

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 11, 1975

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to acknowledge to honourable members their applause, which I hope will not be unjustified. I will attempt to make a contribution to the House, as have done other members prior to me and as I have attempted to do in every Throne Speech that has been read since my entry to the House in 1966.

I, first of all, Mr. Speaker, would like to wish yourself the best that you would wish for yourself in the operation of the proceedings of the House, and I would also want to welcome the new member - who is not in his seat - my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface. One of the aspects of the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is back in the House - and honourable members will recall that moments have not always been, you know, that easy as between myself and the Member for St. Boniface, as a matter of fact, there have been occasions when the Opposition side have had the opportunity to smile at the remarks that have been exchanged between he and I - but the most significant feature of his return, I believe, is that there seems to be a sense of unreality to all of the suggestions being made by the Opposition of impending doom on the part of the government and the fact that the Liberal Party is an irrelevance and that more and more people are running to the Conservatives. I am aware that each constituency has its peculiarities, but I would think that a party that has just been involved in an election, which is a test of public support, and has received such a minimal share of the popular vote, would at least not be so bold as to suggest that everybody is running from the government party, which has just won the election, to the party in opposition, which has just lost the election and run a bad third, and that the Liberal Party, which ran a very respectable second -- I won't say "close" because we in Manitoba know what close elections are; I mean if there are more than 20 votes, it's a landslide, so that we can't really call it close -- but that one has to sort of take these remarks in perspective and realize that there is a sense of unreality to the suggestion that wholesale changes of the public opinion are taking place within the province and that they all point in lines which can be clearly delineated and which are clearly indicated. So I'm not going to try to sustain my entire position on the election of the Member for St. Boniface, but I do think that for those who are carried away with the surge to the Opposition that they seem to feel is there, they will have to explain away at least that particular result.

I also, Mr. Speaker, do want to indicate that the House has moved very quickly into a debate which is emphasizing the differences, philosophical differences, as between the parties. I think that that debate at times, up until now, and I expect it will continue, has developed in the same way that kind of a debate can develop, that people feel very strongly about their positions, that in feeling very strongly they extend themselves as far as they can. Some are able to do it within the restraint of good debating, and I was particularly impressed - and I would have to say so - with the contribution that was made yesterday by the Member for Fort Garry. Though I couldn't agree with some of the things he said, I did find that the Member for Fort Garry had, for what I thought was the first time in the House, really unleashed the real him in making a speech which he felt very much, in which he indicated his commitment to serve the Conservative Party, and I think that that is the kind of thing that is welcome in the House and the kind of thing that one should expect from both sides of the House. Members on this side will also from time to time -- and I think that the Member for Gimli probably made the same type of presentation, that for the first time we saw the real John. He indicated what he himself, rather than reading from a prepared text, rather than mouthing something that he had written down, he spoke with feeling about his position within this party and why he thought that we would be the ones that should be supported for the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm moving rather slowly. I do want to indicate that I am a bit casual because the Premier has indicated that on this particular amendment, that is the amendment of the Member for Portage la Prairie, that his time will be available to me. That will not preclude him from using his full allocation of time on the main motion but it will also permit me to perhaps develop my thoughts in a manner less pressing than has been imposed on some of the other members, for which I am grateful to the Premier and I hope

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) will not impose too much upon the time of honourable members. There are reasons for this having occurred, essentially because one of the main criticisms that has been made by the Opposition members, and one of the main topics of discussion relative to the Throne Speech Debate, has been the Manitoba Development Corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are in every debate, you know, matters which really are said because they are the thing to say, and everybody in the House knows that they don't mean a great deal but nevertheless one person or another is going to make the remarks. And I mention some of these small things so that we try to eliminate the wheat from the chaff -- is that the correct expression . . . agricultural member? We know, for instance, that when the Leader of the Opposition says that after six years they are still talking about municipal financing, that that is not a very significant remark. We all know that if we are here for another ten years we will still be talking about municipal finance, and we know that in the Province of Ontario where they have a Conservative administration, that after thirty years they are still talking about municipal financing. So when he leaves the suggestion that after six years of government that the problem of municipal financing should have been solved, we know that he is only making Opposition noises and we forgive him for it, but we still know that it doesn't make a great deal of sense, and that when he says that after six years we are still talking about educational financing, we in this House know that we will be here another six years or another ten years, and that it won't matter which government is in power, that they will still be talking about educational financing, and the fact that this party has been in power for six years and has not solved that problem is not much of a criticism to make of this government.

We hear the type of statement that may have some rhetoric but which all of us are aware really has no meaning, when there is some suggestion that people on this side are not really sincere, and I will hastily have to admit that the kind of thing that comes from that side often comes from this side of the House too, and I will try to in advance say that when it comes from me it should be discounted in the same way, and when it comes from members on this side it should be discounted in the same way. But there is some suggestion that people on the other side are interested in good government for the people of Manitoba, whereas people on this side are merely interested - and to repeat the words of the Leader of the Opposition - the profound observation that they are merely there to take their turn at the public trough. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, that is a very interesting observation to be made by the Leader of the Opposition. He says, Mr. Speaker, "take their turn at the public trough." Now, what does that really mean? What does it mean to members on that side? It means that somebody was there before and that somebody is now taking their turn. Well, he was there before, Mr. Speaker, and maybe he regards the taking of the turn as we doing what he did.

Now I can't, Mr. Speaker, make that type of observation - and I think that there are members in this side of the House who will agree that I sat for three years on the Opposition benches, Mr. Speaker - I cannot recall, and if I'm wrong I stand to be corrected, but I cannot recall making a single accusation against the integrity or honesty of a member of the Opposition side of the House, or sincerity of that member of the Opposition side of the House. Not, if I am erring as to my own observations, then I will stand to be corrected, but I do not recall it, and I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition in using that kind of remark is really reflecting on his own position and not on members here, because, Mr. Speaker, for myself, and if one needs to become personal when one has suggested that he is taking his turn at the trough, I say that for myself and for most of the members who I sit with, very few of us drank at the public trough.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I grew up around the same time as the Leader of the Opposition. He knows me and I know him personally. I know that he knows that I worked for many types of organizations. I worked for public organizations, I worked for private business, I received cheques from the organizations of which he was a member and director, I received cheques from the federal Treasury who paid me for my work. The Honourable Member for Riel has so charitably pointed out that I received cheques from lawyers who paid me for my work. I received cheques from private clients, I received cheques from public clients. I don't know that the Honourable Member for River Heights - and he will have to correct me - ever received a cheque from anybody except his own family firm or the public trough. But there's nobody else whom he ever got the confidence to pay

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) him anything. So when he talks about the public trough - and he is the one who introduced that kind of thing into this debate - and when he talks about the turn at the public trough, let us recall that what he is talking about is his attitude toward serving the public and being paid by the public, not the attitude of members on this side of the House; that most of the members on the front benches of this government either worked for others or worked for themselves, and they did not enter the public service because they couldn't make a living in any other way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the small things. Another one of the small things that come up in debate, which I'll deal with later, is the fact that he seems to have developed a new attitude towards how we deal with independent commissions and independent inquiries. I remember when I was a member of the Opposition side of the House that it was considered virtually a breach of privilege to talk about somebody who was given an independent appointment, as if they somehow were not doing an independent job. Mr. Speaker, I can recall that the Conservative administration appointed a Commission of Inquiry - the Member for Portage la Prairie was here; I was not - dealing with the Grand Rapids Inquiry. The lawyer, I don't know who it was, I think it was D. Thompson, the judge was Mr. Justice Tritschler. During the terms of that inquiry a very peculiar thing happened. The Speaker said the matter could not be discussed in the House because it was in the hands of the Inquiry. The Inquiry Commissioner said it could not be discussed before the Inquiry because it was a proper subject for legislative authority. Now I am obviously simplifying, but if there were a Member of the House who was to suggest that Mr. Justice Tritschler was somehow not doing his job as an impartial inquirer, Mr. Speaker, he would have incurred the wrath and condemnation of the entire status quo membership of the House and also of the media within society and from all the best drawing rooms and country clubs and other places where these subjects would be brought into discussion.

