took the bull not by the tail but by the horns and dealt with the problem. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact, you know, it is a fact that when any problem involves a significant change that there is bound to be some opposition to it and I think that facing that kind of fact has often caused governments to say well we better not do anything. But sure enough a government which had been elected some two years earlier took municipal government, one of the biggest problems that had been facing Greater Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba and which various people had said that they would deal with, and they dealt with that problem. That was the third year, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if one examines one's role I think one has to first of all think in terms of what the objectives are, and I must admit that much as it may be suggested to the contrary, that I don't think that great achievements are made. I think that great progress is made with small moderate achievements and that that is about the best that one can expect. And if, Mr. Speaker, this government had not lasted any longer than having been able to pass the Medicare legislation, I would have been satisfied that we had done something. I take heart in the Member for Crescentwood's remarks about taxation not doing a great deal and when he made his remarks he said it as if he was really revealing a secret that is known by some government members.

Mr. Speaker, the second speech that I made in this House when I was in opposition was dealing with the income tax legislation. I said then that keeping an income tax rather than going to a sales tax is not going to do a great deal of good, that the structure of our society is generally that those people who have the power to pay the taxation have also got the power to avoid the payment of taxation, and that taxation is a small measure in terms of bringing about equity. I said it in opposition and I said it in the first budget debate when we had changed from the one tax to the other. So I don't think that this is a very profound revelation that is being made but I think that it is a fact that taxation does little. I wouldn't agree that it does nothing. If it does nothing we wouldn't have such a howl about it when we change from one form of taxation to another, and the fact is that taxes might not be passed on if you are

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . dealing with an exported article and where there is a competitive market and it also might not be passed on if you are dealing with sales where you have to compete with what is taking place in another province. So although what the Member for Crescentwood says is generally correct, it is not so correct as to eliminate any suggestion that there be fiscal measures taken.

The real benefit, Mr. Speaker, is that they demonstrate to the public that payment for government services can be done on a fair or less fair basis because services to the public as distinct from fiscal measure do go some direction towards equalizing the lot of people in the Province of Manitoba. Every time you have a universal program, when the people of a country decide that education will be provided to all of the citizens at collective rather than individual expense, you are achieving a degree of equality. When the people of a country decide that hospital services will be provided to all at collective rather than individual expense, you are achieving some small measure of equality. And the same is true of Medicare and the same is true of other programs.

That's why it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in some of the speeches that were made by members of the Opposition that said that they had been urging these type of programs all along, when we talk about the nursing care program, and now the member for Assiniboia talks about denticare, it appears to me that the whole House has moved somewhat forward I don't care who takes the credit for it; when we are all talking that way I believe we have moved; because we didn't all used to talk that way.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when I came into this House the people on that side of the House, the Conservative administration and particularly the Liberal Party, said that we should not provide medical services as a universal service. Mr. Speaker, they said that we should not provide medical services as a universal service: that what we should have is a medicare plan for those in need. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Assiniboia is getting up to make an objection, and I assume that he wants to say that I am incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is **incorrect**. I wish he would go back and read my speech. I did say that after 40 years of private medical insurance service it was not covering many people and I was for a universal plan. I wish he would read my speech.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the member studiously identified the opinion with himself. I said that the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party were both against a universal medicare program. They both took the position that we should not have a universal medicare program; we should have a medicare program for the poor. That the people who were on medicare didn't need it and that the poor would be looked after if they came to some civil servant and said that I am very poor and I didn't make it, and I'll turn my pockets inside out and I'll cross my heart and spit, and I haven't got any money, and please give me money so I can go to a doctor. That was the position of the Conservative Party and that was the position of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Does the Minister realize that the then member of the Liberal Party who made that remark is now a member of the NDP Party?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, you know various people within any party can have differing opinions even on that question. There could be people in this party still today who do not take the position that you should have a universal program. I know that there are people in the New Democratic Party who today say that family allowances should not be universal. And that's why I studiously avoided talking about a member. I talked about the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. And there may still be that difference in the party.

When the Leader of the Opposition got up, said that he approves of a universal nursing care program, it may be that there are conservatives, one might be able to find one in the world, who says that he doesn't think that we should be providing universal nursing care programs, but that doesn't make my statement incorrect, and I don't wish to compromise my honourable friend on this. He may still feel that a universal medicare program is not justified. That is an opinion which - no -, Mr. Speaker, it is an opinion with which I may disagree, but it is nevertheless an opinion, which could be had by various members. All I

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . am saying is that that type of talk that I heard from both of the leaders was not the type of conversation that I heard when I came into the House in 1966. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved a little bit and that one now accepts the fact that it's not a question of charity, that sometimes the best way for society to provide themselves with a service is to get together, pool their resources, and provide the service at the expense of the person who happens to be in trouble. That it's our problem when he is in trouble.

Now I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, that that is the case, that the position has changed in six years. I'm hoping that it's not just an accident of location, that the members on that side of the House happen to be talking in that way, because they feel that by talking that way they can somehow change their seats; that what they are offering the public is something they don't have, therefore it's easy to offer.

It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a story told by Myron Cohen, where a woman came into the butcher shop and she said she'd like to buy some lamb chops. And the butcher says "That's fine". She says "How much are they?" He says "Oh, 79¢ a pound". She says "79¢ a pound?" She says "The butcher shop across the street is selling them for 55¢ a pound". So he says "Well, if the butcher shop across the street is selling them for 55¢, why don't you go and buy them there?" She says "Because he doesn't have any". He said "Well, if I didn't have any, I'd offer them to you for 40¢ a pound."

Now what we do know, what we do know about the members on the other side is that none of them have the capacity to implement the programs that they are talking about, and therefore one really has to judge their position not from what they now say but the implications of what they now say and by what they did when they were in office. Mr. Speaker, I go back to the first statement. The very harping that has been done by the Opposition on the question of taxation, the very suggestion that Manitoba has harmed its citizens by having the highest income tax rate in Canada, indicates the direction of the opposition. I think it's worth repeating, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate the reason I'm ambling so slowly is that the First Minister has asked me to use his time on this particular amendment. Therefore, I will not be constrained by the 40 minutes. --(Interjection)-- on this amendments.

A MEMBER: Give me 10 minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: That's in accordance with the rule.

MR. GREEN: So sit back and relax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Are we to understand that the First Minister is not going to reply?

MR. PAULLEY: On this motion . . .

MR. GREEN: Which we vote on tonight at 9:50.

MR. PAULLEY: On this motion, Jimmy, you're right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I'm sure that you're in for even a bigger treat --(Interjection)-- next week, that's right.

So, Mr. Speaker I want to take the position of the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Leader of the Opposition, and say that he has used the tax issue as being the most serious problem that Manitobans are faced with, and he says the most serious thing is that we have the highest income tax in Canada; and therefore I presume if he became the Premier of the province that he would change that, he would reduce the income tax. He would reduce it by five points, which is what it was before we got here. And they would put on a premium to pay for those five points. But, Mr. Speaker, if he believes that, if he believes that - well, let me carry it further, because apparently he wasn't listening. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the honourable member, I've just given him a new political program which he hasn't yet unveiled. You could go to the people of Canada and the people of Manitoba and tell them we will have not only not the highest income tax but we will have no income tax. The Leader of the Opposition - I've tried to give him good political advice, which I've tried to do in the past. You know, you didn't take it in the past and you lost both times, so listen this time.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I am giving him a proposal which could eliminate income tax in Manitoba, and then he would be able to go around and brag, as you have up till now complained, that we have no income taxes in Manitoba. We raise \$150 million out of income tax. You can collect that all by a premium. The cost of the premium would be five

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . times \$120 million which would be \$600.00 -- five times \$120 which would be \$600 per family in the Province of Manitoba. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, you could then say that the people of Manitoba pay no income tax and the fact that it is costing them \$600.00 to pay for what previously cost them 200 is of course considered value by you by the position that you have been taking.

Mr. Speaker, if we had enacted Medicare and if we had enacted automobile insurance and had stopped there, and that was the length of the government, I would still fee, Mr. Speaker, that we had achieved far more than what the previous administration had achieved in the ten years that they were in office --(Interjections)-- Well, you know, I was around, I was a citizen of Manitoba bearing what you were doing, that's why I decided to get into politics. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had instituted Medicare, if we had instituted automobile insurance, if we had instituted the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg, and it had stopped there, I would still have considered that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba during the administration of which I was a member had accomplished very important things, and that that would have been enough to sustain my feeling that we had achieved something.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't stop there. If we would have changed the Medicare premiums, if we had instituted automobile insurance, if we had effected municipal reorganization, if we had then enacted the tax credit program which we introduced last year and had stopped there, I would say that that would be a proud achievement for one administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, we didn't stop there. We've now come into the House in what may be the last legislative session of this government, and in the last legislative session, after doing all of these things and doing them, Mr. Speaker, and I say it advisedly, without increasing taxation in the Province of Manitoba; without increasing taxation in the Province of Manitoba, we have come to the last session, and we have a very - well, Mr. Speaker, you judge what is on this flight. That there will be a universal nursing home care program, not financed by the Federal Government. And you know it's interesting that the Leader of the Liberal Party said that he should adopt the whole liberal program. We had to do this without Liberal help. That there will be an entry into the pharmaceutical field whereby people who are old age pensioners would have 80 percent of the costs of their drugs paid for after an initial payment of \$50.00 on their own behalf as a single person or \$100.00 as a couple. And that in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have eliminated the Medicare premiums for the old age pensioners. Of course, we could have avoided eliminating the Medicare premiums for the people over 65.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . old age pensioners.

MR. GREEN: My colleague corrects me and he properly corrects me. We could have avoided that Medicare premium reduction. Do you know what we could have done? We could have reduced income taxes. We could have said "Take the \$4 million which is to go to the people over 65 in this society as a tax reduction", but that's not going to let us walk around saying that we are not the highest income tax provinces in the Province of Manitoba. And therefore, I think that in order to stop the Leader of the Opposition from saying that we are the highest income tax province in the Province of Manitoba, let's not reduce the Medicare premiums for the people over 65. And I assume, Mr. Speaker, from everything that has been said, that he would have been congratulated by the Leader of the Opposition, because he would have been able to say, or maybe he would no longer have had the luxury of saying that they are the highest income tax province in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: It is one now.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members of this House something that I would think that the Province of Manitoba would not be showing its direction in the fiscal field, -- and I know that the Member for Crescentwood will say that this is very important, but I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we would not be showing the proper direction in the fiscal field if we did not have the highest income tax rates in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, there are many people who agree with this who the Leader of the Opposition should become acquainted with. We have numerous delegations, we have delegations from the City of Winnipeg, we have delegations from the rural municipalities, we have delegations from the urban municipalities, and they all say "Take the tax off this, take the tax off that, take the tax off farm lands, take the tax off, the sales tax. I think that it's - and this is not being critical - I think that it is usual for people to want the government to reduce taxes in one

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . area. And our response to them- yes, that's natural - our response to them is that those are all very good ideas. Where would you suggest that the money that is lost by virtue of the tax coming off that particular area, where do you suggest that it go? Mr. Speaker, without exception do you know what they say. They say income tax and we say but our opposition is continually saying you have the highest income tax in Canada, and they say well ignore the opposition, put it on the income tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have put it on the income tax, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have done so, we have done so, I repeat that we have brought in all of those measures without increasing taxes to the to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Well, Mr. Speaker, last year the Minister of Finance brought in a budget which was going to spend \$40 million in tax reductions or let's say, let's be safe, let's say 30 - I want to be safe, let them have it on which was bringing in \$40 million in tax reductions and raising 20. --(Interjection)-- But, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about taxation. Now the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition says that giving \$40 million in tax reductions and raising \$20 million by taxes is an increase in taxes. But that doesn't surprise me because the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition says reducing water levels by two feet is a flood. So it really doesn't surprise me that he would take that position.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech, and I appreciate this, he said that we have made a mistake in our economic dealings, that the doctrine of confidentiality which is the doctrine which was pursued by his administration was wrong, that it's much better that the entire financial transactions of the government be open and that we suffer whatever embarrassment that results, that in the long run it will be to the benefit of the people of Manitoba. And the Leader of the Opposition knows that I agree with him because he knows that I was arguing that position against him when he was in opposition and when he said, Mr. Speaker, that not maintaining confidentiality is somehow going to hurt the business firms that get moneys from the MDC. So he has indicated that he now accepts, and I assure him that this government accepts, the motion of public accountability. I don't agree that we don't have it to the extent that has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

He suggested public accountability in the telephone. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when the Telephone Committee reports that there is full accountability. The fact that we haven't asked the questions that would be our responsibility not the responsibility of the telephone system. When Hydro comes in they come in with their balance sheet, they come in with their statement of revenue and expenses and there is full accountability and the fact that, Mr. Speaker, we haven't asked as many questions doesn't mean that that was not the case. When the two Crown corporations that were under the Department of Mines reported to Legislative Committee last year there was full accountability, and when the Manitoba Development Fund chairman comes in there is full accountability in that field. And the fact, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable members do not ask as many questions as they should be asking doesn't deter from the fact or detract from the fact that we have accountability.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said something else which I think is a very interesting remark. He said that we should set up, and I can't remember the exact name, it was an Economic Fund - a Manitoba Development Fund - I wonder-- if I've got the name wrong, Mr. Speaker, I apologize but he talked about a fund in which Manitobans could invest and in which the government would participate which would undertake industrial development in the Province of Manitoba. Is that not correct? Was that not part of the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made? Did I hear him incorrectly?