But times have changed, Mr. Speaker - yes, times have changed. Now Mr. Justice C. Rhodes Smith is named to be the head of an inquiry. Leon Mitchell is named to sit on that inquiry, and Professor Donnelly. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mitchell was my former law partner. There is absolutely no doubt of it. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely --(Interjection)-- you're asking who Tritschler was a partner of. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to go to that level, I am going to say that my good friend, who I have respect for but apparently you don't, Maurice Chartrand, was a special advisor to the Premier of this province and was lawyer before the Brandon Packers Inquiry; that Mr. Justice Tritschler was always a good friend of the Conservative Party before he became a judge, and he was appointed Commissioner for the Brandon Packers Inquiry. And when Mr. Bob Russell after the inquiry issued his report, saw fit to question as to whether Mr. Justice Tritschler really knew about industrial relations on which he purported to make a report, he was condemned by all of the editorial pages in this province and by the members of the Conservatives in this House as somehow daring to challenge the integrity of an independent body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Leon Mitchell was my partner is not a reflection on his integrity, and one has to look at the report, one has --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Riel will think so, and I say that that is because we are now in a different system. Mr. Speaker, we are now operating . . . (Interjection)--

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

MR. CRAIK: It was a point of his bad judgment, his bad judgment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Before we proceed, if members will stop interjecting, then they won't be misinterpreted. Only one man has the floor and that's the only thing that's being recorded. The rest of the interjections will therefore not necessarily be correct. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to have my judgment questioned by the people of Manitoba, which they will do every time, and I am satisfied that the judgment exercised in the appointment of that commission was excellent judgment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the only way that the Member for Riel would be satisfied with a commission report is if it said that the Conservatives did everything right and the New Democrats did everything bad; that would be an independent impartial inquiry. Anything less would be somehow dupes of the government or a -- and I use now -- it's been suggested that

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) the Inquiry Commission, that there was no reflection on its impartiality. What do the words used by the Leader of the Opposition mean? "So-called impartial inquiry." What does that mean? That means that it was an impartial inquiry. That's what it means. Oh, is that what the definition is, that when the Leader of the Opposition says "so-called impartial" it means "without a doubt impartial"?

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the times have changed; that what has happened is just what I said to the members of the Farm Bureau, that the people who they saw as being impartial because they agreed with them are now not accepted by the government. They said they did use a disservice, the Farm Bureau -- no it wasn't the Farm Bureau, excuse me . . .

A MEMBER: Dr. Hare.

MR. GREEN: Dr. Hare - did use a disservice, did the Conservatives the disservice of saying that if the Conservatives went out and campaigned on a platform of no purchase of public lands, no purchase of farm lands by the public, and won a majority, let's say 40 seats, on that platform, that they should then not institute that policy but that they should appoint an impartial inquiry to determine whether there should be purchases of lands, of farm lands, from private people, and that this impartial inquiry would look very closely at the facts and they would determine what the case was to be, not the people who are elected on the platform.

Now I asked the members of the Farm Bureau, not Mr. Hare, well, I am going to suggest an impartial inquiry: Mr. Charles Hunt, Mr. Max Hofford, and Mr. Roy Atkinson. How's that for an inquiry? Well, after five seconds of being stunned, Mr. Chairman, they laughed that that type of suggestion could be made. So I said, "Well, what's the matter?" Ten years ago, Bill Parker, deceased, Runciman, and George Tritschler would have been a perfect impartial Inquiry. But that's their definition of an impartial inquiry.

Now I prefer not to suggest that things are being done by an impartial inquiry when they are not being done by an impartial inquiry. But let us recall that the CFI Inquiry had on it, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice C. Rhodes Smith, a Judge of the Supreme Court of the Province of Manitoba; Mr. Donnelly, a political scientist; and Mr. Mitchell, a distinguished lawyer in the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba, a lawyer who has been hired probably by more composite citizens in this province than any other lawyer, because he happens to act for groups of citizens and did for many groups of citizens. So I say that he was a very good appointment for that particular job. But is the Member for Riel suggesting that Mr. Mitchell, if there was a suggestion of lack of integrity, could somehow cause Mr. Smith, Mr. C. Rhodes Smith, former Attorney-General of this House, former Chairman of the National Labour Relations Board, that he could somehow cause him to suddenly favour the New Democratic Party in making his report? Well that's the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have to accept, because when upstarts . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker . . . on the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member state his point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Sir, I don't recall using the word "integrity" which has been attributed to me by the Minister of Mines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the fact that the honourable member does not know the word "integrity", would not use it, and it should not be applied when referring to the Member for Riel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's get to some of the matters of substance that were dealt with in the Throne Speech Debate, because there were matters of substance. And, you know, we have some problems. Every government has problems and every government knows that the Opposition can zero in and deal with those problems. Well, Mr. Speaker, it works both ways. You know, some of the times I come in here wondering how I'm going to be able to deal with some of the weighty problems that are on my mind, and then we are saved by the Opposition, because they don't want to deal with the problems, which are bad enough, but they have to try to compound them as if they are ten times worse, and in compounding them they make themselves look non-credible.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a problem with the regulation of Lake Winnipeg, and there was a problem with the Water Commission and dissension on the board, etc., and we had to deal with those questions. How were we saved on that question? How were we saved?

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) How was our political position saved? Saved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, in response to that question, said that the licence is illegal, that the licence says that they will be regulated between 711 and 715, and we have a scientific document that says that in one year it's going to go up to 715.3 and I don't remember the exact figure, but he said 715.3 and therefore it's an illegal licence and therefore the whole procedure has been damned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition had a pretty good point about how the Water Commission was having difficulty in interpreting government policy, and the government was dissatisfied with the way the Water Commission was conducting hearings. We were embarrassed by it. Perhaps there was some credit accruing to the Opposition on that point. But when the Leader of the Opposition made the statement that the licence was illegal, he was implying that a licence which says regulation between 711 and 715 kept the water below 715; and nobody, Mr. Speaker, nobody that knows anything about water regulations could support that position. The Leader of the Opposition does that on so many occasions that it makes it easier, Mr. Speaker, for us to deal with these questions.

Now how did he do it with regard to the Manitoba Development Corporation? There are problems, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Manitoba Development Corporation, and the Government is aware of these problems and the public is aware of these problems. How does the Leader of the Opposition choose to deal with these problems? I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it was a fairly well-accepted fact by all members in the House - I can remember the Member for Charleswood, other members, indicating that we were at least correct on this point - that the Manitoba Development Corporation was not set up as a conventional financial institution, that the Manitoba Development Corporation was set up because the existing financial institutions were not sufficient and that because there was needed - despite the fact that we had a free enterprise system - that there was needed an additional government thrust to not replace the free enterprise system, but to deal with those things that the free enterprise system didn't handle, so that the economy was not left at the sole option of that particular system. I thought that that was generally accepted. Do the Members of the Conservative Party now suggest that the Manitoba Development Corporation was set up as a business institution to go into business in the regular way in the Province of Manitoba? There's no way that you would accept that. So we all agree. And when it was raised in the House last year that we knew that there would be problems with this organization because it was a lender of last resort, there wasn't a breath of an objection to that suggestion. And, Mr. Speaker, if it needs any confirmation, and I know that these people like to listen to what the Chamber of Commerce says, I saw the Chamber of Commerce representative on the news tonight, who said that if the government goes into this position of removing that particular clause, it will remove what the Development Corporation was set up for in the first place, and that is to be a lender of last resort so that it would not interfere with normal business practices in these lending agencies. So if they need that confirmation, they have that confirmation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made a very big point on this. He said, "Have they not read the Act? This is the clearest statement of incompetence that we have from this government." And I've got to feel a twinge, then, because the Manitoba Development Corporation is under my particular ministerial portfolio, and I'm being told that that is not the purpose of the Manitoba Development Corporation; that the Act does not contain such a section; and I am in the Throne Speech repealing a section which is not contained in the Act. Now I'm in trouble. I mean, you would agree he's got me over a barrel. I'm in very bad shape. I have not read the Act so I have to start looking for sections, Mr. Speaker. And what he said was that the Minister of Industry and Commerce said in 1971, I believe, that the Development Corporation is intended to be not only as a -- I don't know if he used the word "only", but to expand the role of the Development Corporation from a lender of last resort so that it will not be merely a lender of last resort. But, Mr. Speaker, he didn't say that it could then start loaning on a conventional basis. All that the Minister of Industry was saying is that it would cease to be solely a lender; that up until that time, all that the Development Corporation had done was to lend money, and that's why you had the peculiar situation of the Development Corporation agreeing to lend 100 percent of the cost of building the Churchill Forest Industry Complex. The whole thing was to cost \$92 million, they agreed