MR. PAULLEY: He hasn't got his scriptwriter here tonight.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understood the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that such a vehicle be set up, a vehicle in which Manitobans could invest and in which the government would participate and that that vehicle would involve itself in the Manitoba economy.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . upstairs there. Is he there?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I appreciate the question has been asked but I do think our rules of debate do not allow it. I would suggest if the honourable member wishes an answer he could ask, -phrase the question so a nod will do.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. GREEN: Obviously the honourable member can't either nod his acceptance or deny it he. . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My difficulty in answering it that the honourable member has already referred to other portions of the speech which he's interpreted in his way. I don't want to get involved in the debate, he has used terminology that I did not use and he is also using terminology here that I did not entirely use although the intent, the intent with respect to the last item was in fact that there would be a growth fund, that was the terminology used. But my problem, Mr. Speaker, and the reason I rise on a question of privilege is because in the course of his presentation he has made assumptions with respect to terminology and intent that are not entirely correct in other matters and there's not point of my trying at this point to clarify it, I'll have an opportunity in the course of this sitting to be able to, I think, debate this matter further.

MR. PAULLEY: When you have your scriptwriter here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my honourable friend's response that it was a growth fund that he was talking about and I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the implications that I am making from my honourable friend's speech are not the implications he would want to have made and I accept that. I accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when I make the implication that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't want the highest income tax, I accept the fact that he does not want it implied that he would substitute income tax for premiums. I am suggesting that we judge them by what they have done and by what the effect of their suggestions imply. I'm going to do the same thing with the growth fund and it's not a question of privilege, he can certainly debate the questions, but I am going to do the same thing with the growth fund. Because I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that once the doctrine of confidentiality is accepted by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to accountability in financial transaction that there will be a void in the Conservative Government program and that void has to be made up by something else and that something else is the growth fund, because the Conservative administration will have to have a public fund to prop up those people that they want propped up who can't make a go of it privately. That's what they did with the Manitoba Development Fund and that's what they will want to do and will not be able to do if confidentiality is introduced into its dealings.

So they say that there will be a growth fund, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when that growth fund is set up that that growth fund will be a secret fund. --(Interjection)-- Never mind that. There will be nothing sinister about it, Mr. Speaker, but when one wants go go to this growth fund and find out what has happened, the Conservative administration will say well you can't look at that growth fund. It's a business fund in which people of Manitoba have contributed money and they are engaged in business transactions which cannot be laid out to members of the Legislature because it will interfere with the carrying on of those business transactions. Because that's what they said with the Manitoba Development Fund.

Mr. Speaker, it's not unlike what is now being done to the Canadian Development Corporation by the Liberal administration in Ottawa. The Canadian Development corporation was conceived as a means whereby Canadians could develop this country by using their economic power collectively in a public way to do those things which were not being done by the private sector. The Liberal administration has taken that Canadian Development Fund, have transferred to it the viable wealth-giving public corporations that the people of Canada have produced for years and years and they now say that they are going to sell 90 percent of the shares of the Canadian Development Corporation to the public. And I assume that they are talking about the same public that the Leader of the Opposition talks of when he says that the public is going to divest in this Manitoba growth fund. Well, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the public is he talking about and who is he talking about? How many people in the public do you know, Mr. Speaker, who have shares in the corporations that they are now able to invest in? The fact is that a very small percent of the public own a very large percent of the shares that are now on the market and when the growth fund that the honourable member is talking about is set up it won't be Manitobans who participate in it, it will be the same

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . percentage of Manitobans who now invest in other economic enterprises - a very very small percentage of the people.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the Canadian Development Corporation is that the Government of Canada - to coin a phrase - is privateering public enterprises because they are taking public enterprise and they are turning it over to private people; public enterprise that the people of Canada have had great benefit from for many many years. And I suggest that despite the intentions, or maybe he hasn't thought it through, despite the intentions of the Leader of the Opposition, that what he says set up by a Conservative administration would fill a void, and despite the directions that he thinks it would go in it would go in the direction that it has to go in given the economic status quo; and the direction that it has to go in given the economic status quo, is to prop up private enterprise that can't make a go of it, because that's what the Manitoba Development Fund was used for.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside has spoken to us this afternoon about a subject which I know is very difficult for him to speak about and we get the-- I see the same anxiety in the honourable member's face every time he talks about it because it's the subject of the raising of the water levels at South Indian Lake and the honourable member -- (Interjection)-- the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, is so sensitive about it that in order to make the Conservative position which was attempted last year, in order to make themselves feel less guilty about what they were going to do -- and by the way I don't think that they should feel very guilty about it -- (Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, let's see, let's see what has occurred. In order to make themselves feel less guilty about what they are going to do they have to now take the position, the following position, that 30 feet is the same as 10 feet, that those two things are the same. That having a community -- (Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who is an engineer says that 30 feet is 10 feet.

A MEMBER: That's right. That's what he said. And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member took the Lake Winnipeg regulation report, the Water Commission report and said that in that report there is a statement that the level of the lake will be over 715 feet, more often under regulation than it would be not under regulation. Well the honourable member will have to show me that statement, and he is an engineer and he has a great advantage over me in this connection because he is supposed to know about these things. Now, Mr. Speaker, that statement to my reading is not contained in the book. What the books says, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Send the book back.

MR. GREEN: . . . I'll tell the honourable member what my interpretation of the book is -- yes pick out the statement and have it sent back - my interpretation of the situation which I never ever detracted from was to the effect that with Lake Winnipeg regulation the levels from 715 to 717 will be eliminated and that the water will be higher than it would have been had there been no regulations when it was between 714 and 715 feet. That in order to -- the honourable member, you know, he has an advantage over me. Mr. Speaker, he has pointed out a graph and the graph is something that I suppose that he will read better than I can because I am not an engineer, but the statement that he made is not contained in this report, the statement that he made is not contained in this report. I will show him a hydro graph. Mr. Speaker, he is referring to a graph, the statement that he made --(Interjection) --Mr. Speaker, I will read the graph in its entirety. "Lake Winnipeg regulated to meet Manitoba's energy requirement in 1966. Regulated conditions, modified historical 711/713, 711/714, 711/715" - I could read these figures forever. It does not say in this report that the level of the lake will be over 715 feet, more often under regulation than without regulation.

MR. CRAIK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: The Minister has asked for the evidence, he's been given it. There's only two points in there that count. It's a 711 to 715 regulation which I think he's still adhering to and if I'm wrong he can correct me, which means that you take the difference between the natural level graph and the one of 711/715.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated, you know, that my honourable friend will be able to interpret this graph better than I, and I certainly have seen other graphs which say exactly the contrary of what he is saying. But he told the Legislature that there

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . was a statement in the book which said that you know and I would think that the Water Commission would point that out. I would think that if what my honourable friend said is correct that somewhere in this body it would say that under non regulated conditions the water would be less often over 715 feet than under regulated conditions. . . But that statement does not appear here. Now the honourable member says that is what the graph said and I of course admit that I'm not able to interpret the graph, so I cannot find the statement, I will have my officials interpret the graph and then I will speak to him.

MR. CRAIK: Would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Simply request that the author of the report appear before the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to now try -- if the honourable member wishes to get a statement from the author of the report making the observation that I have made he can do so. I am not going to make commitments for the Public Utilities Committee at this stage and the honourable member knows that I am not going to do so. The point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that the statement -- let's leave the argument here -- that the honourable member says that the statement that he made is contained in the graph. I say that the statement that he made is not made in the text and I don't know what the graph says.

MR. CRAIK: You can't read the graph.

MR. GREEN: I said that. You can't read the text.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, that's right, that's right. And it's elementary English, even I could read it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to review. That in order for my honourable friends to be able to deal with the situation they now have to say that what we are doing with Lake Winnipeg regulation, with Churchill River diversion, they were about to do in 1969; that our program is in effect their program, and in order to sustain that, Mr. Speaker . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: The Honourable Member has a very unique way of putting words into other persons mouths that weren't in fact uttered. We never have said that that was our position in 1969. I have said in this House in the course of the debate that that is our position now, in 1973 with the information that we now have available to us --(Interjections)-- and that position, and that position is that the optimum level is 854.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. May I suggest - ORDER! ORDER! ORDER! The members will have ample opportunity to debate the question until Tuesday evening. I wish they would contain themselves. There will be differences of opinion I should suggest that they are not matters of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding on the basis that the members of the Conservative opposition are now saying that there is no difference between what we are doing now and what they were proposing in 1969, and the honourable members have alluded to that in almost those words.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital said that last year in the Legislature, and we had a long debate upon it. He said that we are now forced to go back to their program, and in order to sustain that they have had to say that 30 feet is the same thing as ten feet, and the honourable member says that what's the difference between one inch of water on the carpet and 10 inches of water upon the carpet, and in order --(Interjection)-- two inches? okay. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, he is suggesting that the fact that the community will not be flooded out is the same thing as if the community will be flooded out. They are suggesting in order to sustain that argument that roughly 900,000 acres of flooded land is the same thing as roughly 175-200,000 acres of flooded land. They are making those - they are equating those two positions, and I'm willing to say to the people of Manitoba that we say that those two things are different; we say that 10 feet is not 30 feet, that no land flooded is not the same as land flooded and the 900,000 acres is not the same as 170,000 acres, and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . we are willing to see whether the people of Manitoba think that that constitutes a difference.

The Honourable Member for Riel says - and this is a graph that I will ask him to read - that there is no difference between the amount of damage that will be done by ten feet of flooding as against what will be done by 14 feet of flooding, or that it will be negligible. --(Interjection)-- well, all right, I want to be correct. He says it will be negligible -- (Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, those graphs are contained in the Task Force which have been made available to my honourable friends, and which the Honourable Member for Riel who is an engineer can read very well, and I assume that if he just takes the figure on the graph he will find out what damage would occur at 754. I by recollection remember that the damage with ten feet of flooding were discounted at roughly \$10 million and the damage at 30 feet were discounted at \$40 million; so between 10 feet and 30 feet, a distance of 20 feet, there was \$30 million extra damages. Now I assume that it's a fairly simple arithmetic calculation to calculate what are the damages between 10 and 14 feet, and the honourable member who's indicated to us that he can read graphs --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? --(Interjection)-- Oh well, Mr. Speaker, he asked, he said that nowhere has it been shown the value of those resources as between 10 and 14, and I'm only answering that question. That question is answered by the graphs which are contained in the Task Force.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that we took it to the public, that we held hearings. Now, you know that really is the least sound position for the honourable member to take, because he himself said that those Hearings were not intended to determine what the Hydro project would be, and he is nodding his head, they were not intended to determine what the Hydro project would be. They were intended to inform the people as to what was occurring and to hear their position with respect to compensation. And that type of hearing we have always indicated will be held and there is no need, and there is nobody who is suggesting that that type of hearing has to be put into a statute; that that type of hearing goes without saying. That is not what the hearings were proposed for, and I want to indicate to my honourable friend that I did not jump into South Indian Lake when it became a matter of debate. It became a matter of debate in February - in May of 1968. It was introduced by the Member for Portage la Prairie as an emergency debate, that this was occurring, that there was a Hydro project that there were several communities going to be flooded. I knew about that because Mr. Kuiper had told me about it, but I did not see that that was a real subject to debate, that it had something to do with the Hydro project which would be discussed at Public Utilities Committee.

I never made a statement about South Indian Lake at that time, I never made a statement about South Indian Lake when the honourable member called his hearing. I went to those hearings, I saw a disgusting exhibition, and I agree with you, I saw the Leader of the Liberal Party standing at the back of the hall, urging the crowd on, shouting objections from the floor, making all kinds of noises, doing very much what the Leader of the Liberal Party did when the Environmental Council was meeting to hear this question. I did not attend those hearings in that respect, and I did not think that the exhibition that was being put on by the Leader of the Liberal Party - and I want the present leader to learn something by this - I didn't think that they were doing very much good, and I didn't think that they were proper, and I stayed completely out of that question until I read an announcement, Mr. Speaker, in the paper, which said that "no matter what these hearings decided, we are going ahead with the project". The hearing was being held to determine whether the project should or should not be proceeded with. The honourable member knows that that was what was at issue, that's what he wanted. Well, I want to be completely fair. That was the impression that the public had and that was the fraud that I said that I would not perpetrate and which I've stuck to to this day. If a Hydro development plan is not going to be decided at a public hearing, then it is wrong to hold a hearing for the purpose of window dressing.