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) to lend \$92 million rather than take an equity because they acted only as a lender of last resort. All that the Minister of Industry was saying was that they would not be only a lender of last resort.

But if you don't believe that I am correctly interpreting the Minister of Industry, then, Mr. Speaker -- the Leader of the Opposition says I've not read the Act. So I have to look in the Act. I have to find something to repeal, because we say in the Throne Speech we're going to repeal something. Well let's look and see if there's anything to repeal. Well here's something. Here's a kind of a cute one. If I can somehow make this one into the one that I repeal, I'm saved: 7 (1) The Corporation shall not make a loan if, in its opinion, the applicant for the loan can obtain sufficient funds for his requirements from other sources on reasonable terms. Saved! Saved by the bell, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't it but I got this one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member doesn't believe the Act when it says that it can only act as a lender of last resort - at least we have something to repeal now. Now all we have to do -- you know, we're safe to that extent. Now we have to find an argument that that means that it is a lender of last resort. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he won't believe me, you know, so let's find somebody who he will believe. --(Interjection)-- Well, maybe he wouldn't believe Mr. Evans. I'm talking about the former Minister of Industry, Mr. Gurney Evans, but I won't say anything unkind about him at this point. But this is what Mr. Evans said: "The second principle which is built into the Bill" - this is October 27, 1958 - is the explicit instructions to the board to co-operate with ordinary sources of capital. Criticism has been suggested to me along this line, that there are instructions in here, for example, that no loan is to be made until the borrower is able to satisfy the board that he cannot get his requirements at a reasonable price from the ordinary sources of capital. A deduction might follow from that, that perhaps the board will inherit only what is sometimes described as the lemons, or the overly risky loans."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to be fair to Mr. Evans, he then says that that deduction should not be agreed to, that that is not necessarily what will take place. But Mr. Evans said that that is the only loans that they are to take and that somebody might make the deduction - and I think that he is certainly making a fair prediction that that deduction can be made - that if he can only take loans that everybody else refuses, that you will be acting as a lender of last resort and that you might inherit only what might be described as the lemons or the overly risky loans. Now that's what Mr. Evans says.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he may not believe Mr. Evans, because, you know, Cabinet Ministers don't always agree with one another. Members on the front bench on the other side don't always agree with one another. Today's Cabinet Minister or today's front bench might disagree with what a Cabinet Minister said five years ago. But the honourable member, he has a friend. There's somebody who he says we should believe no matter what he says. The Leader of the Opposition seems to rest his case on the Provincial Auditor, that what the Provincial Auditor says is law. Well, will the honourable member agree with me - and he can confirm it when he has the opportunity - that the Provincial Auditor in commenting on the guidelines that were arrived at between the board and myself, indicated that the guidelines do not make it clear that the Fund is not to lend money except as a lender of last resort, and that those were instructions that were given to me by the Provincial Auditor?

So, with a good case, with a good case of dealing with a difficult situation that the Fund was in, in connection with moneys, why does the Leader of the Opposition take a good case and make it ludicrous for himself by suggesting that there is nothing in the Act now to indicate that this Fund is a lender of last resort, something which everybody in this House has accepted? And why has everybody in this House really accepted that position? Not to be charitable to us. Mr. Speaker, they have accepted it because they know that they were in the same problem as we are in. It is now somehow being suggested - and I heard the Leader of the Opposition say this - that they were the ones who started lending money in this way. Why are they now complaining? Well, Mr. Speaker, those are just not the facts. Let us appreciate, first of all, that almost every province in Canada operates on the same basis; but secondly, that the Conservative Government - and we did not criticize that portion of it, and I'll come to it in a moment - that the Conservative Government operated on exactly the same basis and knew that, in dealing with the Corporation, that there may be losses because

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) they are acting as a venturesome organization to do things that would not be done by private capital. And there is some attempt now - and the Premier last year described it as some sort of amnesia - to forget that we were involved. The Member for Fort Garry says, "Okay, you were a lender of last resort, but nobody stuck a gun in your belly and told you to make those loans." Oh, I don't know who stuck a gun into whose belly or what was stuck into somebody's belly, but something was stuck into Rex Grose's belly to make him agree to advance \$92 million to Churchill Forest Industries. And that is the testimony that he gave.

A MEMBER: On whose advice?

MR. GREEN: On the legal advice of Walter C. Newman. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I am talking about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. GREEN: Okay. I am talking about the commitments, I am talking about the commitments to advance -- they won't, you know -- talk about being willing to accept responsibility! I will accept the responsibility, as a member of this government, that after we came into power we fulfilled the commitments, all of which were signed prior to July 15th of 1969, to advance 92 million of dollars to that complex; everyone of those commitments signed before this government came into power. Mr. Speaker, I will also assume responsibility that we paid out moneys during the term of that contract, that we paid out the major . . .

SOME MEMBERS: How much?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the responsibility that we paid out the major part of that moneys. I will accept the responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, I will accept the responsibilities that for a period of time we relied on, and were wrong in relying on, the written advice and representations of the man that they called 'Mr. Manitoba', Mr. Rex Grose, and I say that we were wrong. And I'll say, Mr. Speaker, another thing: that we would not have been praised if we had done anything else; and, Mr. Speaker, that when we announced that this man and us were no longer together, that I will never forget the speech that was made by the Member for Riel. Mr. Speaker, he didn't say, "You were right to get rid of him; that guy's been costing you dollars and dollars. You've been spending money without invoices." Mr. Speaker, do you know what he said, the Member for Riel? (I've even got a smile out of him.) Mr. Speaker, you know what he said at that time? He said, Mr. Speaker: "Today the Detroit Red Wings have released Gordie Howe." Mr. Speaker, he then went on to talk as if this was the saddest blow that could occur to the Manitoba Development Corporation in our existence.

Now the honourable members are going to try to suggest, they are going to try to suggest - and this will be their story to the people of Manitoba and I will be happy to fight it and try to fight it with integrity - he's going to try to suggest this: that if the Conservative Government was elected in July of 1969 and continued, that in November they would have cut off CFI, they would have stopped it, and they would not have continued with the project; they would have spent \$40 million and they would have said that they don't want to deal with this person any more; that they would have gone to court with Kasser, and that there would have been a successful termination and that they would be up there with half a project. That will be their position. Our position was that we had a contract to fulfill; that we fulfill that contract; that we did it on the best legal advice that was available; that we did it on the advice of the best consultants; and that we stepped in when it became absolutely necessary.