Now the honourable member knows that I didn't participate at those hearings until after that statement was made. When that statement was made, I waited in line just like anybody else, put my name into the chairman, got up, made my remarks and left. I did not do what the Leader of the Liberal Party did. And my remarks, the only criticism that I made, was that you cannot treat people this way, you cannot say that you are holding a

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . a hearing to determine what you do and then tell them that the hearing is a farce, that no matter what the hearing decides, you are going ahead. That was my criticism, that remains my criticism to this day. I never said that the Hydro-electric, project should be decided on as a basis of hearing. The present Leader of the Liberal Party says I did, but I didn't. I'll come to him in a moment.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the worst heat of that question, in the worst heat of that question immediately after the hearings -I want the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party to maybe learn something from this. There were four by-elections held, the Liberals lost the only seat that they had, the Conservatives won three, we won one- and that was when the Hydro project was coming under its worst and most vicious attack. When we got into the House, again it was not the Hydro development project that we criticized. What we said was that you have now brought this bill into the House, you have asked us to become part of the administration, because this is an administrative act, it is not a legislative act - to deal with the Leader of the Liberal Party. We said if we are parties to the administration you have to give us the evidence that the administration has. The Conservative administration steadfastly refused to give us that evidence, and we said, if you won't give it to us, we cannot support the scheme. That's what we said. And we said then that the reason that this information is not being given to us is that for some reason they feel sensitive about what they are doing, therefore we can't support it. During that debate I said that if this is being decided in the Legislature - and I never ever said that it should be decided in the Legislature- then if there is a conflict sometimes they hold an independent commission and we get the reports of that commission to look at so that we can make a decision. But, Mr. Speaker, we did not bring a bill into the Legislature, and nowhere did I ever suggest that that's the way --(Interjection)-- well, the honourable member you really want to make that a point, you really want to say that you brought a bill in because it was democratic? You don't want to concede that you brought a bill in because there was an injunction pending against the issuance of a license by the Director of Water Control, that you really wanted to bring a bill in, that that's the way you wanted to do this thing, because you wanted to show how democratic you are. You want to maintain that position? Tell it to the Member for Lakeside, cause he knows it's not true. Tell it to the Member for Lakeside. --(Interjection)-- The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there is - and you know, I really --(Interjection)-- I want, Mr. Speaker, to leave - I really want to leave the Member for Lakeside --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Liberal Party --(Interjection)-- the Leader.

. . . . . continue on next page.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. GREEN:** The Leader of the Liberal Party is back and I think that I can continue these remarks by talking about things that he has said, and I assume that he has said them because he is new, that he is inexperienced, and that he doesn't really know the procedures of the House. He said that somehow this is going to be decided and debate is going to be precluded, that there will be no opportunity for debate. Now, I assume that the honourable member who is new to the House doesn't know that he can debate this on the Throne Speech. Not only can he debate it on the Throne Speech but that it was debated on several Throne Speeches when he wasn't here, and of course, he didn't know, so we can forgive that remark. I assume that he doesn't know that you can debate this question during the estimates, and if he doesn't know - pardon me?

**MR. ASPER:** 90 hours.

**MR. GREEN:** Is it 90 hours? That's quite a lengthy debate. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't know that you can debate it on the Capital Estimates, that the Hydro cannot spend a cent of that if the Capital Estimates . . .

**MR. PAULLEY:** He doesn't know.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, I think that-- well, you know, we really have to forgive my honourable friend because he is new and doesn't know that there are, Mr. Speaker, dozens of occasions during this session when this will be debated, and what is more than that, Mr. Speaker, that there are dozens of sessions during the previous sessions that we were at where this subject was debated, and therefore when he was running around telling the people of Manitoba that -- pardon me?

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

**MR. ASPER:** The question to the Speaker, or rather to the Minister, is would he be good enough in his offering to explain the value of debate on an issue after he has left the contracts which make debate academic. This adherence --(Interjection)--

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just changed his mind again . . . The honourable member has just changed his mind again, because last week, unless the newspapers did the same injustice to him as they did to me, he said that when he is Premier of Manitoba he's going to break these contracts, so the fact is that legislative debate would be helpful. If you can bring the government down, you can break the contracts and you needn't proceed with the diversion. Isn't that what you said? So you also knew that that statement was incorrect; that it is not correct to say that debate is useless; that not only is debate not useless but it can be very useful.

**MR. PAULLEY:** You better go back to Minnedosa.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, that is what the honourable member said. The honourable member in his remarks, and I now come to the Leader of the Liberal Party, and my time is fleeting so I'll deal with some of the more important observations that I have with regard - to make to his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party knows that if a person doesn't make sensible remarks or he contradicts himself or if he says one thing and does another, that this could hurt his credibility and that in this way if he can demonstrate that a person has made two conflicting remarks, that somehow this demonstrates that he is not doing a proper job. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party said that I did something that I falsely deny, having taken a certain position, and I guess, Mr. Speaker, I've been accused of a lot of things in this House, but I think that this is the first time that I've been accused of falsifying my position; probably members give me the credit for trying to be accurate. But he says that I falsified my remarks because in 1969 I said, we have reason to believe that the same project that the Minister wishes to go ahead with, one of the world's greatest Hydro projects, can be proceeded without the flooding of South Indian Lake. I made the statement; we have reason to believe that this project can go ahead without the flooding of South Indian Lake, and he says that that is a contradiction of the following statement. I would ask him to listen to the statement. When I was in opposition, I indicated that the program that was being advanced by the then administration was not properly researched and that if elected, the New Democratic Party would consider a whole series of alternatives, one of which would involve a low level diversion which would not flood the community of South Indian Lake. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that those two remarks contradict one another; they are not identical remarks;

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . you know, they are not identical remarks. I want the honourable member to know that when we talk about South Indian Lake we talk about two things; we talk about a lake and we talk about a place. --(Interjection)-- Well, I am a lawyer. The honourable member has something against lawyers? I wonder why he went into the legal profession? I wonder why he did so well by it . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder too.

MR. GREEN: . . . that he could earn money and go to Africa. I'm a lawyer, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the average citizen listening to these two remarks would find no contradiction. One was made, Mr. Speaker, in 1969; the other was made in 1973. I did not have a chance to look at one or the other, and the honourable members know that I rarely - as a matter of fact I would say that I never speak from a text. Now the honourable member speaks from a text. Let's see, Mr. Speaker, if we can find two conflicting remarks in the time that the honourable member has been here, whether they are as conflicting or more conflicting or less conflicting. Let's take this remark: "Mr. Speaker, I am able to say that I am happy to acknowledge that on the specific proposals made in the Speech from the Throne, a substantial majority of them are in accordance with the previously stated Liberal policy, and subject to the specific legislation which is brought forward, will receive enthusiastic support of the Liberal Party." That's one statement.

A MEMBER: He said that?

MR. GREEN: Oh, he said that. Mr. Speaker, then take another statement by the same person, which says the following: "We have over 300 points which the Liberal Party has evolved over the past few years and which we have spoken on on many occasions in this Assembly, and all of which I could have catalogued and used as a basis for attack against the inadequacy of the Speech from the Throne. However, we have attempted to do this in the past to indicate to the government the directions which it should be going, and for the most idea, any idea which this government has heard that does not originate with the NDP has generally fallen on deaf ears, at least from the government's side of the House. Those two statements, Mr. Speaker, one said, you know, a substantial majority of what we have done are in accordance with previous Liberal party policy statements. The next statement says that we've attempted to advance Liberal policy statements for many years and what does not originate with the NDP has generally fallen on deaf ears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has not been here six years or seven years. He has not made as many speeches as I have, therefore I have much less room to travel. I could only go back as far back as next year and this year and he's only made a few speeches and, Mr. Speaker, he reads from a text, so he could be more careful about what he says. Mr. Speaker, would you believe that this speech was made not between last year and this year. Mr. Speaker, would you believe that it's not in the same speech, that it's within three paragraphs. Am I talking like a lawyer?

A MEMBER: A politician.

MR. GREEN: Well I am a politician. Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no apology for being a politician and when I have heard you on numerous occasions talking about "these cheap politicians" or making references of that kind that they are politicians . . .

A MEMBER: He was looking in a mirror.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that he regards a politician as something evil, somebody who does tricks, something, Mr. Speaker, which he has modeled himself by in trying to become a politician. Well I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that it will not succeed. Mr. Speaker, last year when he got up in the House and, you know, I'm really not going to have the time, the same as I didn't last year, to deal with some of these suggestions that he's made. But he has referred to hearings. The first time I heard his presentation on this case, and I hope I'm not being unfair to the honourable member, the first thing I heard was that at the environmental council which we have set up so as to stifle people, according to him - and you know it's really peculiar that we have an Environmental Council, the Honourable Member for Osborne says that we named Mr. Axworthy the Chairman so we could say that we won't listen to him - the Environmental Council was made up of anybody who said that they were interested in the environment - anybody regardless of race, creed, color, religion or politics. We put all those people on the council, we told them that they are to have a completely free rein and we

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . told them that they are to elect their own executive. It was they who named Lloyd Axworthy, not I. But the Leader of the Liberal Party saw fit to attend the meeting of this council and at the meeting my impression was that he told the meeting that they would not divert the water from the Churchill River to the Nelson River, that the statement that came after that meeting was that "If Asper's in, flood's out" very similar to what the leader, Mr. Bend said. That's not fair to the honourable member . . .

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

MR. ASPER: A point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a transcript of the hearings of that meeting and the position that was taken at that meeting is the position that the Liberal Party has taken consistently since October 1970, which is that there will be public hearings . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That is not a privilege.

MR. GREEN: And we know what the honourable member's position is and he'll be able to state it again. I will, if it helps me get on with my speech I will withdraw that particular comment and let the honourable member say what he wants to say. What I interpreted his first position was, and I obviously did it incorrectly and I want especially the friends of the Churchill to know that that is not correct, is I interpret his position that they would not flood. He is now telling us that he did not say they would not flood and I think that that should be underlined.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. GREEN: The next position that I heard was that we will not flood, we will hold hearings and we will only flood if it is absolutely necessary, which is of course overwhelming.

MR. PAULLEY: Naturally, overwhelming.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, of course that is the position that we took and that is the bias upon which we proceeded. But, Mr. Speaker, the position has changed again because in the Speech from the Throne he no longer — he doesn't say we will stop the flooding, we will hold hearings or we will do what is absolutely necessary; his position now is that they will hold hearings, and he says nothing about the flooding. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the position in the Speech from the Throne. He says, oh. Mr. Speaker, for many years people have thought that this is the way they can go about things. When I went to university which was at the same time as my honourable friend went to university, there was a writer named Max Strong and at that time the chief target of the university students was the Winnipeg Electric Company. We didn't get satisfactory rates, we didn't like the buses that they put us on, and the Winnipeg Electric Company had like a standing war with the university students. So Max Strong did a take-off on the Winnipeg Electric Company "Take-one's" which you used to pick up on the buses when you went on and his take-off was to make fun of the articles that they did, and one of the articles that he took off on was an article that he headed "Vandalism". And it said there had been terrible vandalism on the buses. A university bus had its seats wantonly slashed. No — a Cathedral Avenue bus had its seats wantonly slashed. Because university students ride on the Cathedral Avenue bus it is assumed that this has been done by university students. Therefore it has been decided to remove the seats from the university students buses. However, in order to have this done fairly we are going to hold a hearing and we are going to see what the students want. The hearing will be held, the results will be tabulated and the seats will be removed.

Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party is now saying is that the hearings will be held, the results will be tabulated, and the diversion will proceed. He has said nothing else, Mr. Speaker, and that is his position on this question. Mr. Speaker, there can be no other position because it is not the fact that anybody can determine hydro policy in an auditorium or by the amount of applause that one expert will get as against the amount of applause that another expert will get. And it is not correct that this government is not listening to the people. Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- the fact is that my honourable friend well knows that if the government was to be interpreted as not listening to the people because it didn't do what its last critics suggested that the Churchill River diversion would have taken place last year when D. L. Campbell and Kristjanson said that the government should be proceeding with the diversion. And I assume that when we didn't do that that the Honourable Member for Wolseley the Leader of the Liberal Party said, or would

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . interpret that as not listening to the people or not listening to advisers,

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has advanced certain reasons why he says the government is not proceeding with this program. They're bad reasons and therefore he deals with them badly, or he deals with them easily because it's easy to defeat a bad reason. He says that we say we are locked into it, that we say that other things, there were three reasons, one of which was that it's too late, we're already committed, that if we don't proceed with the Churchill River and South Indian Lake thousands of jobs will be lost to Manitoba. I don't remember that argument ever being advanced.