And what was the suggestion when we stepped in? Was the suggestion, "Oh, you guys did a good thing. You stepped in and you're going to save the project"? Mr. Speaker, when I was examined by the lawyer for the Conservative Party, and when others were examined, the suggestion was not that we stepped in because there was anything wrong, but that we stepped in because we wanted to grab for the state that particular project. And that's what the inquiry was all about. People have a short memory. When we started the Inquiry, we started the Inquiry so that the public would know that we were not stepping in for the purpose of doing somebody out of their rightful property, but that we were stepping in because the province had to safeguard the moneys of the people of Manitoba. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if there was some, if there was some delay in stepping in and that if somebody who looks at it

March 11, 1975

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) from a period three years later and says what somebody should have done, Mr. Speaker, that kind of judgment can be made, that kind of judgment is told to the public. The people who are willing to accept responsibility -- the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Riel, they say that that is a so-called biased, so-called independent inquiry, which was composed of a partner of the Minister of Mines "so we pay no attention to it. They let off the NDP and they blamed us." That's acceptance of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, which the Leader of the Opposition prides himself in.

Mr. Speaker, I accept responsibility. I accept responsibility. I say that one of our main faults during those first months was to try to pacify the business community that we were not going to do anything untoward, and that there was a contract with the CFI; that it was entered into although we didn't like the nature of the deal, it was entered into by the previous administration, and that we would follow it through provided that it was fulfilled, and, Mr. Speaker, maybe trying to satisfy the kind of hysteria that some people were afraid of when we became a government, that we stepped in too late. And I will accept that responsibility. But the fellows over there who are . . .

A MEMBER: All us dishonest ones over here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did not say the dishonest ones.

A MEMBER: You're worse than the Liberal Leader was.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I do not use that kind of statement, and I'm not going to use that kind of statement, but I will say that the Leader of the Opposition and that the members of the Conservative party are trying to avoid all responsibility for their involvement in that transaction, and that the public, while accepting the fact that somebody could make a mistake, will not accept the fact that somebody will not accept responsibility. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to go to the public and make the case that we are accepting our responsibility and that we are willing to fulfill that responsibility. But the Leader of the Opposition pretends that they had nothing to do with it. And that is the kind of testimony that he gave before the Commission of Inquiry.

But let me get back to the solid point. The Leader of the Opposition says that we are the ones who started it, we are the ones who incurred all these losses in the MDC, we're the ones who made all these things, so we are the ones who are now correcting it. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a statement which may surprise honourable members as to the responsibility which each of us has to assume for what is being done with the Manitoba Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, there is \$267 million outstanding to the Development Corporation at this time - \$267 million. I hope that my figures will be accepted as round figures, not precise figures. Of that, Mr. Speaker, \$204 million - and I'll indicate where the argument is but that's the only argument - \$204 million has been advanced to firms which were set up by the Conservative administration when they were in control of the Manitoba Development Corporation. That's 76.5 percent of the Fund. They include, Mr. Speaker, the Pas Forestry Complex, Manitoba's Distilleries, Columbia Forest Products, Electro-Knit Fabrics, Friendly Family Farms, Lighting Materials Limited, Simplot Chemical, Macey Foods Limited, and, Mr. Speaker, there is in this list - and I'm not going to foist it on the members of the Opposition, I'll let them remove this one - there is in this list A.E. McKenzie, which was also in existence and which had received a bank guarantee from the Government of Manitoba for \$450,000 before this government was involved with A.E. McKenzie. But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to A.E. McKenzie, the honourable member spoke on it today, I am going to show the Honourable Member from Brandon that, using his Leader's definition, A.E. McKenzie is making good money.

The Leader of the Opposition has overstepped himself again. He has given us the definition of making money and I'm going to show you how that definition applies to the Manitoba Development Corporation. But I leave you in suspense for the moment. \$204 million of the 267 million were advanced to firms which were in existence prior to this government taking office and which had commitments from the Manitoba Development Corporation prior to this government taking office. \$52 million, 25 percent, after this government came into office. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, there is some touch of success in blurring the issue. Selkirk Navigation, for instance. People say that we started that operation. Selkirk Navigation was started under the Conservative administration, not under this administration.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Well I hear the question being asked: "Yes, that's how much money was out, but what about the losses? What about the losses? The people who involved money in these losses are incompetent, unable to manage, throwing the public's money away, not thinking of where it comes from. It's these losses that we are talking about that had been incurred by the irresponsible people." Is that right? That's right, eh? That's right. The Member for Souris-Killarney says that's right. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, let's get to the losses.

There's a total, Mr. Speaker, of \$75 million accumulated losses in the Manitoba Development Corporation; \$75 million. The Pas Forestry Complex incurred 35 million of those losses, 47 percent of those losses. Lake Winnipeg Navigation \$715,000. Columbia Forest Products - I'm not going to now . . . that figure because it's still being dealt with. Lighting Materials, other accounts, a total of \$43 million of the losses which are shown on the books of the Manitoba Development Corporation, which the Member for St. James keeps accumulating, keeps referring to, were incurred through industries which were set up while the Manitoba Development Corporation was run by the Conservative administration - 58 percent of the losses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are losses that have been incurred while the Fund was under the hands of the New Democratic Party administration. Flyer Industries has a reserve for losses. Saunders Aircraft has a reserve for losses. William Clare Limited has a reserve for losses. There are others that have a reserve for losses. The total losses and reserves for losses under our administration is \$31,629,000 or 42 percent of the losses. But I want you to know that in that 42 percent there are losses which we have shown up as reserve, which would have never been shown up had it not been for the substantial changes that we have made with regard to accountability in the Manitoba Development Corporation. And when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition refers to acceptance of responsibility and candor regarding the dealings of the Manitoba Development Corporation, Mr. Speaker, he is treading on very dangerous ground. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, you know -- the honourable member says that this can be attributed to the bookkeeper and I'm going to deal with that in a moment, because if we did a different form of bookkeeping, we would not be showing these type of losses and apparently the Leader of the Opposition would be satisfied.

You know, the Leader of the Opposition blames -- he said that the New Democratic Party credo is to accept credit for everything that goes good and blame the other side for everything that goes bad. Then he said, Mr. Speaker, that everything that the Manitoba Development Corporation has done, like Flyer and Saunders, are mismanagement on the part of the government, and then he comes out with a pregnant statement. Mr. Speaker, he said, and I'm trying to recall his words: "Isn't it ironic that CFI is the only one that's making money?" That's what he said. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the fact that CFI is making money, if we used that type of bookkeeping, and he talks about fiddling the books, the Manitoba Government in the Development Corporation has virtually lost nothing, because now I'm going to read what the Leader of the Opposition says is the definition of making money. I've done this several times and indicated that I don't want the Manitoba Government to engage in this -- that if you advance a firm a great amount, or take a great amount of capital shares rather than advance it money, then it will have an opportunity of paying money because it will not have to pay interest, and if, for instance, the Manitoba Development Corporation were given a fund of \$150 million rather than an advance of \$150 million on which they had to pay, let us say, \$12 million in interest, if they could save that \$12 million interest charge they'd be making money. And I said by that type of bookkeeping we could show a much better picture for the Manitoba Development Corporation, but it is not our wants to do that, because we would prefer to show what is being spent on interest by the Manitoba Development Corporation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition now shows us what is his definition of making money, and his definition of making money is as follows: January 7, 1971 to December 31, 1971, there was a cash-flow loss in Churchill Forest Industries of \$7,406,000 - that's just cash-flow. That does not take into account a cent of interest. If we add the interest, that would be \$5,348,000 so there would be a loss of \$12 million. Somebody please add these as I'm reading them. \$12 million in 1971. In 1972 there was a cash-flow loss of

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) \$4,645,000 plus interest charges of \$9 million, or \$9,500,000, which would mean a total loss of \$13.5 million. In 1973 there was a cash-flow surplus - you know, that's when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would be happy. He makes money on a cash-flow surplus. He's the only one that I know that makes money on a cash-flow surplus, but he said that if we will make money on a cash-flow surplus we're making money. You know, I'm surprised that he didn't say that the Minister of Mines should be congratulated for making money with CFI. I mean, everything else he has indicated that we are incompetent with. If we are making money with CFI why are we not getting the credit for that? --(Interjection)-- We're getting it? No. You know why we don't get it? Because I'm just going to show you that we're not making money. That's why we'll get it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a cash-flow surplus of one million five and interest charges of \$8 million. Now I count that as a \$5,500,000 loss. In 1974 there is a \$10 million cash-flow surplus, but, Mr. Speaker, there is interest due on advances totalling \$150 million. Now, if we take that at 8 percent, there is interest payable of \$12 million and we have a deficit of \$2 million on interest alone. In every single year, Mr. Speaker, if we take the interest on the moneys advanced, there is a loss in the Churchill Forest Industries account. I haven't even touched depreciation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those accumulated losses, those accumulated losses . . .