Mr. Speaker, we have never said that we are too late, that we are already committed; we have said that this is a committed program but we also say that it is a good program. It is the best program. We are willing to fight the program on its merits and we are willing to fight it in this House, outside of this House or on the election tours as the honourable members says . . . . He's now got an out by the way. He's now found his out. He says that by the time the election comes there will be so much money committed in contracts that he won't be able to pull people out of the diversion and therefore he's got it every which way. He will say then that we are committed, too much money has already been spent and we can't get out of it. We do not say that, Mr. Speaker. We say that this a good program, that this is a program which has been carefully researched. This is a program which contrary to what has happened in the past, every single document has been - every single report, can't say every document there has been interdepartmental documents that we have not filed - but every single report -- I'm sorry, I've only got five minutes and I have one very important point to deal with. Because the honourable member last year said that our inclusion of a particular thing in a particular act was a demonstration of the nature of the government, the character of socialists who want to pry into other people's affairs. He has also tried to characterize us in the same way and he's done it again. He fell into the same trap with regard to the same person. He's trying to characterize us as being somehow bad people. Doesn't say that we are proceeding wrongly, that we have made an error in judgment, that we are bad people - I'll use the words: "so incomprehensible, so beyond belief; so unreasonable that one must conclude that the government has something to hide, perhaps it has made a mistake; violates fundamental civil rights and principles of justice; indefensible action in refusing to hold hearings; and most arrogant in refusing to hold hearings."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have very good authority which I'm sure that if not the Member for Wolseley, that the Member for Assiniboia, the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Member for Carillon will accept the fact that because a person doesn't feel that hearings should be held in this type of case, doesn't mean that he's arrogant, doesn't mean that he violates fundamental civil rights, doesn't mean that it is indefensible. Who would you like for an authority? Would you believe D. L. Campbell? Would that be a good authority? Same person that you ran up against last time. We had this out at Public Utilities, Mr. Speaker, and I ask you to refer to the report, June 1, 1971, I checked this with my honourable friend, there are some errors in the transcript which sometimes happen which I assure you don't change the meaning of what I am saying, After Mr. Campbell spoke, the Chairman said: "I have Mr. Green, Mr. Spivak, Mr. Craik. These are people to ask questions. "The Leader of the Liberal Party should listen because he's just characterized a man very well respected in his party, as arrogant, violating civil rights, etc. Then the Chairman says, "I have Mr. Green, Mr. Spivak, Mr. Beard" and then the transcript says Mr. Craik - calling on Mr. Craik - it was Mr. Green that he called on and I checked that with Mr. Craik early this afternoon and he agrees that it's most probably my questions because it's not questions that he would have asked. "Mr. Campbell are you convinced as a result of all of the information that you have had access to as a result of being a member of the board that the Hydro should now" it says here "not" but it's "now" - proceed with, and I will use the word without precision, a medium level diversion of the Churchill River to the Nelson River? Mr. Campbell: Yes. Mr. Craik: Then you would proceed with that program now? Answer. Yes. But you wouldn't call a hearing I would do better than have a hearing. There was a hearing held and the views of the people are well known. I would do better. I would suggest that the government itself, representatives of the government themselves, should go right in there and discuss this question with the local people."

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

The Premier of this province has been there twice discussing this question with the local people and we will be there on many occasions. But just in case, in case there's any question of what is being said here, "But you have indicated that you would proceed with the program and that is all that I ask you. You said that you now have the information, it has all been tabulated, the results have been tabulated and the seats will be removed and that the program should be proceeded with now but you wouldn't have a hearing to see if you should go ahead with it. "This is the program", this is Mr. Campbell. "It has been decided upon".

Now, Mr. Speaker, would anybody have the political cynicism - I called it fraud and I say it is fraud to go about staging a hearing where people can come and get things off their chest just for the purpose of making them feel that they are doing something, knowing that the program has been decided. -- (Interjection) -- Well he says he wouldn't do it. He said, Mr. Speaker, first of all he said that there will be a hearing, they will go ahead if it's absolutely . . . I'm concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Now he says that they will have a hearing, now he says that he won't change the programs because contracts are let. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what he is saying.

MR. PAULLEY: He doesn't either.

MR. GREEN: I brought this point up not to challenge the hearing principle. I brought the point up because I want to know if the Leader of the Opposition says that D. L. Campbell is arrogant, is trampling on civil rights, is doing an indefensible thing: by not holding a hearing where he knows that the program is decided upon and is willing to face the public fully responsible for what we have done. (Hear, hear.)

MR. SPEAKER: According to our rule 35, subsection 2, on the fifth day of debate if there is amendment to the amendment it must be put before the House. I shall therefore now put the question to the House.

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

A MEMBER: . . . . . a division on that

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The motion before the House is the amendment to the amendment in reply to the Throne Speech.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS

Asper	Ferguson	Watt	McKenzie
Barkman	Froese	F. Johnston	Moug
Bilton	Girard	Jorgenson	Patrick
Blake	Graham	McGill	Sherman
Craik	Henderson	McGregor	Spivak
Enns	G. Johnston	McKellar	Trueman

NAYS

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 30.

MR. SPEAKER. I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see we're running out of time on the clock; however I would like to make my contribution, I think probably I can get it in the 15 minutes. And I'd like to start off, Sir, by congratulating you once again on your position as Speaker of the House. Your fairness in the periods that you have served in the previous years, previous sessions has shown that you are a fair and just adjudicator. I'm sure you

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd)... . . . will carry on this way again this year and I would like to congratulate you again, Sir, on your appointment.

To the mover, the Member from Flin Flon, I would like to also offer my congratulations. He and I are noted as the two most vociferous fellows in the Chamber and on this particular occasion he acquitted himself very well and I would also like to congratulate him.

To the seconder, the Member from Radisson, I see he's not in his place, — he's the Whip of the party and a fellow that I have quite a bit to do with over there. I didn't know that he was an economist but he gave quite a speech the other day in the seconding, and to him also I offer my congratulations.

And in the loss of the Member from Churchill, he was a Neepawa boy, never a constituent of mine of course but he was raised in the Town of Neepawa, and I would at this time like to offer my condolences to his wife and I'm sure that he will be missed both in the Chamber and in his home.

Now we get into the Throne Speech. We had the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources tonight not in his usual form; he was pacing himself, he didn't allow himself to become upset but he managed to put in the hour and a half and he didn't really have the spurs on tonight, I've seen them when they are on a lot worse. However he did pat the government on the back for what they had done in the past few years. Mind you he didn't mention what they anticipated doing in the future. He also said that in the period of time that they had been in power there had been no tax increases. I think I would like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, that in 1969 the budget was \$398 million; in 1970 it was \$448 million; in 1971 it was \$516 million and in 1972 it was \$575 million, but this was all done without any increase in taxation according to the Honourable Member from Inkster.

Now I would like to make a few comments on the Throne Speech. I expect that possibly this will be the last one before an election. And the comments I would like to make mostly, Mr. Speaker, will be how it affects my constituents and basically there are some good clauses in the Speech from the Throne. No one that has spoke up to this point have criticized the benefits to our senior citizens. I think we all recognize the fact that they are the people who developed our province and we were willing to suffer through a little taxation to make their retirement and reclining years more comfortable. I think we all recognize this fact. However, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to face the fact that there has been quite a discrepancy or a neglect of the middle income people. We're facing again we may as well say the highest taxation in Canada — income tax — this particular group of people. However our businessmen also find themselves in a position whereby not only do they have the taxation, which doesn't leave them in a competitive position with other provinces, but they have the ever present shadow of government over their shoulder and government takeover. Now I don't think that any businessman or most businessmen are going to take a long hard look at the Province of Manitoba when they are bucking high taxation and also the fact that government takeover's facing them. Now I think that the mover suggested that there would be more government takeover of business. He suggested fire and life insurance. We have a report the other day from Professor Kierans dealing with the mining what will take place in this. We have no way of knowing, I don't know whether the government knows or not but it certainly has upset the mining industry. I think that anyone who saw the news tonight will have had a pretty good idea of what the mining people are thinking and where their dollars are going to be invested.

We also have the NDP manifesto published, in circulation in November, whereby they're going to move into the banking business, holding companies, basically a takeover of the economy. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if incentive is going to be stifled in this province and it's going to continue to prosper and grow that there has got to be some recognition of this facet of people to give them some incentive, get them back to work and so they're willing to take a little bit of risk and gamble a little bit.