A MEMBER: . . . somebody's added them up.

MR. GREEN: \$34 million; that's the Leader of the Opposition's definition of making money when he wants to indicate that CFI is a good thing, and that's the only thing that is making . . . --(Interjection)-- There is no repayment of capital, and look, you're not helping me out because I've got the same problems with other firms.

But I don't pretend that we are making money. Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend that that is making money.

A MEMBER: A. E. McKenzie. . . ?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in A. E. McKenzie we would make money if we capitalized everything that has been advanced. The bank is making money on A. E. McKenzie. The Honourable Member for Brandon East said today that they are paying huge amounts of interest to the bank. If they are paying \$600,000 in interest and if we said that instead of having \$11 million, eight of which is loans, that we're going to say that it is all share capital, there would be a profit shown on A. E. McKenzie because there would be no interest charges. And we didn't do that with A. E. McKenzie. I'll tell you something. We are going to do it, and we are going to do it, Mr. Speaker, because it is being demanded of us, not because I ever wanted to do it, but because members on that side have demanded that we follow the auditor's statement, and the auditor's statement, which they interpret to mean one thing - and they'll be able to question the auditor - that these statements are not handled in a proper business fashion, have been taken by honourable members to mean that they are not being run businesslike, that somehow the operation of the particular company is not being handled properly. That's not what the auditor is saying. The auditor would be very happy; he would say that this is businesslike if we provided an annual subsidy of \$17 million a year for the Manitoba Development Corporation. He would say, "That shows that you're going to have that amount of deficit, that you're going to have that amount of income, and as far as I'm concerned that's businesslike," and if you don't believe me you can check with the Auditor of Public Accounts. That is all that he is referring to. He is not talking about mismanagement, and those people who have interpreted that as a reference to mismanagement wrongly interpret the auditor. The auditor will also be happy if we take the Manitoba Development Corporation and instead of saying that it's capitalized at \$5 million, that we capitalize it at \$150 million, because then it won't pay interest at \$12 million a year to the Manitoba Government, and it'll show virtually no losses.

Will the members of the Opposition then say, "You have corrected the error of your ways. You have now gone into businesslike practices. You are now making money like CFI"? Is that what the Member for St. James will say?

Mr. Speaker, we have not done that. Essentially we have not done that, because, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to show the affairs of the Corporation in its most difficult light rather than its most favourable light. So when the Honourable Member for Morris says bookkeeping, there is no system of bookkeeping which the honourable member could devise

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) which would show in worse light the operations of the Manitoba Development Corporation. They've got a capital of \$5 million, loans of \$170 million.

Somebody says that doesn't happen to the IDB. Well, it's interesting, you know, the IDB says they make money. How do they make money? The IDB had an equity fund, a total of 53 million in shares, 21 million in reserve fund, or a total equity of \$74 million in 1970. They showed a profit of a half a million dollars. That's making money. --(Interjection)-- No, they showed a profit. On \$74 million capital investment, they showed a profit of \$500,000. If that wasn't capital, if it was a loan of \$74 million on which they had to repay money, which is the way in which the Manitoba Development Corporation operates, they'd have interest payable on the \$74 million of \$5 million and they'd show a loss of \$4,500,000 with no change in operations. Bookkeeping. In 1971 they had total capital of \$78 million and they show a profit of \$2 million. By Manitoba Development Fund bookkeeping, that would be a loss of \$2 million, roughly \$2 million.

In 1972 they had \$84 million and they show a profit of \$3,600.000. If they should use our form of bookkeeping, it would be a loss of over a million dollars. In 1973 they showed \$3,800,000 and profit \$92 million in capital. Using our form of bookkeeping, it would be a loss of roughly \$2 million. In 1974 they got \$104 million capital funds on which they pay no interest, and with interest in that year at 10 percent, they showed \$2,700,000 profit. Using our form of bookkeeping that would be a loss of roughly \$6 million. So when you talk about bookkeeping and when you talk about why doesn't it happen to the IDB, I tell you because we have operated differently, that we have operated differently, and members in this House know that we have operated differently, and they are --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't make a special claim for it. I happen to believe that there is a role for the public in economic affairs. I don't believe that that role is to bail out private enterprise. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the way it is used in every other jurisdiction. That is the way it was used by the Conservative administration. That is not the way in which this government should use that particular authority.

That's why we are suggesting, which I thought everybody would accept to be true, that this type of agency has traditionally in the past in every jurisdiction where it has been used, has been used as a means of bailing out private enterprise. And, you know, I respect those people who say we shouldn't use it at all and if private enterprise can't stand on its own feet they shouldn't get a penny. There are very few over there who will say it. The Leader of the Opposition will not say it. The Leader of the Opposition says we should do away with the Fund and set up a ghost fund. And what is a ghost fund? A ghost fund is an amount of capital which we will then put into the hands of a private board of directors, who will then use it as they see fit in cooperation with private enterprise, and we won't know what they're doing with it. That's the key to everything, of use of public moneys for the help of private enterprise. And that's what he suggests.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few who would say, "Don't do anything." I think that the Member for Lakeside would say, "Get out of it. If they can't look after themselves let's not look after them." But the Member for Lakeside, he got fired, Mr. Speaker. He would say it. The Member for Morris would say it. But the Leader of the Opposition would not say it. The Leader of the Opposition still wants the public to come in and support the existing elite status quo. That's why he believes, Mr. Speaker, that's why he believes in a private insurance company in the auto insurance industry, a public insurance company. That is now his program. He believes that the private insurance industry should exist, that there should be 50 companies, and there should be a public insurance company in competition. What does that mean? --(Interjection)-- The private insurance companies would be overjoyed with such an arrangement. Everybody, Mr. Speaker, who they did not want to sell insurance to, they would not have to have an assigned risk plan any more. There are those government guys over there who have to take everything. And after they take it, they will show a very bad balance sheet and then we will all make fun of how badly they do business. And that's what the Chamber of Commerce said tonight: "We don't want the public in a conventional mortgage business venture institution, because if they are not there, Mr. Speaker, everything that we need to help us but which we can't get a risk on, will be picked up by the public - we will get the benefit and they will take the risk."

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

That's why the banks -- The banks, Mr. Speaker, they love the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. The Manitoba Agricultural Corporation had a policy as follows: It would guarantee a farmer. It would guarantee a farmer who got money from the bank. The banks, who for years either foreclosed or would not lend the poor farmer money, suddenly became the farmer's best friend. The farmer would go in, the government would sign the covenant, the bank would pay the money. The farmer didn't pay, the government paid; the farmer paid, the bank made money. That's what he wants with an insurance corporation.

A MEMBER: Free enterprise.

MR. GREEN: Oh, yes, that's great. That's what they want with the Development Corporation, and those are the weak ones. The rugged individualists will not ask for it. Those who are the weak sisters who asked for it, and we know who they are.

A MEMBER: Name one.

MR. GREEN: They want the Development Corporation. They want it secret; they want the risks to be taken; they want the public to be involved so that there would be purchasing power; so that there would be jobs; so that people could buy from their stores; but they don't want the risk; therefore let the public take the risk and us make the money. And it's not something that was set up by socialist institution. It was set up by every government in this country, Mr. Speaker. There's only one difference -- well, not one, but one substantial difference, and it was forecast by Gurney Evans when he introduced the Manitoba Development Corporation the second time. He said in other -- "It is the intention of the government (just a minute) -- "The Fund has been at arms-length operation and it has been the policy of the government to recognize the independence of the Board of Directors in the administration of the affairs of the Fund. It is the intention of the government to maintain this policy in the normal operation of the Fund. It has also been our policy to respect the policy of the Fund in maintaining in confidence all its financial relationships with individual plants and we intend to continue this policy. In other provincial loan agencies there is no disclosure of loan details. A change in present policy would make Manitoba the only province making some such information public and would only make our problems more difficult and in fact would scare away potential investors."

The "only province", Mr. Speaker, "it would make it the only province" that makes disclosure of these loans. And the Minister of Industry at that time said "it would make our problems more difficult". Well it does make things more difficult, Mr. Speaker, but it's a concept which this government is committed to because we believe in the validity of what we are doing. We believe that what we are doing will stand the light of day and we believe that in the long run that the public involvement in knowing what is being done by their elected representatives in the area of commercial enterprises makes for an advance in the democratic process. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we are the "only ones" -- and despite the fact that "it makes our problems more difficult" we believe that what we are doing will earn us the confidence of the public.

We are prepared to operate with candor, which the honourable members were not prepared to do. We are prepared to accept responsibility, which the honourable members opposite were not prepared to do and which the Leader of the Opposition is still not prepared to do.

A MEMBER: Right on.

. continued next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that full disclosure is done only in the Province of Manitoba, we know that what's happening in Manitoba, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry says, "Who stuck a gun in their belly", and there's some suggestion that this is done by industry-grabbing socialists.

Mr. Speaker, in every province in this country and in the country as a whole there has developed a pattern, because of the failing of the ideology which suggests that everything will happen by itself and a frantic desire to pretend that that is occurring, there has been a public instrument to prop up the free enterprise system in commercial affairs. Are you not aware of them? Do I have to relate them? You know, you're talking about a, roughly let's say a \$20 million loss on the Manitoba Development Corporation's activities last year and the year before, most of which is interest. Do you know how much was lost by the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia last year on one operation, on the steel mill? Twenty million dollars. It's a public corporation. Do you know what was lost the year before? \$20 million. \$40 million in two years and I'm not certain therefore I cannot swear to it, but it wasn't all interest charges, it was operating losses, that's without charging huge interests on advances. \$40 million in two years. Do you think that that happened because Jerry Regan(?) is an incompetent Socialist? I know Jerry Regan. He is neither an incompetent, nor is he a Socialist, which I'm sure that he will be annoyed to hear me say.--(Interjection)--If you think that I am joking you do not know Jerry Regan. That's right. But if you think it's because there is a Socialist Government that that occurred you are badly mistaken. And if you're saying, "Well that's the Liberals, that's those three guys over there, we wouldn't do a thing like that".

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the Conservative Government in Nova Scotia spent on business enterprises, on one enterprise?--(Interjection)--Well, my understanding is, and again now here the Premier is more of an expert than I, they spent \$100 million on one plant. And, Mr. Speaker, they never ever did anything with it. So if they used our form of book-keeping, if they used our form of bookkeeping they would have to show \$100 million expenditures, \$7 million interest the first year; 7 million compounded on \$107 million the next year; by now their losses would be astronomical. That was done by a Conservative administration headed by the Chief Conservative in this country. Who stuck a gun into his belly? Do you know what stuck a gun in his belly?--(Interjection)--Why did the Salter Bridge get built? How come we could afford to build the Salter Bridge or the Treatment Plant in West Kildonan? How could we afford it? Do you know why we could afford it? We were so broke we had no choice but to build it. Those were built during the depression when we couldn't afford anything. So they said "We can't afford it, let's build it, so we'll be able to afford it". It has always been, it has always been the lifesaver of the free enterprise system as practised in North America to save the system by public spending, and one of the vehicles of public spending, at its worst, Mr. Speaker, and I say at its worst.

That the Manitoba Development Corporation at the present time has several problem accounts. Flyer Coach Industries is a problem account but I say given a chance there is every reason to believe that that could be a good industry in the Province of Manitoba, despite you know all of the efforts to discredit it. That is one problem account of the MDC. There are other problem accounts. It's interesting to hear, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie saying that it's not a lender of last resort, you're dealing with a multi-million corporation, they could get as much money as they want in Misawa Homes. Well, the Member for Portage la Prairie doesn't seem to realize that Misawa Homes (Japan) is not standing on the risk of the Misawa Home (Manitoba) Company. The Misawa Homes (Manitoba) Company stands on its own two feet. But I'm glad that he indicates that it would have been a very big problem to refuse to participate in that operation.

How would you people have acted? Here is a multi-national company, impeccable credentials, willing to put \$2 million - let's say that figure, it's not exactly correct but let's use that figure - into a town where you are on the verge of being destroyed because the Federal Government is withdrawing, only if the Manitoba Government will show similar confidence. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if we said "Go Fly a kite", the people in this House would say "What's the matter? Here is a way of building. Here is the Japanese willing to put in \$2 million of their money", and the Manitoba Government is not prepared to go along. Now despite that, I say that the principle upon which that was gone into made sense, but despite that it doesn't mean that it's not the kind of account that would only be invested in by an

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) investor of last resort, because Misawa (Japan) is not asked to guarantee the account, nor should they be, nor would they. There's no way in which they could assume responsibility for that account.

He said Simplot Chemical was an indication that this is not a lender of last resort. I'll tell you something: that the Simplot Chemical account didn't look good for a long time and Mr. Simplot, he made it quite clear in Fortune Magazine that when he invests he invests other people's money, not his own, and he was not on the covenant for payment of the Simplot account of \$23 million. So these were all venture accounts, as well they should be, and nobody's arguing about it. And nobody argued about it till now. You know, I really think that this has been an accepted feature of the system, that we use the public to prop up failing private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, that is a role which the public has played for many many years. They have been the doormat, they have acted as a willing doormat, they are not willing to act merely as doormat any longer. And they are saying that if we are involved in this type of agency and we are taking the criticism of all the losses, let us at least make it clear that that is what we are involved in. That we have been taking these losses to bail out a system which has failed from time to time and that we want to be involved, or at least we want to permit the Board of Directors who are dealing with us to have an opportunity of being involved in conventional form of financing. And the upcry which I am hearing from private industry and which I heard - well I couldn't really properly classify it as an upcry - but private industry expresses some real concern that the public is being involved. They should stick to lending money as last resort so we can poke fun at them. That's their role, not to be involved in anything useful.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our responsibility which seems to have been forgotten was that there would be a fund, which would be voted a capital account of money. That we would try to see to it that that fund had recruited to it public-spirited citizens who were capable, who would operate and manage its affairs. We have recruited, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard a word against them, a commendable group of people from all political parties. They have been given independence in the operation of the fund. I sometimes wonder why they stick with it. They get nothing, they get virtually nothing. They are blamed for things over which they have had no control. The present board, for instance, had very little to do with Saunders and Flyer Coach when they started. They have been working to try to make the best out of these enterprises. They get criticism every day in the newspaper as if they are nincompoops. There is absolutely no glory attached to doing the job. I wonder why they stick with it. And then I remind myself that people will do in the public service far more, work far harder, accept far more abuse, have a much greater incentive than anything that the profit motive has to offer.

And this, Mr. Speaker, despite - you know, it went almost to the verge of terrorism. The Leader of the Opposition has gone on some oppositional escapades, which I think are new in Canada. They are new. I do not know when there has been in any jurisdiction an attempt to create dissension within the board of an independent board of a corporation. The Leader of the Opposition made a public statement suggesting the people on the MDC Board should resign or should think about their consciences. He should think about his. Their consciences are in perfect condition. But, Mr. Speaker, that is a first in politics in my view and I will have to be shown another situation where that occurred. Who are these people? What control have I got? What power does Sid Green have over them that they are willing to take this abuse, willing to hear that kind of thing, willing to be catcalled and get nothing for it? And I say it's only their interest in serving the public. There is absolutely no political involvement and very few of them had political association with this party prior to being involved. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that they deserve better than what they are getting. If I have interfered with them, I am to be criticized. If I have made their job more difficult, I am to be criticized. But it cannot be said, Mr. Speaker, that they can be criticized for the way in which they have tried to deal with the various corporations under their control. Mr. Parsons, Mr. Speaker, will be before the Committee to deal with this question. As soon as we get the list from the Conservative Party we will be able to get the committees set up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've taken some time and this obviously is not going to be the last debate on this issue. I recognize that every debate brings us closer and closer to what the real issue is. And it took me, Mr. Speaker, many years to really appreciate that the issue was so clear and that the direction was so unilateral on both sides, both aiming in the same direction. When I was a youngster, Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to hear that somebody was

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) arguing against having a medical care program which would pay for the medical expenses of all of us rather than have each individual pay for his medical expenses. I thought that that was a program that would give me much more freedom and I heard that the others were arguing it on the basis that it curtails freedom. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is one thing that is sought with such an earnestness by members on both sides of this House, that from time to time they overstep themselves in the length that they will go to try to further their position to achieve it. And that, Mr. Speaker, is freedom. That both sides of this House are working towards the achievement of freedom. And when I see a mild-mannered man like the Member for Souris-Killarney suddenly have his large forehead go red and his fist brought down on the table, I know that he is looking for freedom. When I see the Member for Rock Lake, as mild-mannered a man as you could hope to find, Mr. Speaker, suddenly look like a . . . ready to rip apart every member on this side of the House, I know that he is working in defence of freedom. What members on the other side should appreciate is that we on this side who are moving in the direction that we move in, we do so because we think it increases the freedom of the individual in this society, and for that we are willing to fight. (Applause) That's worth more than a \$6.00 increase or decrease on automobile insurance premiums. There are people who will stand on a picket line for six months and not get paid to fight for freedom. There are people who will go to war and get killed and lose all their income in pursuit of freedom. What will always remain a difference is the way in which it's achieved. But do not think that that's not what we are working for.--(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, I want to tell the Member for Lakeside, that throughout history every positive achievement in the social economic field which has resulted in an increase in freedom to the individual has been challenged on the basis that it's going to destroy the freedom of the individual. When they went for universal education, which I say did more to increase individual liberty than anything else that ever happened before or since, it was objected to by Conservatives on the basis that it would interfere with the teacher-student relationship and would destroy the freedom of the individual. When they went for workers compensation which made it not a requirement that a worker who lost an arm on a job would have to sue his fellow worker if he was negligent rather than his employer, and said that however injuries take place on the job that the worker will be compensated and we will not have to try and find out who was negligent, it was opposed by the Conservative Party on the basis that that was an interference with the freedom of the individual. When we went, Mr. Speaker, for a system which said that people would be able to go to the hospital at the expense of all of us --(Interjection)--Pardon me.--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, each one of these things, the same thing had to do with it. And each of these when I grew up, Mr. Speaker, when I grew up I knew that if I had freer access to education it would make me more free, not less free. When I grew up I knew that if I could get workmen's compensation if I happened to get laid off - and I by the way never had to collect a cent of it in my life, for which I am grateful but I paid it - that that would make me more free not less free. That when I grew up I knew that if I could go to the Doctor and not worry about who paid for it, that that would make me more free not less free. But there is another group in society, Mr. Speaker, cause I know that . . . and you know when I grew up I knew that the suggestion that I could work or not work as I saw fit, that I was paid to work or free not to work was ridiculous. That I had to work, that I had to work as virtually, you know, some will call it a wage slave - I don't like those terms - but there are many people who are trapped on the job and have no choice but to work or not to work on that job, they have no choice unless the choice is not to look after their families, not to enjoy any of the amenities of life. That those people know that freedom to them meant an extension of the rights that they had within society.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he grew up the question of medical care was never a problem, the question of education was never a problem, the question of health care was never a problem. I mean those things were available, therefore he was free and anybody who was going to tax him to make them available to everybody else was going to interfere with his freedom. So there is one set of society who said that every time the Government interferes with my right to see to it that we continue to be able to have the status quo exploit, the status quo elite exploit the status quo dependent, that that was an interference with their freedom, but it was an extension of the freedom of the others. And I tell the honourable member this, he knows the emotions that are in the breasts of members such as the Member for

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Souris-Killarney and everybody else on that side when they are fighting for freedom. I tell you that this side fights for freedom with the same intensity, and we intend to maintain that fight. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: According to Rule 35, Subsection 2 at the half hour before adjournment, I must now put the sub-amendment, the amendment made by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

Question put, Motion lost.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member have support? Thank you. Call in the members.

The motion before the House is the one made by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, the sub-amendment. Do you wish it read out?

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

YEAS

Messrs. Axworthy	F. Johnston (Sturg. Creek)
Bilton	Jorgenson
Blake	McGill
Brown	McGregor
Craik	McKellar
Einarson	McKenzie
Enns	Minaker
Ferguson	Patrick
Graham	Sherman
Henderson	Spivak
G. Johnston (P la P)	Watt

NAYS

Messrs. Adam	McBryde
Barrow	Malinowski
Bostrom	Miller
Boyce	Osland
Burtniak	Paulley
Cherniack	Petursson
Derewianchuk	Schreyer
Desjardins	Shafransky
Dillen	Toupin
Doern	Turnbull
Green	Uruski
Hanuschak	Uskiw
Jenkins	Walding
Johannson	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22; Nays 27.

MOTION lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker I too would like to do the correct thing in preserving the traditions of this House which I think in the years, as they go on, more and more members opposite begin to appreciate are perhaps some worthwhile things to preserve despite the initial Throne Speech that was read into this Chamber by this government when they first occupied that side of the House.

So I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on once again assuming the responsibility of presiding as Chief Steward of this Chamber. That of course is extended to the Deputy Speaker as well. I'm sure that we all are pleased to see the robustness of the honourable gentleman from Logan. I've been assured that he can still wield a mean gavel if called upon, so we look forward to that occasion.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

To the new members on the treasury benches, the Honourable the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation, I believe it is, the Minister of Co-ops and harvestable resources, wild rice . . .

A MEMBER: Wild oats?

MR. ENNS: No, no. And of course to my honourable friend who has just left the Chamber, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, the Minister of Health and Social Development for whom I have many fond memories and look forward to renewing some of the debates that we've had in the past and that I'm sure with some refining we can do greater justice to in the coming days of this Session.

I extend further, congratulations to the new Deputy Leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. I would simply want to indicate to you what has already become evident. You see what the honourable members opposite do not know, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Member from Brandon West is effectively known in the inner circle of the Conservative Party as "Mad Dog McGill", and I think the kind of new thrust that the opposition has had just these first few days as exhibited by the Honourable Member from Riel, the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, the Honourable Leader in his reply from the Throne Speech indicates that perhaps the wisdom of choosing a new Deputy Leader at this particular time in fact has considerable merit that would be borne out in the ensuing days of this Session.

I have to make some further passing remarks about re-election of my friend, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface because there has been a kind of euphoria exhibited by members opposite particularly by the last speaker who kind of feels that this indeed is a vindication of the fact if there was any question about the fortunes of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba that they should now be laid to rest after the successful election of that honourable gentleman.

Well, I think Mr. Speaker, in fairness one should recall just some of the preamble prior to his election. He did not rush, indeed did not even want to become elected as a New Democrat. He needed of course the personal assurance of the First Minister that the First Minister was going to be in his place. Now, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister suffers from a problem that I from time to time have been known to suffer from; you know being reasonably candid and honest with the press, perhaps saying, you know, letting my mind ramble when I'm out at the ranch and perhaps you know ill-advisedly so in terms of latter repercussions and it was in one of those moments of course that the Honourable First Minister's indicated his deep desire to leave that group, to get away from them. In fact even a United Nations assignment somewhere in this whole wide world might be more appealing to him than sitting or carrying on for a few more years with the honourable members that sit around and that he has to call his colleagues.

Well, Sir, that particular statement, you know, understandably upset any person who was thinking of joining that group and particularly the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development now. So prior to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface showing any great inclination or any real desire to seek that seat under the banner of the New Democratic Party he required, and indeed received that kind of personal reassurance from the Honourable First Minister that in fact seeing as how he was that attractive, not to the New Democratic Party, but to the Honourable First Minister, the First Minister would have to concede that he would have to stay where he is, at least for the time being. And of course he perhaps, and I wouldn't. You know I think with some justification. In view of the difficulty that the Honourable First Minister has in rounding out his Cabinet the other suggestion that perhaps should he desire to seek that election, why he might move a little closer to the most favored First Minister, why that might also have been considered to be some little inducement in the mind of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface who once again graces this Chamber.

You know, I just have to make those few comments. The endorsement was so great by various members--oh, Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to make a bad kind of a speech, but the thought did strike me on opening day as that mass of Cabinet Ministers sprawled into the front of this blue carpet, those few remaining backbenchers had such long faces and of course, you know it's in passing reference to the mover and seconder of this speech, it's understandable that the opening paragraphs were nothing but consummate praise for the First Minister, because I can understand their loneliness back there when the Cabinet is meeting. They must

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) be ricketing across each other in that caucus room with five chairs apiece, because Lord knows what they've done to the Cabinet Chamber, because as far as I know since the last time I've been there it hasn't been made that much bigger.

Well, sir, enough for that. I should of course also suggest that it has not escaped my attention that in all of this there's been a significant change in the power structure of my honourable friends opposite. We have wasted considerable time, gentlemen, in the past in not properly identifying where in fact the power lay in that group. I can recall some report, I don't wish to speak entirely definitively because I don't have the actual press clippings before me, but it seems that while the First Minister was having difficulties in making up his mind as to whether to stay or not they decided to hold a conference somewhere, a Cabinet meeting at the Nanking or the Shanghai, Peking or somewhere, they held a convention, a conference, at least so it was reported in the front pages of I believe the Free Press. And you see we've laboured under that illusion that perhaps the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or, indeed the outgoing, the former Minister of Finance or some of these other, the Honourable Minister of the Universities had you know kind of controlled and manipulated or had powerful influence in that Cabinet. But, sir, the candid comments coming out of that well, reported, I might say, Cabinet meeting while the honourable gentlemen were enjoying I presume Chinese food although I don't want to bring any racial overtones into this debate. While they were doing thus we find out first of all that it is the Honourable the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation that wields the power. If I understand correctly, he was quoted as saying very definitively that he will decide as to when the First Minister can take a holiday or not. And he will decide when major Cabinet changes should be considered or not. So I suggest to all of us if we intend to effectively deal with this government we should direct our rapier-like thrusts at none other than the Honourable Member of Tourism and Recreation who we now recognize as the new power source in that party.

Well so much for the New Nanking or the Shanghai or Peking conference. I think a passing reference has to be made to the mover and seconder of the speech and my congratulations go to them. I wondered why the seconder chose to use as his major thrust a defence of Autopac. Could it be, for instance, could it be for instance that in that catalogue of virtues listed in the Throne Speech, which of course went back to Day One, included the medicare program, included the present and latest pharmacare program, included everything this government ever did. And that's fair game. But the one thing it didn't include was any reference to comprehensive automobile insurance which they sometimes lead us to believe is one of their gems. I found it somewhat difficult to understand, at least it jogged my mind why did auto insurance, Autopac receive no honourable mention in the Throne Speech when a four-year old medicare program still deserved high-ranking and rating; when as yet an untried and fully implemented pharmacare program has received that kind of rating. Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that despite the description of the length and width of the conduits and what have you that there is some nervousness on the part of honourable members opposite about the popularity and general appeal of that great program? I suspect that we will hear considerably more about that.

To my honourable friend from Thompson, I suppose it's a question from where you see it, but he sees the world perhaps as black and white as I tend to see it sometimes. The main thrust of his comments were of course the massive class struggle that he likes to describe is going on in Manitoba, which I regret. However it's his privilege to feel that way about it.

You know one has the temptation, Mr. Speaker, if one speaks late on in the debate on the Throne Speech to simply refute what other speakers have said and subsequently not to have an opportunity to make the remarks that one had originally intended to remark. And I find myself somewhat in that position by having to thank the Honourable Member from Gimli who spoke in such glowing terms about what is happening in the Interlake and I couldn't agree with him more. In fact I have seldom received such acknowledgement of success in my political life, having been of course part of the government and indeed the signatore of the \$85 million re-development scheme for the Interlake which was signed in 1967, which has indeed had the five or six years running time during the length of this government, and I have another occasion to congratulate them for not changing it, for indeed improving it, and acting upon it. So the remarks made by my honourable friend from Gimli, you know, are gratifying, they really are, because it indicates to me that, in some instances anyway, when sound but progressive

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) forward-looking programs are enacted upon by one government there can, under our system of governments at least - the ability to carry on with the continuity of them is there. For that I thank the Honourable Member for Gimli.

I really would also like to spend some time with my honourable friend from Fort Rouge who rose in a fury of anger the other day, and you know in checking through the Hansard of that day I must say I'm somewhat amazed. If the portent of his speech which would seem to be that up to date there has been no constructive criticism, there's been nothing of substance brought forward by this side of the House, well that shows the tremendous sensitivity that he probably has or whether or not he can take it. I checked through it. I thought listening to him that maybe I hadn't listened to the Member from Riel correctly. So I just went through the Honourable Member for Riel's speech. It's on Page 88 of Hansard of Monday of March 10th, and I find him devoting his first page of his speech to the very things that I've just finished doing--doing the traditional congratulations, I find his second page, a full page, devoted in doing something that is not all that usual, not all that common, regrettably perhaps, but he takes time out to compliment the government on some of the programs that he thought were worthwhile that were mentioned in Throne Speech, child development services, the day care services. He then, lo and behold, carries on into another third speech about - this is what begins to put him suspect in my eyes when he makes such an all out effort for the women's vote in the time that he dedicated to the affairs of women and their rights, and that more attention should be paid to them.

He seems to me then that he has a very legitimate criticism on Page 4 of his speech to devote to the financial handling of this government; the kind of over-expenditures of this government; the validity of debating estimates in this Chamber when upwards to 40 and 50 and 60 millions of dollars are passed by special awards. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's fair comment to make. I would hardly think, sir, that that was being irresponsible and negligent in our responsibility as the Official Opposition.

I then find that he publicly makes the case - a case that has been made before for the most significant economic development that this province has seen, namely, his call and plea for some consideration for the Arctic Gas Pipeline coming through Manitoba. But perhaps my honourable friend from Fort Rouge realizes that his liberal counterparts in Ottawa have no intention of paying too much attention to us, but that happens, Mr. Speaker, to be one of those major far-reaching visionary kind of suggestions that emanate only from this side of the House, something like the building of the floodway around this city that he is so fond of, and that would have no problems about worrying about the development of its core area if it was going to be flooded out every new year's. But no he doesn't recognize that as something of substance and of something of importance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he got awfully nervous . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to carry on tomorrow.

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