I'd like to also, Mr. Speaker, at this time comment briefly on agriculture. There has been quite a change in the attitude of our Minister of Agriculture in the past year and a half. Up to that point he was supply management sticking out his ears and every egg was going to be numbered, every hog was going to be numbered and all of a sudden we find ourselves in a buoyant market caused by the law of supply and demand. It was unfortunate that the two great socialist nations of the world, Russia and China, chose the same time to have a crop failure

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd). . . . and bring this condition about -- (Interjection) -- Well my colleague says, caused by bungling bureaucracy, and I believe that there may be more truth than fiction to this statement as I think that the people involved in the production of agricultural products in these nations are considerably greater than they are in either Canada or the United States and there's certainly no competitor or no competitive deals showing as far as the amount produced per person involved in agriculture.

We also are being faced with a proliferation of boards . In 1969 and 70 I can remember where there were two rows of seats taken in the Speaker's gallery by a stalwart group of men; as the boards and commissions formed the ranks up there dwindles and we find ourselves now with basically there are none of them up there tonight.

A MEMBER: They're all sitting on boards and commissions.

MR. FERGUSON: Some of them now I understnad are holding down three positions on boards and commissions that have been

A MEMBER: Travelling all over the world.

MR. FERGUSON: . . . and looking at the boards that have been formed, Mr. Speaker, we have the Hog Marketing Board, an Egg Marketing Board - milk was in before - Feed Grain Board. But I would like to dwell on the Hog Producers Board a moment, and this is supposedly open government. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in his speech -- he usually said that they were going to disclose, they would disclose what had gone on. Now we have had a sale of pork to Japan, there has been no price announced; there has been a levy on hogs of 1 1/4 percent; basically last year I think we marketed a million hogs. This to me represents a factor of well over a million dollars that's been skimmed off the top of the hog producer. What is going to be the disposition of this money? I'm sure that the Minister when his turn comes to speak on agriculture will tell us what the pork was sold to Japan for; what they're going to be doing with this million dollars; we now have a price of hogs I believe today it's about 48.65. This is definitely just about double the intake into the board and we're all quite interested in knowing where this money is going to be used.

Another thing I would like to mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, is the cattle industry. I am directly involved in that and I think that we've been quite able to take care of ourselves. We haven't asked for any boards, commissions or anything else. At the local level auction marts have been established in the rural areas, they have been successful in moving the feed cattle, to a great deal the fed and finished cattle, and in the Province of Manitoba there are now a considerable number operating. As we move into an expansion of livestock, encouraged by government, which I have no fault to find with. The 20 percent forgivable clause is quite a good thing, but the young fellow goes to the bank, he borrows his money, he goes to the auction ring and the . . . picks up the 20 percent right off the bat, because we're not having an increase in cattle herds, I don't think that we'll find it in the province; we're having a reshuffle, a lot of these young fellows are buying cattle that are culls from other herds and they're going to have a tough time bailing themselves out. Mind you, this has nothing to do with the principle of the loan, it's good enough, but we're involving people in the business that haven't had experience at it and some of them are going to get burnt.

Another thing I would like to talk about is the Federal Government's abandonment of the sales tax in regard to family farms. We argued this through the Succession Duty Bill here last session, and I feel that - I don't believe that the Succession Duty should be completely removed, but I believe that it should be on an equal basis with our provinces. And if we're all so interested in maintaining a family farm, we have the "stay" option, as a coined phrase beginning to be used - it will be used considerably, I expect that will be one of the highlights of the Minister of Agriculture's election speeches will be the "stay" option, what is being done to encourage people on the farm. And I think we've got to allow some . . . of cattle to be left with the family farms to take care of adjustments whereby you're going into diversification, possibly from grain to cattle, possibly to special crops or whatever the case might be; and I think it would be a far better deal to leave some of the money in the family farms rather than take it by taxation and then scramble to lend it back at some rate that we're possibly not that interested in getting.

Also, Mr. Speaker, all levels of government, both provincial and federal, are asking for an increase at this time due to our world market buoyancy, etc., and apparently the farmers are answering the call again. Fertilizer sales in January have reached the same proportion as they did last year in the total deal, total season, and I think that they are once

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) . . . . more going to answer the call and produce a crop, weather permitting. But I think there's something else we've got to face here, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we're running into a group of old men left on the farms, and we can't entice them on the farms, we can't entice our young men to stay on a farm where they come into the city, most of them don't have any trouble getting jobs, they're still willing to work, and on a 40-hour week, and it's pretty tough to be sitting out on a tractor working 18 hours a day on a long weekend or something, and watch the cars go by, and they're just not going to do it.

Another thing, we now are building our markets up in countries that we have never been able to get into before, get our foot in the door in the markets, and I wonder if this government or any of our governments, federal especially, are contemplating any legislation whereby if we have a market that our produce is going to be delivered and shipped out to our customers. The situation with Japan over the past years has shown what can happen to our markets. I think in 1959 -- I'm just quoting off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker, I could be wrong. -- our sales were about 19 million bushels of wheat. After the first grain handlers' strike they dropped about 48 million bushels, and I think the last year or two they've been down to about 27 million bushels. And the big end of it, Mr. Speaker, has not been caused by a poor quality or a high price, it's been caused by the lack of ability to deliver our produce when it's supposed to be and on time of course.

I'd like to mention Hydro very briefly, Mr. Speaker. We've gone on at this at great length and I expect that every speaker's going to say something about it. The only thing that I would like to comment on is the fact that in the Throne Speech it says that substantial sales have been made to various provinces and states, and I think that since 1969 when this government came to power the work had started on the diversion; we've lost three years, we're blessed with a river system that is -- well, it doesn't have to take a back seat from any system in the world, and I think that this government is in power, they're going ahead and I would say, get on with the job and sell the power. If there is something wrong, they're going to have to accept the responsibility for it. -- (Interjection) -- That's fine.

I think that also I would like to comment a bit on rail abandonment. 1975 as we all know is going to be the cut-off date when we're going to be really facing the rail abandonment issue, and it's in the rule, it definitely is going to be quite a factor. The road system isn't good enough in a lot of cases to move the produce;

where it's been going two or three miles it's probably going to have to go 10, 15, 20 miles. I think that possibly the government should consider grants to municipalities where lines are abandoned, because I'm sure that the municipalities are not in a position to carry any more financial load at this time. School costs are mounting. In my own particular area watershed is going to be taking a 3 - 5 mill slice out of taxes again this year. This is going to have to be definitely an increase on the budget and an increase on the taxpayer, and I don't think the taxpayer is going to be in a position to be able to carry too much more of a load in this confined period.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived, the honourable member will be able to continue tomorrow.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning.